



MEETING OF THE PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES

4 MARCH 2026



Please consider
the environment
before printing



Consider carefully how
the information in this
document is transmitted



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL HELD
4 MARCH 2026 IN ST KILDA TOWN HALL AND VIRTUAL VIA TEAMS**

The meeting opened at 6:31pm.

IN ATTENDANCE

Cr Makin (Chairperson), Cr Buckingham, Cr Crawford (online), Cr Cunsolo, Cr Halliday, Cr Hardy, Cr Jay, Cr Mears, Cr Thomann.

Chris Carroll, Chief Executive Officer, Brian Tee, General Manager City Development, Kylie Bennetts, General Manager Community Wellbeing, Robyn Borley, General Manager, Governance and Performance, Tarnya McKenzie, Acting General Manager, City Infrastructure, Daniel Lew, Director, People and Experience, Mike Fisher, Manager City Planning and Sustainability, Dana Pritchard, Manager Open Space, Recreation and Community Resilience, Ryan Plunkett, Coordinator Emergency Management, James Gullan, Acting Manager Communications and Governance, Emily Williams, Senior Council Business Advisor, Josh Vearing, Council Business Advisor.

The Council respectfully acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the Kulin Nation. We acknowledge their legacy and spiritual connection to the land and waterways across the City of Port Phillip and pay our heartfelt respect to their Elders, past, present, and emerging.

1. APOLOGIES

Nil.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved Crs Halliday/Thomann

That the minutes of the Meeting of the Port Phillip City Council held on 18 February 2026 be confirmed.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED.

3. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.



4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND SUBMISSIONS

Public Questions are summarised below. The submissions were made verbally and can be listened to in full on our website: <http://webcast.portphillip.vic.gov.au/archive.php>

Public Question Time:

- **Frank Artuso:** What restrictions exist on creating a Local Government Digital Infrastructure Ecosystem that enables Councils to deliver high impact services together on shared priorities with any Council, not just neighbouring ones, where there are clear mutual benefits?

Can principles of Digital Infrastructure be applied to assist Local Government? Delivering benefits of a shared services and collaboration, standardisation and interoperability, scalability and innovation and continuous improvement?

As an alternative to traditional amalgamation, can an IT platform-based merger be considered particularly amongst Councils that may be "lesser equals" in digital maturity, but share a common need and readiness for IT renewal and improvement? For example: Merri-Bek City Council noted in March 2025 that 120 IT applications were no longer fit for purpose and budgeted a \$31.3 million transformational budget. Darebin had a \$36.4 million five-year program. Yarra had allocated \$32 million.

Where is the discussion on Local Government digital alignment for the public interest of residents and ratepayers of this State? Where is Port Phillip on this proposition?

Yarra City Council's mid-year review deferred an initial approximate \$3.9m in an enterprise resourcing planning program, lifting its forecast budget position by \$7.2m. This is simply masking the implication of a siloed IT system and delays a cornerstone reform needed for critically required strategic efficiency. For Port Phillip this challenges a healthy local government sector that must be technically independent, however strategically unified as a shared continuous evolving digital infrastructure system that benefits all people of the state.

Daniel Lew, Director People and Experience advised in relation to Digital Infrastructure Ecosystem, in general, Councils can collaborate digitally and they do not need to be neighbours. The constraint is not geography, but whether collaboration can be done safely, fairly and responsibly. That means protecting people's information, keeping systems secure, ensuring records can be accessed when required, and making sure procurement and spending are transparent and represent value for money. Equally, it needs to be done securely and practically. Shared platforms only work where there is sufficient alignment in processes, data definitions, and ways of working. Without that, technology alone adds complexity rather than value. The real work sits in agreeing common approaches, improving data quality, and being clear about governance, including who is responsible, how changes are funded, and how Councils can enter or exit arrangements. These foundations need to be in place, for shared digital approaches to deliver consistent outcomes for residents.

In regards to the principles of digital infrastructure, these are relevant to Local Government, but they are constrained by existing policies, processes, legacy systems and varying levels of data and digital maturity across Councils. In practice, any shared approach would be shaped by current operating models, regulatory requirements, standards and readiness, rather than an ideal or uniform design. Application of these principles is therefore incremental and contextual, not theoretical or one size fits all.

In relation to traditional amalgamation, Daniel Lew clarified that the response was a general comment on the concept and not a reflection on, or assessment of, any individual Council.

MINUTES - MEETING OF THE PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL - 4 MARCH 2026



In principle, a shared IT platform arrangement can be considered as a form of collaboration. However without a traditional amalgamation, it does not change the fact that each Council remains a separate legal entity and must retain its own decision-making, accountability, and obligations for privacy, security, records, and financial stewardship. The key question is therefore not whether the technology can be shared, but whether the governance, risk settings, operational impacts, and long-term costs are acceptable and equitable for participating Councils. Any consideration would need to be approached cautiously, given the public interest and the need to maintain clear accountability to residents and ratepayers. In practice, Councils would still be likely to rely on tier one platforms due to the scale of ongoing investment required in research and development. Licensing and end user costs are unlikely to deliver significant savings, as they are typically driven by enterprise scale rather than individual Council staffing models. Any shared platform approach would also require substantial upfront investment and would carry material delivery and transition risk, noting there have been a number of false starts in this space historically.

In relation to discussion on Local Government digital alignment, discussion exists at a policy, advisory and sector level through digital strategies, Local Government Victoria programs i.e. The Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) and sector forums. However, there is no single, coordinated statewide position or mandated approach for local government digital alignment. Most activity remains exploratory and context specific. Port Phillip's focus is on delivering accountable, secure and sustainable digital services for its community within existing governance, policy and budget frameworks. Council participates in sector discussions where appropriate and remains open to exploring collaborative opportunities, including engagement with other councils, sector bodies such as MAV, and technology partners. We are in fact very actively participating in this space with emerging technologies like AI.

- **Michael Barrett:** In regards to the NEXTDC M1 Data Centre at 826 Lorimer St, Port Melbourne. While it physically sits within the boundaries of the City of Melbourne it does sit adjacent to the boundary of the City of Port Phillip and shares the same electrical power and freshwater underground networks as the residents and ratepayers of the City of Port Phillip. The CEO of NEXTDC has stated publicly that they are “pro any source” of any energy which will boost productivity and reliability including nuclear power. Common experience in the US is for residents residing close to Data Centres to have their shower and bath times regulated to take account of the extraordinary amount of fresh water required to support cooling operations of data centres and also to suffer from power “brown outs” as it is estimated that data centres can consume up to 20% of the available power in a local power grid network. I also note that the end-to-end planning approval of the NEXTDC M1 data centre by the Victorian Government was achieved in a record 75 day period. Given these circumstances, can Council outline the proactive steps that the City of Port Phillip have taken in protecting the ratepayers and residents’ interests in light of the imminent construction of the NEXTDC M1 data centre?

Brian Tee, General Manager City Development advised that on 16 January 2026, the Minister for Planning issued a planning permit for a data centre which does sit within the City of Melbourne. The proposal for the Data Centre was assessed by the Minister for Planning under the Development Facilitation Pathway and the City of Port Phillip was not notified of the planning application, and Council did not have a formal opportunity to comment on the application. Water pressure requirements and electricity and power related matters are not within the jurisdiction of council. They are managed under separate legislation, specifically, water pressure requirements sit with Southeast Water, while electricity and power related issues are the responsibility of Citi Power.



Council is aware that the Victorian Government is considering policy settings for data centres. They are undertaking a \$5.5 million Sustainable Data Centre Action Plan, and the Federal Government has also introduced a 2025 mandate around the requirements for achieving five-star energy rating. While this is a matter for State and Federal jurisdiction, Council does work closely with the State Government the City of Melbourne. Brian Tee undertook to raise this matter with their counterparts to seek to understand the impact that this development will have on current and future residents at Fishermans Bend.

Council Report Submissions:

Item 9.1 Elster Creek Litter Action Plan

- Isaac Herman

Item 12.1 Submission to the Victorian Government's Electrical Line Clearance Review

- Chris Zeiher

Item 14.1 Notice of Motion – Councillor Cunsolo - Hooning

- Tim Norman
- Heather Brown
- Tam Lindrum

5. COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

- **Councillor Halliday:** Following up on Frank Artuso's question in relation to the sorts of digital platforms that Council uses. We've seen these large amounts of money that other councils are using in rolling out digital platforms, and certainly the City of Port Phillip invested \$15-23m recently in upgrading one of our core systems. Which of our core systems are SaaS platforms which we buy off the shelf and modify, and which are bespoke and unique to us. Are we any different to any other councils in this operating model?

Chris Carroll, Chief Executive Officer advised that the City of Port Phillip investment was made four or five years ago to Council's core enterprise platform, the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) which is a SaaS based product. As part of that, Council transitioned a number of fragmented systems that were being used and consolidated them into one integrated platform. The core of the software at Council is now software as a service, Council is progressively moving towards software as a service unless it makes sense not to, such as keeping it on premises for security and other reasons, but generally speaking Council is moving towards the Cloud. The City of Port Phillip is a leader in this space, a lot of Councils referred to by Frank are following a similar path to what Council has done previously. The CEO acknowledged that the question raised by Frank was a valid one and something they had been considered extensively, both currently at Port Phillip and previously during their work at Auckland Council during the major governance reforms as part of the amalgamation of many Councils and Council controlled entities. The CEO also acknowledged that while it's a good concept, in their experience during the Auckland consolidation of various systems, it was very challenging to implement in practice when not operating under a single entity of governments.

MINUTES - MEETING OF THE PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL - 4 MARCH 2026



Council did try and collaborate with the City of Melbourne, they made a spin off company before Council embarked on their own process, which failed. At the same time Council were speaking to three other Councils (Wyndham, Moonee Valley, and Mornington Peninsula) who'd embarked on a joint collaborative procurement approach, while we learnt a lot from this, unfortunately that process fell over for a number of reasons. Council have willingly collaborated with Service Victoria and looking for opportunities in particular service platforms like Council's Health Manager and are very open to having a state wide solution, unfortunately which hasn't progressed. Council are always open to opportunities to where Council can collaborate and certainly share knowledge and expertise across the sector.

Chris Carroll, Chief Executive Officer offered the meet with Frank Artuso, along with Manohar Esarapu, Chief Information and Innovation Officer, to discuss their experiences in this space.

- **Councillor Thomann:** Do we have any feedback of all the activities that happened in St Kilda over the weekend. Have we been able to assess how popular and successful these festivals and events were?

Kylie Bennetts, General Manager Community Wellbeing advised that there were a whole range of wonderful activities occurring across the municipality over the weekend, and Council has received some fantastic anecdotal feedback about the quality and diversity of activities across the municipality. There were activities like Beerfest which attracted 4,500 people. The Palais Foreshore had a series of shows Thursday to Monday which attracted about 15,000 people. A very successful Porsche and coffee event at South Melbourne with 400 cars on display and Council has had some anecdotal feedback that there were lots of people in attendance there, we are looking forward to hearing from the South Melbourne Traders Association further around the success of that event. The Blues Festival involved 14 venues, 2 outdoor stages, 40 bands with over 70 performances, and Council believes there were approximately 5,000 attendees across the three days of that event. Council also hosted the fourth open day at the Emerald Hill Library in partnership with the annual Porsche and Coffee event in the nearby South Melbourne Streets and businesses. This event saw over 1,000 visits recorded on the door counter at the library which was a great opportunity for people to participate in a range of activities and check out the local library service. This years attendance was an increase of over 30% of people attending that event over the last year and for many it was their first visit to the Emerald Hill Library.

- **Councillor Hardy:** How is Council tracking with budget in relation to the cyber security and development of new systems referenced earlier in the meeting?

Chris Carroll, Chief Executive Officer advised that Council delivered that project on budget, and delivered all the benefits including the savings that Council have bent a couple of years ago. Council continue to leverage that system. Council delivered on scope, to budget, during COVID, in a virtual environment.

- **Councillor Hardy:** In relation to the road safety survey that was recently placed on Have Your Say, how is the 'other' being measured in the questions?

Mike Fisher, Manager City Planning and Sustainability advised that there was an open field comment box where submitters could provide other remarks on the strategy. These comments can be provided to Council when the Road Safety Strategy Action Plan is presented to Council for adoption.

- **Councillor Jay:** Can officers provide an update on the rollout of Grand Prix parking permits for residents affected by the Grand Prix?



Brian Tee, General Manager City development advised that Council has been approached by a number of residents who have indicated that they have not received their permits, with that number being higher than in subsequent years. Council have met with the contractor to understand if there are any gaps, those discussions are ongoing. Council are preparing to provide permits to residents as quickly as possible. If members of the community have not received a permit they can contact Council and Council will provide permits to those who have not received them. Council are still working with the company and are providing permits proactively to the extent that gaps have been identified in delivery of the permits.

- **Councillor Halliday:** On the subject of the new Data Centre in Port Melbourne that was raised during public question time by Michael Barrett, did Council receive any notification ahead of the announcement of that?

Brian Tee, General Manager City development advised that they could not categorically state whether Council officers have received notification of it. Brian Tee reiterated that they would raise this matter with their counterparts to seek to understand the impact that this development will have on current and future residents.

Councillor Halliday followed up asking if the impact of these Data Centres on the electrical grid and water supply failures will see brown outs or lack of water pressure in certain areas. Will there be mechanisms in place for Council to proactively or pre-emptively be aware of these impacts?

Brian Tee, General Manager City development advised that Council does not have a formal role in the water or electricity matters. If it does have significant impact on the community, Council will take up with the State Government and advocate for changes to make sure there isn't an impact, such as those that you've identified.

6. PETITIONS, JOINT LETTERS AND DEPUTATIONS.

Nil.

7. PRESENTATION OF CEO REPORT

Nil.

8. A HEALTHY AND CONNECTED COMMUNITY

Nil.

9. AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE AND RESILIENT CITY

9.1 Elster Creek Litter Action Plan

PURPOSE

- 1.1 To present the final *Elster Creek Litter Action Plan* (ECLAP) for Council endorsement following community engagement.

The following question was taken on notice during discussion of the item:



Councillor Halliday: There was a comment about potentially dredging the canal to reduce the run off of organic matter. Is dredging the canal something that is envisaged or recommended by Melbourne Water?

Mike Fisher, Manager City Planning and Sustainability took the question on notice.

Moved Crs Crawford/Buckingham

That Council:

- 3.1 Notes the Community Engagement report on the draft Elster Creek Litter Action Plan. **(Attachment 1)**.
- 3.2 Notes the changes to the draft Elster Creek Litter Action Plan following community engagement.
- 3.3 Thanks the community members involved in the development of the Action Plan, and the group of organisations in the Elster Creek Litter Collaboration.
- 3.4 Endorses the Elster Creek Litter Action Plan **(Attachment 3)** for implementation.
- 3.5 Authorises the Chief Executive Officer, or their delegate to make minor amendments to the plan that do not materially alter it's the plans intent.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

10. A SAFE AND LIVEABLE CITY

10.1 Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMP)

PURPOSE

- 1.1 For Council to note the Port Phillip Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMP) which has recently been updated by the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC) in accordance with *the Emergency Management Act*.

Moved Crs Makin/Halliday

That Council:

- 3.1 Thanks, the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee for their work in supporting emergency response, preparedness and the review and implementation of the Municipal Emergency Management Plan and associated sub-plans in accordance with the Emergency Management Act 2013.
- 3.2 Notes the revised Municipal Emergency Management Plan – Port Phillip Municipal District (2025) as outlined in Attachment 1.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.



11. A VIBRANT AND THRIVING COMMUNITY

Nil.

12. AN ENGAGED AND EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

12.1 Submission to the Victorian Government's Electric Line Clearance Review

PURPOSE

- 1.1 To note City of Port Phillip's submission to the Victorian Government's engagement on their Electrical Line Clearance Review.

Moved Crs Halliday/Jay

That Council:

- 3.1 Notes the City of Port Phillip's submission to the Victorian Government's engagement on the Electrical Line Clearance Review (Attachment 1)
- 3.2 Thanks members of the community who contributed to the Victorian Government's Electric Line Clearance Review by making their own submissions to the state's consultation process.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

13. A TRUSTED AND HIGH-PERFORMING ORGANISATION

13.1 Submission to the Federal Parliamentary Inquiry into Local Government Funding and Fiscal Sustainability

PURPOSE

- 1.1 To note the submission to the Federal Parliamentary Inquiry into Local Government Funding and Fiscal Sustainability.

Moved Crs Halliday/Thomann

That Council:

- 3.1 Notes the City of Port Phillip's submission to the Federal Parliamentary Inquiry into Local Government Funding and Fiscal Sustainability (attachment 1).
- 3.2 Notes without structural reform to the local government funding framework, councils will continue to face increasing financial strain, limiting their capacity to deliver services, renew infrastructure and support broader economic and social objectives.
- 3.3 Notes the submission recommended the following five key actions:
 - 3.3.1 An increase in the overall level of Federal Assistance Grants funding to local government.
 - 3.3.2 Reform of rate capping arrangements so that, if retained, they are based on a fit-for-purpose Local Government Cost Index that reflects key cost drivers



such as wages, construction and contracted services, rather than Consumer Price Indexation.

- 3.3.3 A requirement for State Governments to undertake and publish Local Government Impact Assessments for new and amended policies, with identified impacts informing funding decisions and cost indexation.
 - 3.3.4 Action to address the long-term decline in State and Commonwealth co-contributions to service delivery and infrastructure, including indexing future funding increases to relevant service cost indices to maintain relative funding shares.
 - 3.3.5 A coordinated, long-term Commonwealth/ State approach to funding the infrastructure impacts of climate change, including dedicated investment to improve the resilience of existing assets in high-risk locations such as coastal and foreshore areas.
- 3.4 Notes strengthening local government funding is essential to ensuring sustainable communities and the effective functioning of Australia's system of government.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED.

FOR: Crs Makin, Thomann, Mears, Hardy, Crawford, Buckingham, Halliday and Cunsolo

AGAINST: Nil

ABSTAINED Cr Jay

13.2 Proposed Discontinuance and Sale of Laneway R3052, off Kings Way, South Melbourne Vic 3205

PURPOSE

- 1.1 For Council to consider whether the road adjoining 45-53, 55, 57, 59-61 Park Street and 311 Kings Way, South Melbourne, being the laneway known as R3052 (Road) on Council's Register of Public Roads should be discontinued pursuant to the *Local Government Act 1989* (Vic) (the Act) and sold to the adjoining owner.

Moved Crs Jay/Thomann

That Council:

Having considered that there were no submissions received regarding Council's proposal to discontinue the road being the land more particularly known as R3052:

- 3.1 Resolves to discontinue the Road as it considers that the Road is not reasonably required for public use for the following reasons:
 - 3.1.1 Is fully enclosed on the northern, eastern and southern boundaries by adjoining properties, and is only accessible on the western boundary from Kings Way;



- 3.1.2 Is only used for pedestrian and vehicular access to service the adjoining properties (under contract to the Purchaser and pending settlement), namely 45-53, 55, 57, 59-61 Park Street and 311 Kings Way, South Melbourne; and
- 3.1.3 Does not form part of a thoroughfare for pedestrian or vehicular traffic to any other public road.
- 3.2 Resolves to sell the land in the discontinued Road for market value plus reimbursement of Council's costs to facilitate this transaction to the Purchaser;
- 3.3 Notes that proceeds from the sale will go into Council's Strategic Property Reserve used to support the acquisition and development of the property portfolio;
- 3.4 Authorises the Chief Executive Officer or their delegate to negotiate, approve, and enter into such documentation to complete the discontinuance, sale, and transfer of the Road;
- 3.5 Directs that the Chief Executive Officer or their delegate signs an authorisation allowing Council's solicitors to execute transfer documents and any other documents required to be signed on Council's behalf in connection with the transfer of the discontinued Road to the Purchaser;
- 3.6 Directs that any easements, rights, or interests required to be created or saved over the Road by any public authority be done so and not be affected by the discontinuance and sale of the Road; and
- 3.7 Directs that the Purchaser be required to consolidate the title to the discontinued Road within the title to their land (or such part of it approved by Council) within 12 months of the date of the transfer of the discontinued Road.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting for a break at 8:35pm.

The meeting resumed at 8:44pm.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION

Item 14.1 Notice of Motion – Councillor Cunsolo – Hooning

The following question was taken on notice during discussion of the item:

- **Councillor Thomann:** In relation to the Department of Transport and Planning community reference group report referenced by Tim Norman during public submissions. This report was created in September 2023, but progress stalled due to the change in premier and cabinet. Is there any chance for Council officers to request an update to see if any action was taken out of this report?

Chris Carroll, Chief Executive Officer took the question on notice to look into the background of the report.

Moved Crs Cunsolo/Mears

That Council:-



1. Requests officers to advocate to the State Government of Victoria to:
 - 1.1 implement a noise camera trial in response to community concerns about anti-social behaviour and noisy vehicles building on the recent NSW approach to hooning.
 - 1.2 seek a partnership with Victoria Police, Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Victoria and Council to ensure a suitable anti-hooning trial be undertaken within City of Port Phillip at recognised hotspots.
2. Reaffirms its support for a financial contribution to an acoustic noise camera to be used within the City of Port Phillip.
3. Requests the Mayor write to Local MPs and relevant Ministers, relevant Shadow Cabinet Ministers and emerging State Election Candidates seeking action on hooning as per this resolution of Council.
4. Requests officers to contact the relevant authorities in NSW who have undertaken an acoustic camera trial to investigate the effectiveness of acoustic cameras.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

14.2 Notice of Motion – Councillor Halliday – Public Active Transport Election Commitments

Councillor Thomann left the chamber at 9:16pm and did not return for the remainder of the meeting.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9:13pm.

The meeting resumed at 9:20pm.

Moved Crs Halliday/Jay

That Council:

1. Advocates to relevant candidates contesting the 2026 Victorian State Government election to publicly commit to the delivery of priority public and active transport projects across Port Phillip.
2. Specifically advocates to candidates to commit to:
 - a. A clear and funded timeline for the delivery of the proposed tram lines and active transport links and bridges in Fishermans Bend, as outlined in the *Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport Plan*.
 - b. An increase in the frequency, reliability and capacity of the Route 606 bus service to improve reliability and meet current and future demand.
 - c. A clear and funded timeline for the delivery of a new high frequency bus service connecting Fishermans Bend with ANZAC Station, noting the ongoing delay in delivery of the Park Street Tram Link.



- d. Refreshing business case and undertake detailed planning to enable delivery of Park Street Tram Link, maximising the benefits of Metro Tunnel.
- e. An increase in the frequency and capacity of the 96 and 109 tram services to meet current and future demand, including committing to delivery of the Route 109 terminus upgrade – an international gateway for Melbourne.
- f. Provide clarity and timing on the pipeline of level access tram stop improvements as required by Horizon 1 ('now' actions) of the Tram Plan.
- g. A clear and funded timeline for the delivery of state-significant cycling corridors, including:
 - i. St Kilda Road to Carlisle Street
 - ii. Kerferd Road, from Canterbury Road to Beaconsfield Parade and Albert Road, from Canterbury Road to ANZAC Station.
 - iii. creating a safe crossing for cyclists across St Kilda Road to Albert Road.
- h. A clear and funded timeline for the delivery of the pedestrian crossings, including:
 - i. Active pedestrian crossing on Glen Huntly Rd at Elwood Canal near Elwood College.
 - ii. Active pedestrian crossing at Hotham St at Lydon St and Ripon Grove.
 - iii. Active pedestrian crossings on Williamstown Rd at Prohasky St, Salmon St, Beacon Rd, Bridge St, and Boundary St
 - iv. Signalised crossing at Plummer St and Graham St, Port Melbourne near Port Melbourne Secondary College.
- i. A funded feasibility study into the delivery of a permanent pedestrian overpass on Queens Rd into Albert Park to investigate options to improve connectivity across.
- j. A funded feasibility study into the delivery of a permanent pedestrian overpass to the Kings Way/Albert Rd intersection to improve safety and connectivity to ANZAC Station.
- k. Retain regular tram stopping patterns during the Grand Prix period, rather than express trams.
- l. Immediate implementation of the 40km/h speed limit through the Glen Eira Rd shopping area.
- m. Improve frequencies on Sandringham Line on Sunday mornings which currently have up to one hour headways.
- n. Identify alignment, station locations, and necessary land required for future delivery of Melbourne Metro 2 in its entirety.
- o. Reiterate support for extending tram 78/79 to provide a north/south route between City of Yarra, City of Stonnington and City of Port Phillip.



3. Requests the Mayor as a part of Council's broader election commitment campaign write to relevant declared State election candidates, relevant political parties, and ministers and shadow ministers outlining Council's expectations and seeking formal commitments to these projects.
4. Requests officers informally report back to Council on responses received from candidates and parties ahead of the 2026 State Government election.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

15. REPORTS BY COUNCILLOR DELEGATES

Deputy Mayor Mears reported to advise that they attended the Porsche and Coffee event over the weekend and commended all involved to hold the event.

Mayor Makin reported to advise that they attended Shabbat Share last Friday evening following the invitation from their counterpart at City of Glen Eira, Mayor Simone Zmood. Mayor Makin thanked Mayor Zmood for the invitation to the event at the Caulfield Shule to helping build cohesion across communities and share insights into cultural experiences.

Councillor Jay also reported to advise that they attended the Shabbat Share at the Caulfield Shule and commended the excellent event to experience traditions and stories of history within the Jewish community.

16. URGENT BUSINESS

Nil.

17. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

Moved Crs Cunsolo/Halliday

That Council resolves to move into confidential to deal with the following matters pursuant to section 66(2) of the *Local Government Act 2020*:

17.1 Collaborative HVHR - Parking Infringement Management Services

- 3(1)(a) Council business information, being information that would prejudice the Council's position in commercial negotiations if prematurely released.

Reason: This report presents the findings of the Tender Evaluation Panel for the collaborative HVHR procurement conducted jointly with the Cities of Stonnington and Glen Eira. While the evaluation process was undertaken collaboratively, each Council is required to make its own independent decision regarding the tender outcome. To protect the integrity of the procurement process and prevent any Council's decision from influencing the others, this information must remain confidential until all three Councils have formally awarded the tender.



17.2 HR Solution Project

- 3(1)(a) Council business information, being information that would prejudice the Council's position in commercial negotiations if prematurely released.

Reason: This report is required to remain confidential as it forms part of an active procurement and tender process for selecting a new HR system. Releasing its contents at this stage could disadvantage Council and may compromise the integrity of Council's procurement activities.

17.3 South Melbourne Town Hall – Funding and Contract Variation

- 3(1)(a) Council business information, being information that would prejudice the Council's position in commercial negotiations if prematurely released.

Reason: This report contains contractual information, including project and construction contract contingency provisions, that if released at this time would disadvantage Council in its ability to manage its construction contract in the best interests of the community.

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED unanimously.

The meeting closed to members of the public at 9:32pm.

The meeting reopened to members of the public at 10:01pm

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 10:01pm.

Confirmed: 18 March 2026

Chairperson _____