

14.2 NOM 1361 - Seaford Substation

On 28 August 2017 Councillor Kris Bolam gave notice of his intention to move the following motion:

That a report be provided to Council at the December Ordinary Meeting on the iconic Seaford Substation.

The report should consider:

1. The internal and external status of the Seaford Substation site;
2. Whether there is the presence of asbestos, signs of concrete cancer, concerns with the building's structural integrity; and
3. Future plans for the site, and the possible public use of the substation for community purposes (i.e. local museum, community hub etc).

COMMENTS BY DIRECTOR

Question for Consideration	
1. Has the NoM been discussed with the CEO and/or the relevant Director or Manager?	NO
2. Is the NoM substantially different from any notice of motion or rescission motion that has been considered by Council and lost in the preceding six months?	YES
3. Is the NoM clear and well worded?	YES
4. Is the NoM capable of being implemented?	NOTE The Substation is located on State Government railway reservation. Access to the site and sensitive information may be difficult to obtain. Council officers may be limited in terms of being able to access the site and also by way of being provided with any existing structural condition assessment reports relating to the condition of the building
5. If the NoM is adopted, will a meeting be required with the relevant Director and Manager and Council officers in order to progress its implementation?	YES A meeting was held 21 August with local and state politicians and officers, including Victrack, PTV and Metro Trains to understand roles and responsibilities within the rail reserve. Further discussions would be needed to progress the implementation of this NOM.
6. Is the NoM within the powers of a municipal Council?	YES However limited access to information may compromise the basis for decision making.

14.2 NOM 1361 - Seaford Substation

Question for Consideration	
7. Is the NoM free from overlap with matters for which the State and/or Federal Government are responsible?	NO The Substation is located on State Government railway reserve.
8. Is the NoM consistent with all relevant legislation?	N/A
9. Is the NoM consistent with existing Council or State policy or position?	YES The maintenance of the rail corridor (including station buildings) has been excluded from State Government contract and funding.
10. Is the NoM consistent with Council's adopted strategic plan?	NO Council has a number of key priorities which do not currently include the Substation.
11. Can the NoM be implemented without diversion of existing resources?	NO Further investigation and discussion will be required with various State Government departments. The history of the Substation in discussion with Council demonstrates that this site is not a State Government priority.
12. Can the NoM be implemented without diversion of allocated Council funds?	YES / NO
13. Are funds available in the adopted budget to implement the NoM?	YES / NO
14. What is the estimated cost of implementing the NoM?	YES / NO Year 1: \$ Recurring: \$ Senior Officer time and Project Manager.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil