

Motion Title: Strengthening Funding for Victoria's Neighbourhood Houses

Relevant Director: Director Communities

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government to:

1. Highlight the essential contribution Neighbourhood Houses make to community resilience, social inclusion, lifelong learning and early intervention support, and emphasise the need for investment that keeps pace with population growth and increasing community complexity.
2. Review the Neighbourhood House Coordination Program (NHCP) funding model to ensure it accurately reflects contemporary service demand, workforce pressures and the expanding scope of community support delivered by Neighbourhood Houses.
3. Commit to an immediate 25% increase to the Department of Families, Fairness and Housing NHCP-funded hourly rate, in recognition of rising staffing and operational costs, increasing community reliance on Neighbourhood Houses and their critical role in supporting local wellbeing and social connection.
4. Commit to funding five new Neighbourhood Houses in growth areas each year, aligned with demonstrated population pressures and expanding community need.
5. Review NHCP indexation formulas, noting that indexation has not kept pace with real cost increases, resulting in many Neighbourhood Houses now requiring 100% of NHCP funding to cover staffing costs, leaving no funding for operational expenses.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities:

1. Connected places
2. Health & wellbeing
3. Diversity, equity & inclusion
4. Resilience & recovery
5. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Neighbourhood Houses play a vital role in building healthy, vibrant and resilient communities. They enable people to participate in community life and the local economy through programs that promote social inclusion, skills development, improved health and wellbeing, and volunteering opportunities.

However, information from the sector peak body, Neighbourhood Houses Victoria, shows that rising costs and growing community needs mean current funding levels are no longer

adequate, with nearly half of all Victorian Neighbourhood Houses operating at a loss in 2023 and 2024.

For Frankston City's eight Neighbourhood Houses, the community impact is significant, with:

- 112 employees
- 107 volunteers annually
- 281 volunteer hours per week
- 5,160 participant hours per week
- 9,997 program sessions annually
- 95–98% of participants reporting positive wellbeing impacts (emotional, physical and social)

The Minister for Carers and Volunteers has acknowledged the importance of Neighbourhood Houses and confirmed that any additional funding is dependent on annual State Budget decisions, highlighting the need for strong, sector-wide advocacy.

A meaningful commitment to increased funding is essential to secure the future of the sector. Without responsive and sustainable investment, Neighbourhood Houses will be unable to meet rapidly growing community needs, retain skilled staff, or deliver the essential services communities rely on. Strengthening the NHCP is critical to safeguarding equitable access, community resilience, and long-term wellbeing outcomes across Victoria.

Motion Title: Sustainable and Climate-Responsive Crown Land Management Framework

Relevant Director: Director Corporate & Commercial Services

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government and the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action (DEECA) to work collaboratively with local government to develop a contemporary, climate-responsive and sustainably funded framework for the management of Crown land that:

- a) recognises the complexity and true cost borne by Councils in managing Crown land on behalf of the State;
- b) streamlines and modernises DEECA approval processes to reduce administrative burden and improve project delivery;
- c) ensures funding and capability support are aligned with the increasing costs of asset maintenance, regulatory compliance and climate-related impacts; and
- d) acknowledges the significant community, environmental and economic value of Crown land assets managed by local government.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities:

1. Sustainable economy
2. Climate & regenerative design
3. Resilience & recovery
4. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Councils act as Committees of Management for significant areas of Crown land on behalf of the State Government. In doing so, they deliver essential governance, maintenance, compliance, community access and risk-management functions that ensure these public assets remain safe, functional and accessible. While this role supports environmental, cultural and community outcomes, it places substantial cost, operational and legal responsibilities on local government.

In recent years, the demands associated with Committee of Management responsibilities have increased sharply. Councils are now managing:

- Escalating climate change impacts, including more frequent extreme weather events, coastal erosion, increased bushfire and flood risk, and growing biodiversity loss. These impacts require intensive environmental management, emergency preparedness, specialised technical expertise and costly recovery efforts.
- Accelerating infrastructure degradation and heightened public safety risks, driven by ageing assets, harsher environmental conditions and increased community use. Councils must undertake more frequent inspections, maintenance and renewals, often for assets they do not own and must rely on State approvals to proceed.
- Expanding regulatory, compliance and community expectations, including obligations relating to cultural heritage protection, environmental reporting, risk management, accessibility standards and transparent engagement. These requirements increase administrative effort and require skills and capacity that many Councils struggle to resource.

Despite these growing pressures, funding and capability support have not kept pace. Councils carry significant financial exposure and operational burdens for Crown land they do not own.

Given the complexity, scale and statewide nature of these challenges, there is a clear need for MAV advocacy. Strong, unified advocacy is essential to secure fairer funding, streamlined approval processes, clearer legislative frameworks and greater capability support. This will ensure Crown land is managed safely and sustainably, while protecting Councils from unsustainable and disproportionate burdens.

Motion Title: Unlocking surplus public land to accelerate social and affordable housing supply

Relevant Director: Director Communities

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV advocates to the Victorian Government to:

1. Work in partnership with local councils to identify and prioritise suitable surplus or underutilised state government owned public land to unlock opportunities for social and affordable housing supply, by:
 - a. Improving communication, transparency and information-sharing between Victorian Government agencies and local councils.
 - b. Identifying sites that can deliver a mix of housing types, including crisis and transitional accommodation, social and affordable housing and Aboriginal housing.
 - c. Resourcing councils in their enabling role to make better use of modern assessment tools and technology, building on the Local Government Housing Innovation Program led by the MAV and Greater Dandenong City Council, to support efficient, transparent and evidence-based assessment of state government owned public land.
2. Establish a clear, time-bound and coordinated program to accelerate the release and development of suitable state government owned public land for social and affordable housing development, that:
 - a. Prioritises high-need municipalities experiencing significant housing stress and have limited council-owned land available for redevelopment.
 - b. Aligns redevelopment with council housing strategies, infrastructure capacity and open space planning to ensure homes are well-located.
 - c. Maximises affordable housing yield on public land to deliver long-term community benefit.
 - d. Prevents surplus public land being sold on the open market unless it delivers meaningful and measurable affordable housing outcomes in line with local policy objectives.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places

3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Victoria is experiencing significant and growing housing pressures and addressing them will require coordinated action across all levels of government. One practical and timely way to boost the supply of social and affordable housing is to make better use of surplus or underutilised state government owned public land.

In well-established metropolitan municipalities like Frankston City, surplus council-owned land is extremely limited. This constrains councils' ability to directly influence the supply of new homes at the scale the community needs. By contrast, the Victorian Government holds significant portfolio of public land across its departments and agencies. When public land is surplus or no longer needed for operational purposes, it creates an opportunity repurpose land for long-term community benefit through housing, including crisis, transitional, social, affordable and Aboriginal housing.

A coordinated, time bound program, led by Homes Victoria and delivered with councils and registered community housing providers, would create clear and consistent pathways for repurposing appropriate public land. This would give councils certainty about future redevelopment options, ensure planning and infrastructure needs are aligned, and maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered on publicly owned sites. Strengthening collaboration and information sharing between State agencies and councils, and equipping councils with fit-for-purpose tools and capability, would make it easier to identify, prioritise and test potential sites.

While the Victorian Government has committed to unlocking surplus land for housing through initiatives like the Small Sites Program, no similar commitments have been made for Frankston City, despite its role as a designated activity centre experiencing rapidly increasing housing stress. This represents a missed opportunity, as areas like Frankston City present a clear opportunity for place-based activation of suitable state government owned public land for well-located housing that maximises long-term community benefit.

Targeting public land in high-need and well-serviced areas will help the Victorian Government to meet its housing targets, support local housing strategies and provide long-lasting community benefit by reducing homelessness. This approach aligns with Frankston City Council's Affordable

Housing Policy, which emphasises partnership, well-located housing delivery, and a diverse mix of housing outcomes that respond to community need.

Motion Title: Best Practice Implementation of Developer Registers for Local Government

Relevant Director: Director Corporate and Commercial Services

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government to:

1. Set a mandatory requirement for councils to maintain and provide regular transparent reporting on a "Councillor interactions with developers Register"; and
2. Reinforce these requirements, along with a mandatory requirement for a "Councillor interactions with lobbyists Register", in their upcoming release of the Model Transparency Policy.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places
3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

IBAC's Operation Sandon Report released in July 2023 recommended amendments to the P&E Act 1987 to deter submitters of planning applications from attempting to improperly influencing a council.

The Victorian Government are currently implementing a legislative reform program with updates to the Planning and Environment (P&E) Act 1987 currently underway. This is likely to result in amendments requiring local government councils to adhere to the changes.

Frankston City Council resolved on 12 August 2024 to establish a public register of Councillor Interactions with Developers which is published quarterly on its Transparency Hub. A Councillor Interactions with Developers Policy was authorised by the CEO on 26 May 2025 and noted at Council on 2 June 2025. It has been publishing the register quarterly since July 2025.

Frankston City Council's Mayor, Cr Sue Baker, wrote to the Minister and Shadow Minister for Local Government in December 2025 imploring the Victorian Government to implement the requirement for all local government councils in Victoria to ensure that Councillors record their interactions with

developers and lobbyists on a register, and that following privacy assessment the appropriate information be made available publicly on their council website.

Frankston City Council submitted a motion to the MAV State Council Meeting on 10 October 2025 titled "Best practice implementation of Lobbyist Registers for local government" which called on mandatory requirements for council to maintain and provide regular transparent reporting on a Councillor Interactions with Lobbyists Register. The motion was carried.

There is also an opportunity to reinforce councillor interactions with lobbyists and developers as mandatory requirements in the upcoming release of the Model Transparency Policy.

Motion Title: Legislative powers for the enforcement of breaches on coastal Crown land

Relevant Director: Director Communities

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the State Government to:

1. Advocate to the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action, the Office of Conservation Regulator and the Conservation Regulator's Stakeholder Reference Group to include unauthorised use or development of coastal Crown land in the regulatory priorities.
2. Advocate to the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action for increased resourcing and expanded authority of the Office of Conservation Regulator to enable timely enforcement of sections 77 and 78 of the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018*; and avoid reliance on local government to follow up breaches of regulation it is not authorised to enforce.
3. Advocate to the Office of Conservation Regulator to review and strengthen its procedures for responding to unauthorised works, use and development on coastal Crown land in line with its enforcement powers under sections 65, 77 and 78 of the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018*, ensuring early intervention and preventing irreversible damage to the marine and coastal environment.
4. Increase penalty units for breaches of section 21AA of the *Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978* and section 65 of the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018* to improve deterrence of unlawful activities on coastal Crown land.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places
3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Unauthorised use and development on coastal Crown land continue to cause significant and sometimes irreversible impacts on Victoria's marine and coastal environment. Recent unauthorised works around Port Phillip Bay demonstrate the scale and severity of the issue, including unapproved private seawalls and vegetation removal, which damage the fragile ecosystem, increase erosion risk, hinder natural coastal processes, and undermine longterm foreshore resilience. These works are inconsistent with statewide guidance under the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018*, which requires consent for all use, works and development on marine and coastal Crown land.

The scale and frequency of unauthorised coastal works appears to be increasing. Illegal works highlight a growing pattern of high-impact, unapproved interventions on Crown land. These often involve the construction of coastal protection structures built without technical assessment or alignment with coastal engineering and geomorphological principles. These structures harden the shoreline, shift erosion hazards onto adjacent properties and the marine environment, and generate long-term management burdens for councils and the State.

Encroachment onto coastal Crown land through progressively expanded private landscaping, structures, and unauthorised coastal protection works continues to place natural systems at risk. Despite the significant environmental and public land impacts, the construction of coastal protection structures—including protection structures or levees regulated under section 21AA of the *Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978*—is not currently listed as a regulatory priority for the Office of the Conservation Regulator (OCR). This gap limits proactive compliance focus on some of the most harmful forms of coastal Crown land modification.

Climate change–driven increases in coastal hazards are intensifying pressure for intervention—both lawful and unlawful. As Committees of Management for large areas of foreshore, local councils require stronger and more rapid regulatory action from the State to prevent, halt and remediate unsafe or environmentally damaging works.

While councils can act through the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, many unauthorised works fall outside planning triggers or on Crown land, where enforcement by the OCR is likely to be more impactful. Current penalties under the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018* and *Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978* remain insufficient to deter illegal development on public land. Strengthening State regulatory priorities and increasing penalty units would better protect natural coastal processes and uphold the integrity of coastal Crown land.

Motion Title: Advocating for Consistent State Funding of Lifesaving Services and Protection Against Cost-Shifting

Relevant Director: Director Customer Innovation and Arts, Shweta Babbar

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government to:

- Guarantee recurrent, fully State-funded lifesaving services across Victoria's coastal municipalities, ensuring equitable access to safe and supervised beaches for all communities.
- Affirm that paid lifeguard services and associated lifesaving operations are essential public safety infrastructure and a core responsibility of the Victorian Government, and must be fully State-funded, including emerging technologies such as drones and helicopters, with no cost-shifting to local government, service users, community organisations or other stakeholders.
- Implement a transparent and consistent funding framework for Life Saving Victoria that provides certainty for councils and service providers, and avoids ad hoc, annual or short-notice funding requests to municipalities.
- Work collaboratively with MAV and member councils to establish a sustainable, long-term funding model that reflects growing coastal visitation, climate-driven risk, population growth, and tourism pressures.

Strategic Alignment:

- Healthy, diverse and thriving communities
- Resilience and recovery
- Sector capability and good governance

Rationale (max 350 words):

Victorian coastal communities are experiencing sustained growth in visitation to beaches and foreshore areas, with demand intensifying during summer, extreme heat events and peak tourism periods. At the same time, drowning risk in coastal waters has increased, underscoring the importance of reliable, well-resourced lifesaving services as a core public safety function.

Recent approaches by Life Saving Victoria seeking additional financial contributions from councils, often on an annual or short-notice basis, represent a concerning shift away from a fully State-funded service model. In some cases, councils are being asked to contribute significant unbudgeted funds to maintain existing service levels, creating financial uncertainty and inequity across municipalities.

This approach risks establishing a precedent for cost-shifting State responsibilities to local government, undermining councils' ability to plan responsibly and deliver essential services. It also

creates inconsistency in beach safety outcomes depending on a council's financial capacity, rather than community need or risk profile.

Lifesaving services are fundamental to public safety and should be delivered through a clear, equitable and recurrent State funding framework. A consistent model would provide certainty for councils and Life Saving Victoria, support effective workforce and service planning, and ensure all Victorians can access safe, supervised coastal environments.

This motion seeks sector-wide advocacy through MAV to secure clarity, accountability and sustainability in the funding of lifesaving services, and to protect councils from inappropriate cost-shifting while safeguarding community wellbeing.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places
3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Motion Title: Improving the Presentation and Maintenance of State-Owned Transport Gateways and Infrastructure

Relevant Director: Director Customer, Innovation and Arts

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government to:

1. Establish increased and ongoing funding to improve the maintenance, presentation and renewal of State Government-owned transport infrastructure, with priority given to key gateway entrances, transport corridors and arrival points into cities and regional centres. This includes state arterial roads, median strips, bridges, sound walls, rail corridors, railway stations and associated infrastructure that shape first impressions of communities and support daily movement across Victoria.
2. Implement relevant recommendations from the Parliamentary Inquiry into Local Government Funding and Services.
3. Seek investment to prioritise:
 - i. uplift and beautification of major gateway entrances and transport arrival corridors
 - ii. proactive maintenance including mowing, pruning, litter removal and surface repairs
 - iii. graffiti prevention and rapid removal programs
 - iv. improved lighting, greening and public realm enhancements
 - v. pedestrian and cycling safety improvements along state corridors.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places
3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Gateway entrances and major transport corridors form the primary arrival experience for residents, visitors and investors entering Victoria's cities, suburbs and regional communities. These locations play a critical role in shaping perceptions of safety, economic vitality and civic pride.

Across Victoria, councils are increasingly reporting declining presentation standards along State Government-owned roads, rail corridors and transport environments, particularly at prominent entry points into activity centres and municipalities. Issues such as deteriorating road surfaces, unmanaged vegetation, graffiti, poor lighting and litter accumulation are becoming more visible across key gateways despite significant investment in major transport projects in recent years.

While infrastructure delivery programs, including rail upgrades and level crossing removals, have improved mobility outcomes, ongoing stewardship of surrounding assets has not kept pace with community expectations or asset usage levels. Population growth, increased visitation and rising construction and maintenance costs are placing additional strain on existing infrastructure networks.

Local governments frequently receive community complaints regarding the condition and appearance of state-managed transport corridors, creating confusion around responsibility and placing reputational pressure on councils despite limited authority to intervene.

Industry analysis, including findings from the National Transport Research Organisation (NTRO), indicates growing maintenance pressures across Victoria's road network, reinforcing the need for a stronger preventative maintenance and renewal approach.

Improving gateway environments delivers benefits beyond aesthetics. Well-maintained entrances support tourism, investment attraction, road safety outcomes and community wellbeing, while greening and lighting upgrades contribute to climate resilience and safer public spaces.

A coordinated funding and stewardship model between State and Local Government would enable proactive maintenance, targeted gateway upgrades and place-based improvements that ensure Victoria's transport infrastructure reflects the quality, liveability and economic ambition of its communities.

Motion Title: Protective Service Officers at Public Hospitals

Relevant Director: Director Communities

Proposed Motion (max 250 words)

That the MAV calls on the Victorian Government to:

1. Fund and deploy Protective Service Officers (PSOs), or an equivalent dedicated public safety presence, at Victorian public hospitals to improve the safety of healthcare workers, patients and visitors.
2. Provide assurance that funding for hospital security is not cost-shifted to health services, hospital foundations, local governments or community fundraising, and that core public safety functions remain the responsibility of the State.
3. Work with health services, workers, unions and local government to identify priority hospital sites based on risk, demand and incident data.

For a motion to be considered at State Council, the motion must align with the enabling priorities (select alignment):

1. Active local democracy
2. Connected places
3. Health & wellbeing
4. Sustainable economy
5. FutureGen
6. First Peoples local government relations
7. Climate & regenerative design
8. Diversity, equity & inclusion
9. Resilience & recovery
10. Intergenerational infrastructure

Rationale for Motion (max 350 words)

Incidents of violence, aggression and anti-social behaviour within Victorian public hospitals are increasing, placing healthcare workers, patients and visitors at risk and contributing to workforce stress, burnout and attrition. Assaults on hospital staff are well documented across the sector, with frontline clinicians and support staff often bearing the brunt of these incidents.

Despite this, hospital security arrangements across Victoria remain inconsistent and, in some cases, underfunded. Recent media reporting has highlighted instances where public hospitals have been forced to rely on community donations or hospital foundation funds to

pay for private security services, an approach that is neither sustainable nor appropriate for a core public safety function.

Public hospitals are essential community infrastructure and should be supported by a consistent, government-funded protective presence, similar to other high-risk public environments. The absence of a visible and adequately empowered security model places pressure on health staff to manage situations beyond their role and capability and can result in flow-on impacts to local emergency services and surrounding communities.

Providing PSOs or an equivalent dedicated protective service at public hospitals would improve safety outcomes, deter violence, support health workers, and reinforce that protecting frontline workers is a shared state responsibility. A coordinated statewide approach would deliver better outcomes than fragmented, locally funded security solutions and ensure equity across metropolitan, regional and growth-area communities.