



**CITY OF VINCENT**

# **MINUTES**

**Ordinary Council Meeting**

**16 May 2023**

## Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country.....	4
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence .....	5
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements .....	5
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice.....	24
4	Applications for Leave of Absence .....	28
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations .....	29
6	Confirmation of Minutes .....	30
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) .....	30
	7.1 Pickle District After Dark Event .....	30
8	Declarations of Interest .....	30
	Reports .....	31
	Items Approved "En Bloc": .....	31
	9.6 Leederville Oval Civic Precinct Master Plan .....	32
	9.7 Advertising of New Policy - North Claisebrook Planning Framework .....	33
	9.10 Thriving Places Strategy - Approval to Advertise .....	34
	9.12 Outcomes of Advertising - Amendment No. 12 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2.....	35
	10.2 Proposed Residential Only Parking Restrictions, Harold Street, Mount Lawley - Results of Community Consultation.....	36
	10.3 Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Graffiti Control and Removal Policy 2.1.3.....	37
	10.4 RFT IE224/2022 Provision of General Electrical Maintenance Services.....	38
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 31 March 2023 .....	39
	11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 March 2023 to 31 March 2023.....	40
	11.3 Investment Report as at 31 March 2023.....	41
	11.4 Advertising of amended policy - Recognition of Noongar Boodjar Culture and History through Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country .....	42
	12.3 Information Bulletin .....	43
	Reports with Discussion .....	44
	11.5 Differential Rating Strategy 2023/24 .....	44
	10.5 Draft Bike Plan 2023-2028 Consultation.....	45
	9.2 Nos. 334-336 (Lots: 4 & 5, D/P: 1304) Beaufort Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Shop (Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development) .....	46
	9.3 No. 12 Brookman Street (Lots: 69 and 90; Plan: 4576) - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Single House.....	51
	10.1 Response to Petition – Alma/Leake Intersection Diagonal Diversion.....	53
	13.1 Notice of Motion - Cr Alexander- Reintroduction of the first hour free in car parks [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	55
	9.4 Request for Proposals for Redevelopment of Leederville Carparks.....	56
	9.1 No. 4 (Lot: 1; S/P: 24447) Primrose Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Grouped Dwelling .....	61
	9.5 RFT PP249/2023 Mount Hawthorn Youth Skate Space.....	63
	9.8 Advertising of New Policy - Pickle District Planning Framework .....	64

9.9	City of Vincent Arts Plan - Approval to Advertise.....	66
9.11	Outcome of Advertising - Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2032 .....	67
9.13	Extension of Leases to Child & Adolescent Health Service for Child Health Clinics .....	68
9.14	Offers for Sale - 25 (Lot 93) Sydney Street, North Perth .....	69
12.1	Annual Review of Council Delegations [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	71
12.2	Leederville Oval Sponsorship and Naming Rights .....	72
12.4	Report and Minutes of the Audit Committee Meeting held on 4 May 2023 .....	73
<b>13</b>	<b>Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Representation on Committees and Public Bodies .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Urgent Business .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Closure .....</b>	<b>74</b>

**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT  
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AS E-MEETING AND AT THE  
ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,  
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE  
ON TUESDAY, 16 MAY 2023 AT 6.00PM**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p>Mayor Emma Cole Cr Ron Alexander Cr Alex Castle Cr Dan Loden Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ross Ioppolo Cr Ashley Wallace</p>	<p>Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward</p>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<p>David MacLennan John Corbellini  Rhys Taylor  Paul Morrice  Karsen Reynolds  Tara Gloster  Luke McGuirk  Jayde Robbins  Chris Dixon  Yvette Plimbley  Joslin Colli  Kevin Donnelly  Ian Mickle  John Del Dosso  Wendy Barnard</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development  Chief Financial Officer (left at 7.05pm, after Item 11.5)  A/Executive Director Infrastructure &amp; Environment (Left at 8.47pm after Item 13.1).  A/Manager Development &amp; Design (left at 10pm after Item 9.1)  Executive Manager Urban Design &amp; Strategic Projects (left at 10.20pm after Item 9.11)  Manager Engineering (left at 8.48pm after Item 13.1)  Manager City Buildings &amp; Asset Management (left at 6.49pm)  A/Manager Rangers Services (left at 7.08pm after Item 10.5)  Manager Waste &amp; Recycling (left at 6.49pm)  A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance  Stantons (electronically) (Item 9.4 only, left at 10.07pm)  Cygnet West (Item 9.4 only, left at 10.07pm)  Cygnet West (Item 9.4 only, left at 10.07pm)  Council Liaison Officer</p>

**Public:** Approximately 24 members of the public.

## **1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

The Presiding Member, Mayor Emma Cole declared the meeting open at 6.00pm and read the following Acknowledgement of Country statement:

“The City of Vincent would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and pay our respects to Elders past and present”.

## 2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Susan Gontaszewski was an apology for this meeting.

## 3 (A) PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The following questions and statements were received at the meeting. This is not a verbatim record of questions and statements made at the meeting.

### 3.1 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 13.1 and 11.5

#### Item 13.1

- Stated that 100,000 cars have been lost over a six month period
- Mentioned that it is time to revert back to first hour free, and be creative in how this is marketed and in how to raise the extra funds required

#### Item 11.5

- Stated that the report contains the minimum amount of information required by the Act
- Queried the point of asking residents if they are happy with the increase if they are not aware what the funds will be spent on
- Mentioned that prior to 2015/16 ratepayers were provided with a much more detailed document
- Stated that he is not satisfied with the community consultation, as attendees were bombarded with information and did not have the opportunity to ask questions
- Mentioned that it is clear that three areas will have their underground power delayed by over three years. Three areas will be delayed by over three years, two areas will be delayed by 14 months and one area will be delayed by six months.

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Maier for his comments.*

Mr Maier also submitted comments in writing, below:

#### Dudley Maier of Highgate

- 1 When the first three areas to receive underground power were identified, the estimated total cost to property owners in those areas was \$17.6 million. In answer to a question at the OMC of 5 April 2022 the Administration provided a breakup of the costs by area, as well as the number of meters in each area.

Five new areas have subsequently been nominated with a preliminary estimated cost to property owners of \$54.1 million.

Accepting that these figures are preliminary estimates which will be refined over time, what is the latest estimated cost for each of the eight areas identified?

- 2 At a community workshop held on 24 April 2023 attendees were presented with information that indicated that there would be a 12 month gap in the delivery of underground power. Further analysis of the data presented at the workshop indicates that, rather than a simple pause in delivery, the actual situation is that one area will be delayed by six months; two areas will be delayed by fourteen months; and three areas will be delayed by over three years.

2.1 Who initiated these changes – the City or Western Power?

2.2 Has any formal agreement been made with Western Power to defer the start of work on these areas?

2.3 Has any binding agreement been made concerning start dates, or is it open for the council to intervene in the process and renegotiate the project starts?

- 3 In response to motions from the Annual Meeting of Electors, which were considered on 14 March 2023, the Council adopted an amendment which said that the Council:

*AUTHORISES Administration present such a model along with all assumptions to Council for approval, including an indication of when each area will be consulted about the preferences for up-front payment.*

- 3.1 Given that the requirement was that the model be provided to council for approval, when do the Administration think that the model will be presented to Council?
- 3.2 Why isn't the need to present Council with this model shown in the "Register of Reports to be Actioned" which is included in the Information Bulletin?
- 3.3 Did the administration suggest rescheduling six of the project areas based on a financial model which has not yet been approved by Council?

### 3.2 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

- Stated that she has a major City asset running under and through her property. It is a large stormwater pipe which has been neglected by the City
- Mentioned that the GHD Stormwater Drainage report submitted to Council rates the risk management implications as High as "there is a large amount of drainage infrastructure which runs through private property."<sup>1</sup>
- Queried how many properties have drainage infrastructure running through their property? Requested an approximate number
- Queried how much the City pays in total premiums to the Local Government Insurance Scheme (LGIS) per annum?
- Requested the City to place the Stormwater Drainage Connection policy on hold until all the stormwater pipes have been located, mapped, their condition noted and the capacity issues have been rectified and they are able to control the flow of stormwater. Suggested that no developments be allowed to connect to the stormwater pipes until all of the above issues are solved and rectified

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Ms Florey for her comments.*

### 3.3 Greg Johnson of Mt Hawthorn – Item 13.1

- Stated that he is the owner of a footwear business that has been in Mt Hawthorn for 70 years
- Presented a short background of the one hour free parking issue
- Recommended that Council revert to the what was in place
- Queried if Council will keep the promise made to the business owners and ratepayers to revert if the trial was not successful?

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Johnson for his comments and advised the original recommendation was that a report would be submitted to the April Council Meeting, which occurred. This report was to inform the setting of fees and charges for the 2023/24 budget year. That was always the intent. Mr Johnson advised that he is not sure that the intent came across. Mayor Cole advised that that would be part of the decision of Council, which she will pull out.*

### 3.4 Linda Harris of Leederville

- Spoke to the petition submitted to the 14 March 2023 Council Meeting relating to pedestrian safety on the pathway in Britannia Reserve, requesting signage be put up to specify pedestrians only
- Mentioned that the Administration comment was that they are considering widening the path, but feels this will encourage e-cyclists and scooters to ride faster
- Stated that the proposal to calm the traffic in Britannia Road with a bike lane 1.2m wide is proposed to feed into the reserve, which will increase the number of cyclists on the pathway
- Feels that Council has ignored the concerns of the 110 people who signed the petition

---

<sup>1</sup> Edited for clarity

- Urged Council to install the requested signage

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Ms Harris for her comments and referred to the Item 10.5 Bike Plan which has a proposal for the bike lane. Mayor Cole advised that the Bike Plan is going out for advertising and community consultation and urged Ms Harris to consider involving users of Britannia Reserve in that process.*

### **3.5 Aldo Arco of Mt Hawthorn – Item 5.1**

- Spoke to his petition requesting tree pruning, at Item 5.1 of this agenda
- Stated that he owns a property that leaks due to blocked gutters, which has caused damage and mould and he has paid to have the damage and mould repaired
- Stated that the City attended and has cut down a tree and pruned back the other trees, but this has not solved the problem
- Queried if the City will be liable if the leaks damage the property and causes injury to tenants
- Urged the City to review the issues with empathy as it is causing him much distress

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Arco for his comments.*

### **3.6 Sue Golden of Perth – Item 5.2**

- Spoke to the petition she submitted requesting a change in the parking regulations on Chapman St, Perth, at Item 5.2 of this agenda
- Mentioned that there is unrestricted parking on one side of the street and two hour parking on the other side, and Transperth building staff use it as their long term parking during the day
- Since the parking restrictions were put in place, many of the houses have been made into duplexes, there are now share houses where there was previously single person occupancy houses, etc, so the block has increased in density. The block is between Lord Street and West Parade
- Mentioned that a lot of the houses have small driveways and garages, and rely on street parking
- Requested that the parking restrictions be changed to 2 hours on both sides of the street
- The signalling tower that will start operation soon will also take up parking spaces

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Ms Golden for her comments and commented that the City is planning to install two hour parking on both sides of the street as part of the Accessible City Strategy, which is area wide. The CEO advised that the two hour parking restrictions will be installed in the next few weeks, the date of the installation will be advised. The proposal is two hour parking between 8am and 5:30pm Monday to Friday, to match the rest of Chapman Street.*

### **3.7 Shawn Offer of Mt Lawley – Item 13.1**

- Stated that he is from Fresh Provisions in Mt Lawley

Submitted a statement in writing, below, and spoke to it.

I note that tonight Cr Alexander is putting forward a motion to return to first hour free parking. The damage that this policy 'trial' has caused to our business area has been disastrous. When I first spoke on this issue, our business had lost on average about 307 customers per week on the same period the year prior. Today, since this \$1 parking fee was introduced in September as a "reversible attempt to fix the budget if it did not affect businesses", I can report that our average customer transactions per week has dropped by 376 per week or over 50 customers per day. This is just one business. So yes, this damage is cutting deeper for us, I know other businesses around us feel the same way.

I still have feedback form customers who state that the issue is not just paying for parking, it is even the need to get tickets and punch in the registration. The fee with it now is a step too far. Many cannot remember their registration numbers or struggle with technology. One comment this week was "why can the council not use the technology available today to scan license plates from within the Ranger's car to know if a vehicle has been there too long? This occurs elsewhere". We have had outraged customers present us with their fines for shopping with us. "The cost of shopping local has gone up" some say when they send us emails of complaint or worse, post online about it. Our business has had to deal with angry customers who have tried

their luck with no free bays available and the winter weather setting in. These fines are about to increase as will the bitterness customers will feel as a consequence.

At the very beginning the introduction of this \$1 charge was for what reason? No mention that there were complaints about a lack of parking. This was purely to raise revenue. Management went respectfully asking what the feeling was in the community to if the free component was reduced to 30 minutes instead of one hour.

**The categorical answer was that it was not an acceptable proposition.** Management duplicity changed its approach with zero consultation on the new idea and instead introduced a \$1 fee for the first hour like somehow that was listening to the feedback. People feel insulted by the complete arrogance of this move. Councillors backed management's easy decision and did not make a judgement call on those it would impact and the cost to the community in the long run, including the eventual effect this will have on the City's future budgets.

The recent report provided by Management on the financial benefits of the that that has been introduced was poorly presented and confusing. Even if the higher revenue gained can be relied upon, this is a short-term benefit and pushes the cost of the gain to later years. You may have noticed the significant traditional and digital marketing efforts by the City of Subiaco leading up to and over the Mother's Day weekend? This council must now accept that its retail precincts are not sought after or valued by retail operators or retail customers and therefore it must now provide significant support to a struggling retail precinct. Subiaco now has given up its reliance on retail parking revenues, been forced to accept the lower GRV and now provides marketing significant marketing support to turn around its retail reputation. This takes decades! An area that has been heavily affected by being the first to introduce parking fees for retail when it is surrounded by fee free shopping precincts exactly like Vincent is. They now have first hour free on weekdays, free parking on weekends and after 5pm every evening. <https://www.subiaco.wa.gov.au/residents/in-your-street/parking/town-centre-parking>

The thought that we must levy a fee on customers and business for using a council carpark to support local businesses is foolish, that the effect is known and are trying to justify it is ludicrous. The real people you want to be attacking are those who are staying for extended periods, go chase more from them. These are the people whose behaviour you want to change. No one gains by driving people to businesses outside of the City's boundaries.

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Offer for his comments.*

### 3.8 Gerard O'Brien of Mt Lawley - Item 13.1

- Stated that he is the owner of Raglan Road Car Park
- Stated that he has an agreement with the City that the parking cannot be charged for without his permission, which he will not give unless there is 1 hour free
- Mentioned that there is no benefit to charging for the first hour, as if the businesses are destroyed the GRV will fall and rates will therefore have to increase, so all the residents will be punished
- Stated that nobody wants to pay for parking, and there are options available where parking is free, so people will go elsewhere
- Mentioned that strong retail is the heart of community, it is the diverse, strong, balanced retail that makes community, and it is being destroyed
- Urged Council to reinstall the 1 hour free

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr O'Brien for his comments and mentioned that Council is not able to make a decision to end the charge tonight, as there is a 21 day advertising period for fees and charges, so the matter would have to be dealt with at the next Council Meeting. For the Differential Rates item on this agenda, the first hour one dollar fee income has been reduced from \$800,000 to \$400,000, indicating that the City is planning to halve the revenue through the rate setting.*



**3.9 Michael Hernan of Perth – Item 9.2**

- Stated that he has worked at Evolution Bikes for the past four years, and lives in the apartments behind, so is invested in the future of the area
- Mentioned that the design was undertaken following extensive consultation with designers, customer and local residents
- Stated that the building provides an active and interactive internal/external environment, which has helped to expand the customer base in the last four years, servicing in excess of 18,000 people from Busselton to Joondalup. As people often travel large distances to attend the store, they frequently visit surrounding businesses while they are in the area
- Mentioned that if there was a better way to be more active and interactive, while maintaining the security obligations they have to the police force and to the customer's assets, which are secured within the store, they would have done that without hesitation
- Stated that the impact on streetscape outside of business hours, car park on one side, petrol station on other side, across from a park, it is hard to comply
- Mentioned that during business hours the building is in compliance with the Built Form policy, seven days a week, which they intend to stay open for the foreseeable future
- Stated that outside of those time the visual security lost by having roller shutters on the windows is negated by the security they provide themselves, bearing in mind the only direct line of sight to those windows is 100m away through a park
- Requested Council to take into account the positive review of eight respondents, as well as the passive reviews of 38,000 other residents who seem to believe it is perfectly acceptable

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Hernan for his comments.*

**3.10 Carol Scafe of Perth – Item 9.3**

- Spoke in support of the recommendation
- Stated she does not support two storey buildings within the Moir/Brookman Heritage Precinct, as it is not in keeping with the modest, single storey, working class dwellings that make this precinct unique
- Mentioned that one of the heritage aspects related to this development is the rear wash closet, which is a requirement to maintain in the current heritage guidelines
- Stated that the current application exceeds R25 requirements for bulk, having a detrimental overshadowing effect to the neighbour to the south and the new footprint substantially reduces the required open space. Mentioned that these points are an automatic refusal and do not allow for any discussion
- Mentioned that she is concerned that if approved this will set a precedent for the precinct, which may become indistinguishable to other neighbourhoods

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Ms Scafe for her comments.*

**3.11 Anthony Hart of Perth – Item 9.2**

Mr Hart submitted the following statement in writing and spoke to it:

Let me open this statement by saying I fully understand what the council are trying to achieve, creating interactive and active street fronts that are visually pleasing and attract people to the area. I'd like to think we have done an incredible job of achieving this, opening up the windows for the first time in decades, re-decorating the building on multiple occasions and bringing in thousands of customers (around 18,000 who potentially visit multiple times) over the last 5 years. We have done more to achieve council objectives than any occupier of this buildings has done in decades.

And let me be clear, we would prefer the windows were unencumbered by any security measure, day or night. But the reality of the real world denies this. As does our obligations under the Protective Security Policy Framework.

I'd also just like to point out that the glazed areas with fixed rollers shutters related to this application constitute approximately 5% of our total street frontage (corner building) – yes, just 5%. The other 95% is base black with various branding and signage. Not a fully glass fronted shopfront in an area surrounded by fully glass fronted shopfronts.

I believe it's exceptionally important to keep this in perspective when considering what difference is made when fixed roller shutters are down, predominantly out of daylight hours.

For ease of reference, please find some of our 'justification' for fixed roller shutters in bullet point form below.

Each of these points are touched upon in the rest of the statement:

- They provide the most effective level of security we can have, supported by the police and I believe, the council themselves.
- They protect the glazing after hours, maximising public safety. Which is favoured by council and also covers off on our obligations under Policy 15 of the Protective Security Policy Framework.
- They meet the minimum standard we require under our obligations as a government entity supplier (WAPOL) – Policy 15 again.
- They protect our automatic front door, with is neither securable nor weather tight.
  - Specifically the roller 'door' that has been in situ for at least 16 years, of which the council was fully aware when issuing occupancy, and when requiring the aforementioned automatic front door.
- They are fully retracted during most daylight hours, maximising our active participation and interaction with the street.
- They only cover 5% of our total street frontage, we are not a fully glazed shop front.
- They are appropriate for our location, being not a **town centre**, and with a park over the road populated almost exclusively in daylight hours when shutters are retracted.
- They are recessed within the deep external window recesses, providing 'depth variety' to the front facade.
- They blend seamlessly with the rest of the building.
  - As opposed to metal grilles or the like, which would juxtapose jarringly against the remaining 95% of the building and be aesthetically displeasing *day or night*
- They provide material, textural and depth elements and differentiation.
  - With further signage/decoration, they will provide additional colour as well and further integrate with the overall building.
- They are in place already, minimising any additional cost for me to incur. Other options could potentially cost in the 10s of thousands of dollars
- They are far more aesthetically pleasing than metal grilles/bars backed by thick black curtains or other window furnishings, and provide the same level of permeability when closed, and significantly better permeability when retracted.

### Visibility and Permeability

Visibility and permeability have been often highlighted in my application, in the briefing session and various other communications. Please allow me a little question and answer session re: visibility and permeability with a simple yes/no.

Can I hang thick black curtains up in my windows/glazed areas without requiring any council approvals? **Yes**

Can I close these day and night without seeking council approval? **Yes**

Does this present a blank black façade if viewed externally, similar to what might exist if fixed black rollers shutters were in place? **Yes**

Does this create a visual barrier, completely eliminating views inside the building and not enabling any light sources to be seen from the street as per Built Form Policy A1.13.10? **Yes**

If I have installed security measures that are approved as per Built Form Policy A1.13.10 and are transparent and visually permeable and allow views inside the building and enable internal lights sources to be seen from the street *however* I have my curtains closed, am I still allowing views inside the building and enabling light sources to be seen from the street? **No**

Which is identical to fixed roller shutters? **Yes**

To repeat, it's (i.e. compliant installed security measures and thick black curtains) all allowable under council rules/regulations? **Yes**

And are fixed roller shutters allowable under council rules/regulations? **No**

Will enforcement of line 2 in the Built Form Policy A1.13.10 guarantee Visual Permeability regardless of what security measure is installed? **No**

One 'fitout' completely 'allowed' – one not. However the resulting lack of visibility and permeability is the same. And the curtains can be closed 24/7, 365. This currently happens everywhere – please see IMG\_6223.jpg (taken yesterday) showing the street frontage as viewed from the entrance of the Highgate Woolworths. Please also see IMG\_6219.jpg (also taken yesterday) which is a closeup image of 77 Bulwer Street, the right most building shown in the previous image. Please note the shattered glazing.

You can see from the above mini Q&A that strict application of the Built Form Policy in relation to security measures does not guarantee the achievement of councils objectives around visibility and permeability. Putting big thick black curtains (or any other visually impermeable window dressing) in the glazed areas completely negates the 'second line' of the Built Form policy. This is a matter of fact and not interpretation. This has also been communicated to the Council administration on numerous occasions in the hopes that a solution can be reached.

I have just recently been made aware that the fitting of and use of windows coverings (curtains and like) can be made a condition of any planning/development application and subsequent approval. OK, I'll accept that. But my understanding is that anyone can fit internal visually permeable security measures that comply with A1.13.10 without submitting a planning/development application. And then fit curtains/window coverings. No conditions. Not to mention it would be a logistical nightmare to enforce. Or alternatively fit no security measures at all and put up the window coverings, as multiple other shopfronts do.

When considering whether to approve this application, I sincerely hope this is taken into consideration by the Councillors. If we are forced to remove the fixed roller shutters, we can place these aforementioned thick black curtains into the glazed areas and keep them shut day and night, completely inhibiting any visibility and permeability. This will also lead to us interacting less with the external environment than we currently do, and would be a significant step backwards, essentially taking us back to how the property was for the decades before we took occupation – i.e. completely closed up. And benefits no one.

### **Front Door**

During the briefing, Council administration stated (on more than one occasion) that any security measures must be placed behind the glazing – i.e. internally. It is not physically possible for us to put security measures behind/internal to the glazing of the front door – please see IMG\_7757.jpg and IMG\_7758.jpg. Additionally, these doors are not secure or securable as they need to conform to fire safety standards. This was due to another requirement by council at occupancy – the previous fire door that had been used for 20+ years was disallowed as it opened outwards onto the footpath, and therefore created a public safety issue in the event of a fire.

An important point to note as well, the automatic laterally opening front doors we currently have in place were *required* by the council during our building approval/occupancy process (apologies if incorrect terminology here) and replaced a secured and lockable hinge based weatherproof door which was recessed in the entrance cavity. The existence of a secure fixed roller shutter was clear at the time. The cost to instal this came to just under \$11,000.

If the Councillors support the administration's REFUSAL of our application, and we are forced to remove the roller door (the one that's been there for at least 16 years, and predates our occupation by at least 10 years) from in front of the lateral opening glass doors, *we will be unable to secure the building*. As this front door is not weathertight, the building will also be open to the elements.

Council administration has been aware of these challenges via the compliance team, who have visited the site. This has also been communicated via email. Yet still 'only internal security measures' is the latest edict.

**Blank Façade**

This is another key plank in the Council administration’s REFUSAL to support our application, with many statements contained in the briefing agenda pdf, such as ‘When closed, the roller shutters would present a blank and monotonous building treatment’ (pg 8).

The Council administrator also highlights this on more than one occasion in the briefing meeting as well.

The sole reason the building currently presents the way it does is because we received the compliance notice to remove the roller shutters whilst in the middle of our rebrand process. This notice was received at around the same time the whole external frontage was being ‘re-decorated’. We had several designs in place to incorporate the branding on the roller shutters themselves, and to add further colour and artwork to the shutters and the whole street frontage. We changed our design plans and held off on completing these visual improvements when the compliance notice was received.

That this is now being cited by Council administration as one of the key reasons for REFUSAL of our application is an irony that’s not lost on us. But it is exceptionally frustrating.

Besides which, we fundamentally don’t agree with this subjective perspective. Please see excerpts below taken from the ‘Agenda documentation’, page 8.

*Excerpt 1*

<p><b>A1.13.5 Commercial Building facades visible from the public realm shall:</b>                  a) Incorporate a variety of materials, colours, textures and depths;                  b) Not present a blank, monotonous, repetitious or dominant building treatment;                  g) Integrate fire boosters, mail boxes and external fixtures into the building design or screen them so they appear as part of the façade; and</p>	<p>When closed, the roller shutters would present a blank and monotonous building treatment.</p>
---	--

*Ref A1.13.5 a)* Our shopfront, with fixed roller shutters in place, incorporates a variety of materials (the metal of the roller shutters as opposed to the brick structure of the surrounding wall), textures (the corrugated metal design of the roller shutters as compared to the textures of the brickwork) and depths (the roller shutters are recessed within the window cavity providing a nice 3D setback) – as to colour, a lick of paint and et voila, all 4 ‘requirements’ met.

*Ref A1.13.5 b)* With 95% of the building being brickwork painted black, our only solution to this is adding further signage and decoration – problem solved.

The comment from council administration in relation to A1.13.5 – well, that’s covered in my opening paragraph to this section, and can be seen in the excerpt above.

*Excerpt 2*

<p><b>A1.13.10 Security measures shall be:</b>                  a) Located and installed internally behind the glazing line or recessed between elements in the façade such as columns or doorway recesses; and                  b) Transparent and visually permeable to allow views inside the building and enable internal light sources to be seen from the street</p>	<p>Roller shutters are located externally to the building/window and are not recessed between elements of the façade.                   Roller shutters are not visually permeable and do not allow views inside the building or internal light sources to be seen from the street.</p>
--	---

*A1.13.10 a)* Please see images IMG\_6224.jpg, IMG\_6225.jpg and IMG\_6227.jpg showing the fixed rollers shutters as clearly recessed within the window recesses. The rollers shutter ‘cannister’ sits slightly proud of the façade (but almost directly in line with the box gutter to the left of the window – see three images mentioned – provides a degree of symmetry), providing a further variety of depth to the shop frontage (A1.13.5 above). This ‘cannister’ is located 3m from ground level, ensuring there is no public safety issue with the fact it is slightly forward of the façade.*A1.13.10 b)*

This has been discussed at length in the Visibility and Permeability section above.

And importantly, there is significant community support for the fixed roller shutters. Please see excerpt below from page 36 of the agenda documentation.

Streetscape	SHUTTERS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roller shutters are black like the building and blend in tastefully.</li> <li>The current tenant has improved the streetscape and the appearance of the old building from all sides and the roller shutters are the best decision for the aesthetic of the building.</li> <li>The current aesthetic is better than when it was the previous shop. The building now looks inviting, the rear car park is usable, and provides a feeling of safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roller shutters provide a solid, blank and unarticulated facade that results in a bulky and visually imposing structure to the street which was also noted by the City's Design Review Panel Chairperson in their review of the application. The roller shutters appear obtrusive to the streetscape and are not in keeping with the scale and character of the established streetscapes or locality.</li> <li>The City is required to assess any development application on its merits based on the development proposed rather than against the previous site situation.</li> <li>The roller shutters provide a blank façade that does not achieve the Element Objectives relating to Façade Design of the City's Built Form Policy.</li> </ul>

This summary of community feedback is but a small sample set, supporting the aesthetics of the building. And it's somewhat patronising to respond to legitimate community feedback in the manner of the first comment by administration. It discounts their considered opinion out of hand.

I would also like to point out, the image of our building on Page 13 of the agenda documentation isn't even representative of how the building presents now. Further signage and branding elements have already been added on the right hand side, where the roller shutters are positioned. Those of you who visited site would be aware of this.

Even taking in all this feedback, if there are still council administration concerns, it's clear this is an easily solvable issue! We already had plans for, and indicated a willingness time and time again to, paint/signwrite/add branding/add artwork (or anything else, we're absolutely open to dialogue on this) to all the areas of Council administrations concern, as well as to further enhance the building frontage itself. Any solution does need to be considered in light of the significant issues with graffiti we have to deal with.

I would also like to highlight our wall facing the carpark, please see IMG\_6229.jpg. This truly is a pretty much a blank façade...although little we can do about it short of further signage, murals and artwork. This is the wall viewed by the many people that use the carpark daily, and any pedestrian or car travelling north along Beaufort Street. Given that a majority of the people using the car park head to the Brisbane Hotel, or the stadium on game days etc. this is often the only view they will ever see of our building. Let me reiterate, the part of our shopfront in this image is viewed by many many more people than our front façade. But I acknowledge it's not the shopfront in question. And we're happy to add further colour and artwork (taking consideration of our graffiti issue of course) to this wall to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

**Windows**

We are unable to fit any appropriately robust internal security measures behind the windows. The exceptionally narrow internal depth of the window opening, combined with the material weakness of the 100+ year old bricks, provides an insufficient level of structural strength in which to install suitably strong fixings to support a 'security measure'.

Additionally, the presence of steel support poles near each window opening prevents any security measures being fixed to the 'side' of the windows (image IMG\_7754.jpg). These engineered steel support poles were installed by us at significant expense to hold this beautiful old building up, further attesting to the material structural weakness present.

**Safety**

Security measures fixed internally behind the glazing do nothing to protect the glass from being broken. We not only have to deal with the challenge of thieves, but also vandals who just for the fun of it like to break stuff. This was the case on one of the occasions when our front windows were broken, which we observed on our security footage.

There is then broken glass strewn all over the pavement until cleared away, creating a public safety issue. I know that the council administration takes public safety seriously as mentioned above, when we took occupancy, we were unable to utilise the existing fire door due to the fact that it opened outwards to the 'public domain'. Since moving in – multiple broken windows, zero fires.

## Effectiveness of security

Thank you Cr Alexander for raising this topic <https://youtu.be/8LCJgAiltw?t=5060>

In response to a security query the Council administrator states 'We believe there could be *potentially* alternate security measures that would be just as effective while also...'.

I'd be interested in what those are. All of the alternative security measures proposed by the council administration, both in the past and within the briefing itself, I would contend are inferior. As does Police advice. Fixed roller shutters are the recommended solution.

I also infer that the council themselves feel this way, given that there is one, and only one, approval for fixed roller shutters that exists in the City of Vincent. Presumably because it was considered the most effective.

Additionally, anything placed internally behind the glazing doesn't protect the glass itself. Given the antisocial behaviour unfortunately prevalent in our little corner of the City, it's just a matter of time before the windows are broken. Creating the public safety issue mentioned above. And still requiring me to get up in the middle of the night to clean up and rectify. And pay for them to be replaced.

I would also contend that anything visually permeable, a core requirement as per the Built Form Policy, is by virtue less effective. There is a reason we hide our belongings out of sight when leaving them in the car. And close our curtains at night to avoid the prying eyes of burglars. Police always recommend keeping things out of sight. This is also borne out by the multitude of businesses that have window coverings (curtains/blinds etc.) closed at night regardless of if they do or don't have metal grilles/bars or other security measures in the windows.

Additionally, although some breakins are premeditated, many are opportunistic. Having thousands of dollars of product on display at 2am is unlikely to be attracting any window shoppers...except potentially those with a crow bar or angle grinder in their hand.

We also have empirical evidence proving the effectiveness of the fixed roller shutters – 5 breakins in just over 3 years prior to their installation, 0 in the almost 2 years since. Absolute actual evidence.

## Police Assets

We are a supplier and contractor of the Western Australian Police, and at any given time we can have Police assets on site, and therefore have certain minimum security requirements. We reached out to WAPOL to clarify what that entailed, and received a response in writing that can be supplied upon request (excluded due to the fact this document is in the public domain). Within this email, there is specific reference to the governments Protective Security Policy Framework, which falls under the auspices of the Attorney-Generals Department, with Policy 15 being the one that sets out our requirements.

This specific policy contains a core requirement:

Each entity must implement physical security measures that minimise or remove the risk of:

- a. harm to people, and
- b. information and physical asset resources being made inoperable or inaccessible, or being accessed, used or removed without proper authorisation.

Ref: <https://www.protectivesecurity.gov.au/policies/physical-security>

The advice we received, both in writing and verbally, is that fixed roller shutters are by far the best option to achieve these outcomes. We are also more than willing to provide contact details for council administration to discuss this directly with the Police themselves.

Please also note – any security measure behind the glazing poses a potential safety issue (highlighted above) and therefore *doesn't minimise or **remove** the risk of harm to people*. Shutters do.

## Costs

Thank you again to Cr Alexander for bringing this up during the Council Briefing <https://youtu.be/8LCJgAiltvw?t=4985>

Although the Council administrator clearly states 'we don't take that into consideration in planning considerations', I'm presuming as a result of the query raised by Cr Alexander that potentially the councillors will. As such, I've given a bit of detail below. Please note – these are very much estimates and will depend on a range of factors.

The current two roller shutters to the windows cost approximately \$5,000 to install. This is a sunk cost – obviously already installed and already incurred. No additional cost to me as the applicant.

If my application is approved, the additional costs will be dependent somewhat on any conditions that are stipulated. Based on the council administrations justifications for REFUSAL, there will most certainly be additional branding and artwork costs, however much of this will be incurred anyway regardless of the outcome. At this stage I'm guessing there will be minimal incremental cost.

It is also difficult to gauge what additional costs will be incurred if my application is not approved. I estimate it'll be around \$4,000 - \$5,000 to remove and dispose of the existing 3 roller shutters.

In terms of installing alternative security measures *internally* as is currently the Council administration's position, well, with the current door and structural beams in place, this isn't even achievable (as highlighted above). This would necessitate replacing the current front door (the one the council requested we install) – rough estimate \$11,000 (cost of current door). And working with the council on a suitable alternative. We would also need to relocate the structural support beams that continue to support the overall building, if this is even possible. Engineers fees around \$4,000 (based on fees incurred when installing current structural beams). Actual structural building work – roughly \$35,000-\$40,000.

Then the cost to install the new security measures – could be anything from \$10,000 to \$25,000 (or more) depending on what's deemed as 'required', and the potential additional structural support work required to make it effective – hard to assess. Total costs would be in the tens of thousands of dollars, maybe pipping into 6 figures.

## History

Thank you Cr Worner for bringing this up - <https://youtu.be/8LCJgAiltvw?t=4735>

I'd just like to clarify some of the dialogue in relation to this. The Council administrator stated we put the roller shutter in front of the door in place first, and then the shutters to the windows. This is not correct. We moved into this building in 2017, and the Roller Shutter in front of the doorway was already installed, and had been since at least 2007 (this is the earliest visual evidence we could find, so potentially much longer).

Cr Worner also kindly points to the fact (paraphrasing again) that we implemented the fixed roller shutters to the windows based on there being a roller shutter currently in place. Absolutely correct – when reviewing all the available options to further secure the building, the existence of a roller shutter currently in situ certainly factored into the decision making.

This serves to illustrate some of our frustration in relation to this entire issue. If this application is refused, we will be required to not only remove the shutters we put in place, but the one that was already present. And of which the council administration was aware of at the time of occupancy in 2017. Which justified the installation of unsecure automatic laterally opening doors.

We have invested a huge amount of time, money and effort in converting the building from how it was, a derelict looking building with the boarded up windows and graffiti covered frontage, to how it presents now. In doing so, we have improved the active participation and interaction with the external streetscape immeasurably.



## Streetscape

Frequent statements and mentions have also been made of the 'streetscape'. Please see image IMG\_6223.jpg mentioned previously. This provides a fair representation of our streetscape. It's pretty clear that our building *in the here and now*, without any of the additional artwork and exterior decoration we are planning to do, currently presents as well, and typically far better, than any other in our immediate streetscape.

It is also my opinion that the suggested solution, being a metal grille located internally to the glazing, makes the building look like a bear cage. Please see IMG\_6082.jpg and IMG\_6083.jpg. Not remotely in keeping with the streetscape, or aesthetically pleasing at all. I'd opinion that none of us want street scapes ubiquitously filled with these sorts of security measures. This is supported by significant community feedback.

It's also important to consider the building in the context of it's location. We are located directly opposite a park, almost exclusively only populated during the day when the shutters are retracted, a carpark abuts us to the left and a visually impermeable buildings abut us to the right.

It has just recently been highlighted to me that the park across the road may be fitted with flood lights, encouraging active use in the evenings for sports and the like. I fully accept this, however I would contend that such park users tens of metres away are hardly looking towards our building, and admiring or criticising it's presentation or interactivity. Through the trees lining the perimeter of the park.

And even if they were, it would still present as a black mass (signage excluded) due to no internal light sources being present and therefore not really provide any active surveillance. And they certainly aren't at the park to be active and interactive with our building – they're just being *active*.

We are not a high end designer shop, over the road from a busy little restaurant and surrounded by a litany of other eateries and night time entertainment venues within a **town centre** location. We are a *destination zone*, that people either walk or drive right past...unless they are coming to visit us...during opening hours. Just applying a bit of context.

There were also mentions of intimidation and security issues with regards to fixed roller shutters. Personally, I feel far less at ease in any location with a prevalence of metal bars and grilles, much of which is in place 24/7, making otherwise welcoming areas in the daylight feel like you're walking through some sort of prison. Subjective? Yes. But supported by a significant amount of community sentiment and feedback.

## Precedence

It would seem that there is considerable concern around setting a precedent. *In fact, it is clear there is a mandate not to approve* Firstly, this has already been set, approved fixed roller shutters already exist in a town centre location, protecting Matusik Jewellers located at 675A Beaufort Street.

I concede this is in the City of Stirling, but it is located in a **town centre** location shared with the City of Vincent, at the intersection of Walcott and Beaufort Street, a mere few steps from the City of Vincent border. And it hasn't led to the ubiquitous fitting of rollers shutters to all the neighbouring buildings. And multiple roller shutters are already in place throughout the city, approved or not.

## Summary

Clearly, I'm hopeful that the Councillors will support my application.

The inference I get from some of the limited discussion I've had with various representatives of the council (both council administration and elected representatives) is that I'm being contrary or difficult. And that I'm not understanding or appreciative of what the council is trying to achieve. But nothing could be further from the truth, as evidenced by both words (reasoned discussion) and deeds (the transformation we have *already* done on the beautiful building in question).

I have not pigheadedly and doggedly said 'but I'm right', I have put forward a reasoned and cogent argument. Usually addressing directly statements and subjective opinions that have put forward by council administration (which often quoted policies and guidelines). Some of these reasoned responses I have provided highlight what I believe may be some small flaws in the stated policies – this does not mean I don't understand or even agree with what the council are trying to achieve.



Just that maybe it's not all perfect. And isn't that what we should encourage in a modern educated democratic society – active debate and discussion.

From my perspective the opposite hasn't always been the case, as evidenced above in some of my clarifications of the councils subjective statements. As well as the statements made by council in response to the supportive (for my application) community feedback. Again, not mentioned to be contrary or difficult, just to point out my feeling, as a rate payer and constituent of the City of Vincent.

Have I cherry picked my points above? To that, I say an emphatic no. I've reduced the size of this statement from 40+ pages, with numerous other responses and clarifications of the position put forward by council, to under 10. As I fully appreciate the workload you, the elected representatives, have when preparing for and attending these council meetings, and have endeavoured to be as brief and succinct as possible, whilst still addressing what I see as the key decision-making points. As it is clear I am attempting to overcome an absolute council mandate to never authorise fixed roller shutters. Through the use of reasoning, logic, objective and yes, subjective opinions.

Will it ever conform 100% to the Built Form Policy or other council Policies? Clearly not. But they are just policies. Within which potentially exists some small flaws, some of which have been highlighted. And have a clear focus on **town centre** locations. When strict application of a policy doesn't achieve its desired objective – blind adherence to the said policy seems fundamentally wrong.

There is also significant Community support for my application, as was identified in the community consultation period. We have also received significant community support via our social media pages.

And from the wider public at large via other mediums. And isn't that what it's all about? The community? Isn't that why the policies exist? For the community?

The word 'Discretion' was used within the briefing meeting, and I'm hopeful that this will be applied, for all the reasons listed. I'm more than happy to work with the Councillors or administration on any conditions to be included to ensure approval of my application goes ahead, they just need to be reasonable.

If the City of Stirling and Matusik Jewellers can come to some sort of an understanding in a **town centre** location, surely the City of Vincent (supposedly the City that wants to work with business) and I can solve this in the 'back end of nowhere'.

Because it does need to get resolved, as although we've improved the building significantly since we've moved in, there's more to be done. 12 months spent waiting to complete our shop front design, decoration and artwork is 12 months too long.

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Hart for his comments and thanked him for the opportunity to visit the store that day.*

### **3.12 Leon Firios from North Perth – Item 10.1**

- Spoke on behalf of the Save North Perth Streets Action Group in support of the officer recommendation
- Stated that the trial has been useful in providing data about the consequences of the diagonal diversion, which included serious safety issues that were not anticipated, some of which have spilled into the surrounding streets and laneways
- Stated that the large majority of residents do not support the diversion and it should be discontinued as soon as possible
- Urged Council to end the diversion

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Firios for his comments.*

**3.13 Paul Jorissen of Perth – Item 9.2**

- Spoke against the recommendation
- Stated that he used to live the area, and that it has homeless shelters, a funeral parlour and a petrol station in the immediate area. This helps explain why the shop requires such security

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Jorissen for his comments.*

**3.14 Steve Beaumont of Highgate**

- Stated that the service station has toilets at Beaufort and Bulwer but it is closed by vandalism, the Woolworths closes at 5pm and the public toilets in the park have been removed
- Mentioned that this means that there are not public toilets on Bulwer Street, which means when there is a football match people are using the laneways
- Recommended putting up portable toilets at the service station for football patrons to use, and consider what to do for the homeless people in the area

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Beaumont for his comments and said that the City is considering a toilet at Birdwood Square. Mr Beaumont suggested that if Woolworths and the service station cannot supply a toilet, they should have to close their doors, and this should apply across the board. Mayor Cole said that the City could investigate what the planning approval for Woolworths and the service station says in relation to the provision of public toilets. Are they required to offer them, and if so during which hours.*

**3.15 Ben Giles of Perth – Item 9.2**

- Spoke against the recommendation
- Mentioned that the shop is up the road from the Brisbane Hotel, and at risk from drunk people potentially causing damage

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Giles for his comments.*

**3.16 Jamal Banvait of Highgate – Item 9.2**

- Spoke against the recommendation
- Stated he would feel safer if his bike was protected by roller shutters

*The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Banvait for his comments*

**The following questions and statements were submitted prior to the Meeting.**

**Olaf Goy of Perth****Background:**

In June 2021 a group of residents lodged a petition urging the administration to take action in relation to 7 Grams Chicken of 212-214 Lake Street in relation to nuisance odour. This was a result of residents having had to put up with the foul cooking odour for some time. Almost two years later, the issue not only persist but is now being exasperated by unacceptable constant noise levels when the new system is operating in full swing.

A number of residents attended Council meetings and urged the Council to review the Vincent Local Planning Scheme No 2 and in particular the definition for 'Fast Food'. By rights, this business should not have been operating in this area in the first place.

I would like to kindly request answers to the following questions:

1. What, if anything has been done in relation to reviewing the Vincent Local Planning Scheme No 2 to identify potential amendments?
2. I have been the recipient of a noise complaint notice when a tradesman used power tools on a Sunday. The note reminded me of the penalties applicable for subsequent breaches reaching from \$250 all the way up to \$250,000. At the same time, 7 Grams is allowed to operate unabated with the City agreeing to numerous extensions in a series of SAT hearings. Does the City put the interest of commercial businesses ahead of its residents?
3. If the answer to question 2. Is 'no', at what point does the City consider it justified that the business must provide sufficient remedies before it is allowed to continue to trade?
4. What timeframe and resolution does the City find acceptable to resolve the issue?
5. What are the next steps if the proposed solution that has finally been installed does not remedy the situation or in fact, creates a different problem being noise pollution.

### **Brendan Bensky of North Perth**

1. At the council meeting April 4th 2023, Council unanimously approved an updated CCTV policy (i) to be issued for public notice. The new policy plagiarises the City of Townsville's CCTV Policy (ii). Can the City provide an explanation for this?
2. The CCTV policy (i) includes references to QLD's Information Privacy Act of 2009, and QLD's Right to Information Act of 2009. Can the City provide an explanation for this?
3. The City's Privacy Management Policy (iii) is aligned to the Commonwealth Privacy Act. Why does the City's new CCTV policy ignore both the City's own Privacy Management Policy, as well as the Commonwealth Privacy Act?
4. Did the City conduct a Privacy Impact Assessment of the new CCTV Policy (i)? If so, please provide a copy of the assessment.

In September 2021 I met with the CEO, the Corporate Strategy and Governance Manager, as well as a former City of Vincent councillor. At the meeting, the councillor recommended to the CEO that councillors receive privacy training. I have followed up with the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and CEO numerous times on this recommendation, but have received no responses to my queries.

5. Since September 2021, have any councillors received privacy training? If yes, please provide details.
6. Since September 2021, has the CEO, or any Director or Manager received privacy training? If yes, please provide details.
7. Since September 2021, has any other staff member at the City of Vincent received privacy training? If yes, please provide details.

Between December 2020 and February 2022 I engaged with the City regarding e-Permits and privacy. On February 4th 2022, the Mayor wrote that:

"We agree that the City must provide ongoing attention and care to any system collecting personal information during the course of business. To this end the City reviewed its existing Privacy Management Policy in 2021 and is in the process of replacing it with a broader privacy framework aligned to the Australia Privacy Principles. This work is being overseen in 2022 by the City's Audit Committee and will include an embedded use of written Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) for projects or initiatives that involve new or changed ways of handling personal information."

Privacy last appeared in the Audit Committee's minutes in August 2022 (iv). In response to a question from the Deputy Mayor, the Chief Audit Executive advised that City will have finalised its review and incorporated new practices before 30 June 2023.

8. Can the City provide an update on the work being done to update the City's privacy practices?

(i)

[https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Agendas/2023/4\\_April\\_2023\\_Council\\_Meeting/Item\\_10\\_1\\_Advertising\\_of\\_Amended\\_Policy\\_-\\_Closed\\_Circuit\\_Television.pdf](https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Agendas/2023/4_April_2023_Council_Meeting/Item_10_1_Advertising_of_Amended_Policy_-_Closed_Circuit_Television.pdf)

(ii) [https://www.townsville.qld.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0027/54891/Management-of-CCTV-Policy.pdf](https://www.townsville.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0027/54891/Management-of-CCTV-Policy.pdf)

(iii)

[https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/4131\\_Privacy\\_Management.pdf](https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/4131_Privacy_Management.pdf)

(iv)

[https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Committees/Audit/Audit\\_Committee\\_Minutes\\_-\\_9\\_August\\_2022.pdf](https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Committees/Audit/Audit_Committee_Minutes_-_9_August_2022.pdf)

(v)

[https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Committees/Audit/Audit\\_Committee\\_Meeting\\_Minutes\\_4\\_May\\_2023.pdf](https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/Profiles/vincent/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council/Committees/Audit/Audit_Committee_Meeting_Minutes_4_May_2023.pdf)

### **Norelle O'Neill**

I refer to the Proposed Lease of Portion of No.41 Britannia Road, Leederville at Britannia Road for the installation of a telecommunications tower and metal cabinets, the consultation period for which closed yesterday, 16 May 2023:

1. Is it correct that Mr David MacLennan, CEO, City of Vincent, did, prior to the closing date of the community consultation period, tell members of the Vincent community that the proposed location of the tower and cabinets had already been approved and was to proceed at that location?
  - a. If so, does the CEO deem it appropriate to convey such a 'fait accompli'? Does the CEO agree that such comments further erode the community's already wary perception of the City's consultation processes?
2. When the annual photos of Vincent representatives and First Nations Peoples are published to promote the City for National Reconciliation and NAIDOC Weeks, can they please include reference to the fact that the City is proposing to allow the cited area, which is the remains of an extensive traditional Aboriginal hunting and camping ground, to be concreted over for a telecommunications tower. Can the article highlight that the CoV has accepted a consultant's view that in regard to the proposed site "There are no cultural heritage or visual landscape values to be compromised by the location [of the tower], and no significant environmental impact"
3. The mature native tree in the attached photo is located at the site of the proposed telecommunications tower, and was recently damaged by excessive lopping of limbs down one side only. Given the area has been incorrectly deemed by the City as 'under-utilised' the tree would not have been lopped for safety reasons but presumably for plans for the tower.
  - a. Did tower proponent Optus, its contractor Indara Corporation, or any of its sub-contractors, at any time engage with any City of Vincent staff to discuss and/or request lopping limbs off the cited community tree for any purpose, and as a result of that engagement were multiple limbs lopped off that and a nearby tree?
  - b. If so, who paid for that work to be done, the City of Vincent, Indara Corporation or another entity?



### Greg Rice of Mt Lawley – Item 13.1

I would like to make it very clear that I **do not** in any way support the introduction of the removal of the first hour free in carparks around my business, namely the Chelmsford Rd and Raglan Rd carparks. The removal of the first hour free parking has had a severely detrimental impact on number of cars using these two carparks which directly impacts the viability of my business, of which I am a very big rate payer in your council.

If you do not allow for the reintroduction of the first hour free in these car parks, you are in very real danger of killing businesses on Beaufort St as this has clearly forced residents to shop elsewhere. This is not speculation, the declining parking numbers speak for themselves – a **21% decline** at Chelmsford Rd carpark and **28% decline** at Raglan Rd carpark. You cannot possibly interpret these numbers in any other way – just imagine what it could possibly look like in 2 years' time when even more people become sick of paying for parking.

Businesses like mine rely on **short-term** parking as our customers want to pop in and pop out as quickly as they can - any barrier you put up to this means less customers will shop at my store as they will go elsewhere (with free parking) instead. Businesses like 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave IGA (located in the City of Stirling) or Woolworths Highgate, which draws potential customers away from the majority of Beaufort St businesses.

I understand that there are rising costs and you need to offset those, we are all in the same boat. I urge you to look at other solutions to this that aren't going to have such a detrimental effect to your local businesses. I don't try and recoup my rising costs of doing business by raising my prices because I know by doing this, it drives my customers away - please take the same mentality when looking at this.

The feedback from my customers has been unanimous – they do not want to pay for short-term parking and more and more they are taking their business elsewhere.

I had assurances from Emma Cole that, in removing free parking, it was not the intention to send any businesses backwards or broke and that this would be looked at on a case-by-case basis when the numbers come back. Now that the numbers are back, and we can see a **25% decrease** in transaction rates in these two Mt Lawley carparks, will you stay true to your word and do something about this, before it's too late?

I strongly urge the City of Vincent Councillors to look at the damage already done to **your** local businesses in such a short period of time and have a good think about the potential impacts long term. Please support the reintroduction of the first hour free in car parks.

As always, I am more than happy to discuss this further on the contact information below.

### Celia O'Grady of Mt Lawley – Item 9.2

1. I am a ratepayer of Cof V and a customer of the business in question, Evolution Bikes. **I support the owner's request to continue the use of roller shutters to secure the premises after hours.**
2. Having looked at the 34 page document to be considered at the meeting, I am puzzled as to why the issue has gone this far. As I understand it the whole saga was set off by the complaint of a single unnamed person.
3. The reasons listed for refusing the application to retain the shutters are at odds with the reality of the location of the business. This is not a wonderfully vibrant cafe strip. The nearby activities which the shutters are supposed to be at odds with include a petrol station, a Funeral Directors premises, a pharmacy, a large parking lot, and a supermarket. How can windows shuttered at night detract from these businesses?
4. The owner of the business is providing a useful service. He should not have his time tied up in dealing with Local Government red tape. CofV should be supporting his business, as it is in keeping with the CofV's stated aim of reducing cars and encouraging bicycles on our roads.
5. Please just let the application for the continued use of the shutters go through. There are many more worthy activities for Vincent staff to spend their time, and ratepayers money, on.

### Trish Byrne of Perth – Item 9.7

I attended the Council briefing last week and sent a follow up clarification to the Planner on the actions undertaken to inform the Draft Framework. I queried if my understanding per the red font below was correct, following the Briefing discussions. The 'How will we do it' section is the wording from the [Plan Your Place - Claisebrook | The City of Vincent](#) website.

#### How will we do it?

Through a series of community workshops and information sessions, we will understand the community's vision for the area and then design a planning framework that responds to this vision. **I understand this was the Vision Workshop, the survey and a drop-in session.** (We were subsequently informed that approximately 30 people attended this Vision Workshop and note 29 submissions for the survey).

Once the framework is drafted, we will host more workshops and information sessions to confirm we heard what the community said. **I understand this was a Design workshop. Can you confirm if the draft framework was presented at this?** (We were subsequently informed there were significantly less attendees at this Design Workshop)

I received the following response (extracted from the email) to my request for clarifications on the process:

*To aid in the drafting of the document the City, the following exercises were undertaken:*

- A survey on the City's website;
- A Visioning workshop held on 8 December 2022; and
- A Design workshop held on 2 February 2023.

*To promote the above activities and to lead interested parties to the relevant Imagine Vincent page, the City officers:*

- Walked a letter drop to properties within the proposed precinct;
- Placed signs on site at Gladstone Street Reserve, Norwood Park and an entry to the East Perth station; and
- Sent Emails were to property owners.

*All of the above were a form of pre-consultation*

Note no email was received until we had registered for (generic) updates. By comparison, together with an email notification of general proposed changes, Town of Victoria Park recently sent letter correspondence notifying us as owners of specific statutory planning amendments proposed for our site for full visibility over the impact of the proposed changes. We also do not feel the series of workshops and information sessions promised at each stage were delivered, and references to the community vision and feedback represents a very small cohort.

We do not feel adequate pre-consultation occurred with the most impacted landowners, and proposed changes were potentially masked under a broader framework and visioning process. We understand this is at local planning policy level, however we have been advised in the absence of any other planning instrument for this area, this will govern development (and not just be a consideration).

Further, we have gone through the 29 survey responses and Draft document and predominantly it seemed that the (limited) respondents were keen to see investment and development in the area. It was suggested to us by other parties that had been involved in the workshops, that the reduced height around Gladstone Park was influenced by fears over shading impact, which we believe would not be an issue in this southern section. We wish to be clear that we support a planned precinct, however we respectfully request that the Draft be amended in advance of advertising to retain the 6-storey height as is currently permitted to this section of Gladstone Street (south of Somerville Street towards Edward Street), or for further consultation to occur in advance of the Draft being published

#### **Pauline Holdaway of Old Florida Investments – Item 9.7**

I would like to extend the support for the Advertising of the North CLaisebrook Planning Framework. I represent the owners of No 54 and 56 Edward Street and strongly support the continued progress of the Planning Framework.

I would also like to highlight our support for the minimum lot area specified in clause 4.4.1 being reduced to 1,000sqm from the original proposed 1,200sqm. The revised lot size will allow for a more coordinated development across more lots whilst still achieving the desired quality of construction and amenity for the locality.

Thank you for your support in the continued improvement of this locality.

#### **Tom Katselas of Fresh provisions – Item 13.1**

Thank you for taking the time to read my e-mail message. My name is Tom Katselas and I am one of the owners of Fresh Provisions.

Now into our 33rd year of trading, it has probably been the most difficult one we have endured. Over 18 months ago we agreed to re-fit the store at considerable cost to maintain our relevance in the market place. With the conglomerates bookending us with free parking and margins being squeezed through transport and industry costs, we thought we were going to whether the storm and forge ahead. Little did we know that the local council had issues of their own and parking changes were afoot.

My job as a retailer is to figure out how I'm going to make a dollar every day the store opens to support not only my family but the well being of my staff and the local community. I am the one on the floor organising displays, chatting to customers and helping customers with their purchases. The constant feedback I have had from our loyal customers is "why should we pay to shop at Freshies"? The 15 minute bays have not worked as Freshies is also a meeting place for regular shopping. Customers who shop with us like to chat, explore our store and ask questions. This takes more than 15 minutes and the damage has been done. Council has encouraged quick shopping trips so we are now more of a convenience store. Trolley shoppers have dropped off in droves and our customer count is down, simply, nobody wants to pay for parking to do their food shopping, coffee buying or visiting the local fish and chips store for a quick bite.

Our business is dying of a slow painful death and it may seem like an over blown statement at the moment, but after 35 years in the industry I can see the likelihood of us closing down is very real due to the paid parking conditions currently imposed. The first hour free was working well for everyone so why change it? Change the second and third hour fees to collect more revenue. With a lot more cars using the car park I'm sure council will be able to generate a suitable amount of fees after the first hour.

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 20 June 2023 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.48pm.



**(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE****Geoff Cole of Mt Hawthorn**

I am writing to the City of Vincent with regard to car park lighting at the Britannia Road Reserve. A pair of very bright spot lights are installed on the southern end of the carpark, elevated on a pole of approximately 10m height, adjacent to the Leederville Cricket Club clubrooms. Their location is shown by the yellow circle in the figure below.

These lights operate all night and shine into nearby properties (including my own) impacting their amenity.

I am writing to ask whether the council could install a timer function on this light so that it goes out at a reasonable time, such as 9:00pm.



*Currently the carpark lighting is on a timer scheduled to turn off at 10pm. This is for the safety of park users and people accessing the carparks. The City confirms that the lighting is not turning off at the scheduled time and will rectify.*

**Dudley Maier of Highgate**

1. The Revenue and Rating Plan 2023-2026, which was adopted by Council on 20 September 2022 says that in 2022/23 Vincent expects to receive \$3million in grant funding to improve community facilities at Litis Stadium. The Four Year Capital Works Program 2022/23 – 2025/26, which was approved at the same meeting, does not show any significant work on the facility. When will the city receive the grant, why isn't it in the Capital Works Program, and what is the status of the project?

*The Litis Stadium project was excluded from the Capital Works Program 2022/23 – 2025/26 as it was subject to confirmation of Federal grant funding. The City received notification in late October 2022 that the Federal Government would provide \$3 million in funding for Litis Stadium. The project comprises part of the Council adopted Britannia North West reserve Development Plan (OCM 16/11/2021 Item 9.5 and OCM 14/12/2021 Item 9.11). The project is expected to commence in 2023/24.*

2. The supporting documents for the 2022/23 Budget showed an amount of \$250,000 for staff benchmarking (market adjustment).
  - How much has been committed for this benchmarking this financial year?
  - How many staff members have benefitted from this initiative?
  - What is the average benefit paid, the lowest benefit paid, and the highest benefit paid?
  - How much of that has been paid to members of the Executive Management Committee?



- How much of that has been paid to staff designated Manager or above?

*WALGA conducts a comprehensive salary and workforce survey each year. The collective survey results can help guide recruitment and remuneration strategies.*

*The survey results include salary data on a wide range of Local Government positions and filters to view salaries for comparable roles.*

*The City of Vincent is a Tier 2 Local Government and we benchmark against Tier 2 local governments despite being subject to competition for talent and skills from Tier 1 Local Governments.*

*The Australian Local Government Association commissioned a survey in 2022 on the skills shortages impacting Local Governments across the country.*

*Across the Local Government sector, the top three most cited skill shortages that Local Governments experienced were engineers (as noted by 46% of 2022 survey respondents), urban and town planners (40%), building surveyors (36%), environmental health inspectors (30%) and human resources professionals (29%).*

*Several occupational skill shortages are becoming critical, including engineers, town planners, building surveyors, environmental health officers and accountants. The proportion of Local Governments expecting shortages in these occupational areas increased from a range of 20- 35% in 2018 to 37-53% in 2022. The most common drivers of skills shortages are; a market shortage of suitably skilled candidates; an inability to compete with the private sector and other local governments on remuneration; locational disadvantages and some pronounced geographic differentiations.*

*The hardest to fill occupations included engineers (24%) due primarily to competition with the private sector being able to offer better remuneration followed by building surveyors (36%) and town planners (17%).*

*In Western Australia, 38 (90%) of the 42 local governments reported that they were experiencing skills shortages in 2021-22 compared to 47.1% local governments in 2018.*

*Building surveyors, risk managers, engineers and town planners were the top professional occupations experiencing skill shortages in 2020-21, affecting 21-24% of councils. Among trade occupations, customer service workers, labourers and truck drivers experienced the greatest shortages.*

*In recent years, it appears that the largest increase was in the shortage of governance and risk managers, which affected 13.7% of local governments in 2018. Similarly, customer service workers did not make the top 10 occupational shortages in 2018, while labourer shortages previously affected 5.9% of local governments (ranked 9<sup>th</sup> 22 in 2018).*

TABLE 9B: WA LG OCCUPATIONAL SKILL SHORTAGES IN URBAN AND URBAN FRINGE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN 2020-21

Category	Occupation	# responding local governments	% responding local governments
Professional and Technical	Urban & town planners	6	46%
	Building surveyors	6	46%
	Engineers	5	38%
	Building surveying technicians	5	38%
	Asset and facilities managers	4	31%
	Computing/ICT professionals	4	31%
	Computing/ICT technicians	4	31%
	Surveyors	4	31%
	Accountants	3	23%
	Contract managers / officers	3	23%
	Engineering technicians	3	23%
Operational and Trade	Environmental health officers	3	23%
	Labourers	3	23%
	Tradespersons - Horticultural	3	23%
	Customer service workers	2	15%
	Accounts/pay roll clerk	2	15%
	Youth support worker	2	15%
	IT/ICT technicians	2	15%
	Waste management / Recycling operator	2	15%
	Tradespersons - Construction	2	15%
	Waste water/sewerage operator	2	15%
	Truck drivers	1	8%
	Supervisors/team leaders	1	8%
	Water treatment operator	1	8%

Source: 2022 LG Survey

*As reported in the national and WA survey results, the City of Vincent has been experiencing skills shortages in environmental health officers, customer service workers, accountants, urban and town planners, and building surveyors.*

*The shortage of skilled workers has been driving up salary expectations for both retention and recruitment purposes.*

*The City of Vincent uses benchmarking data to ensure it is competitive with marker local governments and the private sector so it has trained staff to deliver critical services, projects and programs.*

*The personal details of staff remuneration is private and confidential.*

3. The Mid-Year Budget Review reduced the 2022/23 expected capital expenditure from \$20.1 million to \$17 million. The financial statements for the period ending 28 February show a YTD Budget of \$15.7 million and YTD expenditure of \$5.5 Million (i.e. 35% of YTD budget). Monthly financial statements also show that in February only \$351,000 out of a monthly budget of \$1.17 million was spent. What is the current estimate of the amount of capital expenditure that will be carried forward to next financial year?

*The City's actual and committed capex spend at February was \$8.9m. The Mid-Year Budget Review is the City's latest estimate of capital expenditure for 2022/23 which will be reviewed again over the next couple of months as the Annual Budget 2023/24 is finalised.*

4. At the last Council meeting I asked some questions about the removal of the artworks produced by Martin Keil and Henrik Mayer and installed in 2012. In the response to my question the Administration has suggested that the artworks may have been removed prior to the adoption of the Public Art Policy on 22 August 2017. The implication being that the works were removed prior to the adoption of a policy that said that artists should be consulted before works are disposed of. Can you confirm that Policy 3.10.7 (Art Policy) was in force prior to 22 August 2017; that the Objectives of that policy made it clear that it referred to public art; that the policy stated that artists would be consulted on the procedures for disposal; and that works that have been de-accessioned will be offered the work.

Yes, the Policy that was in place prior to 22 August 2017; did have clear objectives that made it clear that it referred to public art; stated that artists would be consulted on the procedures for disposal if possible; and stated that that where feasible, work that has been deaccessioned would be offered to the artist. There is no record of this occurring.

5. Tables 5 and 6 of Item 10.2 (\$1 First Hour) show total parking durations and average length of stay from both APARC data and Easypark data.

The number of stays/visits can be deduced by dividing the total duration by the associated average stay. The aggregation of APARC and Easypark data shows approximately 608,000 stays in 2021-22 compared with approximately 485,000 stays in 2022-23. This is a drop of approximately 123,000 and represents a 20.2% drop in stays (see below)

Why is the data which can be deduced from Tables 5 and 6 significantly different from the data deduced from Tables 1 and 2 (i.e. the drop in visits of 123,000 rather than 50,000 as shown in Tables 1 and 2)?

	2021-2022				2022-2023			
	Hours	Average (h:mm)	Average (Dec)	Visits	Hours	Average (h:mm)	Average (Dec)	Visits
APARC	753,085	1:39	1.65	456,415	585,780	1:58	1.97	297,854
Easypark	258,202	1:42	1.70	151,883	309,404	1:39	1.65	187,517
				608,298				485,371

The drop in 50,000 transactions relates to the short term parking (ie <1hr) and the data provided in Tables 5 and 6 is for all length of stay transactions.

### 3.5 Greg Johnson of Mt Hawthorn – Item 9.5

Queried if Council is going to go back to the guarantee that the Mayor gave them that the status quo would be resumed? There would be no further \$1 fee, and it would return to 1 hour free. If not, is that in breach of faith with the ratepayers?

The implementation and review of the \$1 first hour car park fee was undertaken in accordance with the Council resolution as follows –

#### 4. FEES AND CHARGES:

- 4.1 PURSUANT to Section 6.16 of the Local Government Act 1995, ADOPTS the Schedule of Fees and Charges in Attachment 3.
- 4.2 NOTES community submissions were strongly opposed to the proposal to reduce the first hour free parking to 30 minutes free parking in City Car Parks, and this proposal has been withdrawn.
- 4.3 APPROVES a fee of \$1 for first hour parking, as detailed in the Proposed Fees and Charges 2022/2023 at Attachment 3, in lieu of 4.2.
- 4.4 REQUESTS Administration monitor the impact to number of transactions and revenue following the change to \$1 for first hour to ascertain any detrimental impact on occupancy or use in City car parks and provide a report back to Council by April 2023 in time for setting fees and charges for the 2023/24 Annual Budget; and
- 4.5 REQUESTS Administration monitor and review the usage of time limited 15 minute and 30 minute only on street bays in Town Centres following the introduction of \$1 for the first hour in City car parks to ensure short term visitor parking availability.

*Fees and Charges were set for the full 2022/2023 year. Council considered the impact of the \$1 first hour fee as per 4.4 above at its 4 April 2023 Meeting ("in time for setting fees and charges for the 2023/24 Annual Budget").*

### **3.2 Greg Curtis of Northbridge**

Queried if the City acknowledges that the safety and security of residents has worsened since the establishment of the homeless shelter at 41 Money Street?

*The City is aware of community safety concerns associated with a general increase in homelessness / vagrant population in the precinct. Responding to these matters requires a collaborative effort, and the City is working closely with WA Police and other specialised agencies. Noting this, a meeting has been scheduled, with the WA Police and Department of Communities (Office of Homelessness) to discuss concerns around antisocial behaviour in the Money Street precinct. Residents / occupants of the area are encouraged to report criminal matters / antisocial behaviour issues to Police as it is the agency to appropriately address these matters.*

### **3.6 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn**

Queried if the grates placed in Sasse Ave, Mt Hawthorn, approximately 2 years ago, feed into the main stormwater pipe that is on her property

*The drainage grates form part of the drainage pit. The drainage pits are likely to be connected into the 900mm dia pipe which will be confirmed once the new drainage data is captured within the next few months as part of the overall Drainage Strategy.*

## **4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

### **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace**

**That Cr Loden's request for leave of absence from 21 – 24 May 2023 be approved.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)**

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## 5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

A deputation was requested by Anthony Hart for item 9.2 Nos. 334-336 (Lots: 4 & 5, D/P: 1304) Beaufort Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations And Additions To Shop (Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development). Mr Hart subsequently withdrew his application.

- 5.1 Petition with eight signatures received from Aldo Arco of Tuart Hill requesting that Council carry out crown pruning (to a height below the height of the building) and the shaping of the street trees adjacent to the building named "Sant Elmo" 152 – 160 Scarborough Beach Road, Mt Hawthorn (situated on the corner of Scarborough Beach Road and Finders Street), in order to prevent the ongoing roof and ceiling damage to the apartments, and the associated costs incurred, to repair the damage being caused by the flooding from leaf and nut drop into the apartment gutters. The subject trees are situated in Flinders Street Mt Hawthorn.

### PETITION

### COUNCIL DECISION

**Moved: Cr Loden Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That the petition be received and a report be prepared. The report could possibly form part of the Infobulletin, if Administration deem that appropriate.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)**

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

- 5.2 Petition with 23 signatures received requesting a change in the parking regulations on Chapman St, Perth, to restrict parking to a two (2) hour parking limit on both sides of the road.

### PETITION

### COUNCIL DECISION

**Moved: Cr Loden Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That the petition be received, as action is already being undertaken as part of the Accessible City Strategy.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)**

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## 6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Loden

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 4 April 2023 be confirmed.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## 7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Emma Cole made the following announcement:

### 7.1 PICKLE DISTRICT AFTER DARK EVENT

The Pickle District After Dark Event was held last Friday and reflects the Pickle District Planning Framework which is on the agenda tonight and the desire for that to be an arts precinct. The After Dark event was hosted by the Pickle District Town Team and was incredible, the team managed to turn the road reserve, owned by Main Roads, by the Graham Farmer Freeway into a Pickle Park with an RAC grant. This was in full use on Friday night, with lots of people using it as a new public space.

Congratulations to the Pickle District Town Team on another very successful event.

## 8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 Cr Ross Ioppolo declared an impartiality interest in Item 9.6 Leederville Oval Precinct Master Plan. The extent of his interest is that his daughter attends Leederville Early Childhood Centre.
- 8.2 Cr Alex Castle declared an impartiality interest in Item 9.1 No. 4 (Lot: 1; S/P: 24447) Primrose Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Grouped Dwelling. The extent of her interest is that she is friends with one of the architects employed by Chindarsi Associates, who prepared some of the papers for the report.
- 8.3 Cr Dan Loden declared an impartiality interest in Item 9.6 Leederville Oval Precinct Master Plan. The extent of his interest is that his son attends Leederville Early Childhood Centre.
- 8.4 Mayor Cole declared an impartiality interest in Item 9.4 Request for Proposals for Redevelopment of Leederville Carparks. The extent of her interest is that one of the sub-consultants to one of the proposals is someone I know professionally and personally but she has not discussed or engaged with him or any of the proponents in relation to the item.

## REPORTS

The Presiding Member, Mayor Emma Cole, advised the meeting of:

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**  
Items 9.2, 9.3, 10.1, 10.5, 11.5 and 13.1.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**  
Items 9.11, 12.1 and 13.1.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**  
Nil

The Presiding Member, Mayor Emma Cole, requested Council Members to indicate:

- (d) **Items which Council Members wish to discuss which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment or require an absolute majority decision and the following was advised:**

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Mayor Cole	9.8
Cr Ioppolo	9.1, 9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 9.9, 9.13, 9.14, 10.1, 12.4
Cr Wallace	12.2

The Presiding Member, Mayor Emma Cole therefore requested the Chief Executive Officer, David MacLennan, to advise the meeting of:

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved "En Bloc", being:**  
Items 9.6, 9.7, 9.10, 9.12, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4 and 12.3
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**  
Nil

## ITEMS APPROVED "EN BLOC":

The following Items were adopted unopposed and without discussion "En Bloc", as recommended:

### COUNCIL DECISION

**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden**

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:  
Items 9.6, 9.7, 9.10, 9.12, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4 and 12.3**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.6 LEEDERVILLE OVAL CIVIC PRECINCT MASTER PLAN**

Attachments: 1. Leederville Oval Civic Precinct Master Plan - Project Plan and Timeline 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the inclusion of the Leederville Oval Civic Precinct Master Plan as a Strategic Project, within the 2023/24 – 2026/27 Corporate Business Plan; and
2. **NOTES** the Project Plan and Timeline, as at Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.6**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)



**9.7 ADVERTISING OF NEW POLICY - NORTH CLAISEBROOK PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

- Attachments:
1. Draft North Claisebrook Planning Framework 
  2. Survey Submissions 

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council PREPARES Local Planning Framework: North Claisebrook as at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.7**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.10 THRIVING PLACES STRATEGY - APPROVAL TO ADVERTISE

Attachments: 1. Draft Thriving Places Strategy for Advertising 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council APPROVES draft Thriving Places Strategy 2023-2028 for the purpose of advertising.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.10

Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**9.12 OUTCOMES OF ADVERTISING - AMENDMENT NO. 12 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2**

- Attachments:
1. Form 2A - Amendment No. 12 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 - Permissibility of Service stations 
  2. Summary of Submissions - Amendment No. 12 (Service Stations) 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **CONSIDERS** the submissions and Administrations response to the submissions pursuant to Part 5, Division 3, Regulation 50 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
2. **SUPPORTS** Amendment 12 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 without modification, pursuant to Regulation 50(3) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, included in Attachment 1; and
3. **FORWARDS** all relevant information in accordance with Regulation 44 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* to the Western Australian Planning Commission for Approval.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.12**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**10.2 PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ONLY PARKING RESTRICTIONS, HAROLD STREET, MOUNT LAWLEY - RESULTS OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Attachments: 1. Harold St Consultation submissions for resident only parking restriction on northern side of Harold Street, Mount Lawley 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **NOTES** the comments received during the consultation period (Attachment 1);
2. **APPROVES** the introduction of resident only parking on the northern side of Harold Street, between Vincent Street and Beaufort Street, Mount Lawley; and
3. **ADVISES** consultation respondents and affected residents of its decision.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2**





**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**10.3 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED GRAFFITI CONTROL AND REMOVAL POLICY 2.1.3**

- Attachments:
1. Graffiti Control and Removal Policy 
  2. Community Feedback on Draft Graffiti Management Policy 
  3. Draft Graffiti Management Policy with tracked changes 
  4. Draft Graffiti Management Policy final 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **ADOPTS** the amended Graffiti Control and Removal Policy (to be re-named as Graffiti Management Policy) at Attachment 4.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.3**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**10.4 RFT IE224/2022 PROVISION OF GENERAL ELECTRICAL MAINTENANCE SERVICES****Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet IE224-2022 - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE224/2022 Provision of General Electrical Maintenance Services; and**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of EOS Electrical for Portion A of Tender IE224/2022 - Electrical maintenance services to all City of Vincent owned and managed buildings and parks, except Beatty Park Leisure Centre; and**
- 3. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Rosevale Fire & Electrical for Portion B of Tender IE224/2022 - Electrical maintenance services to the Beatty Park Leisure Centre.**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.4****Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)****(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 MARCH 2023****Attachments:** 1. Financial Statements as at 31 March 2023 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 March 2023 as shown in Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1****Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 1 MARCH 2023 TO 31 MARCH 2023**

- Attachments:
1. Payments by EFT and Payroll March 23 
  2. Payments by Cheque March 23 
  3. Payments by Direct Debit March 23 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 1 March 2023 to 31 March 2023 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$6,800,412.35
Cheques	\$600.50
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$130,433.91
Total payments for March 2023	<b>\$6,931,446.76</b>

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2**

**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)



11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 MARCH 2023

Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 31 March 2023 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 March 2023 as detailed in Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3**



**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**11.4 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED POLICY - RECOGNITION OF NOONGAR BOODJAR CULTURE AND HISTORY THROUGH WELCOME TO COUNTRY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

- Attachments:**
- 1. Recognition of Noongar Boodjar Culture and History through Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country - Marked Up Version **
  - 2. Recognition of Noongar Boodjar Culture and History through Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country - Clean Version **

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Recognition of Noongar Boodjar Culture and History through Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4**






**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Loden**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**12.3 INFORMATION BULLETIN**

- Attachments:
1. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group - 30 March 2023 
  2. Accessible City Update 
  3. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of March 2023 
  4. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
  5. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress report as at 28 April 2023 
  6. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
  7. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
  8. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - April 2023 
  9. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - April 2023 
  10. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - April 2023 
  11. Council Workshop Items since 5 April 2023 
  12. Council Meeting Statistics 
  13. Council Briefing Notes - 28 March 2023 
  14. Sustainable Environment Strategy - Progress Update 2021-22 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated May 2023.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**


**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 6.59pm Manager City Buildings & Asset Management left the meeting and did not return.

At 6.59pm Manager Waste & Recycling left the meeting and did not return.

## REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

### 11.5 DIFFERENTIAL RATING STRATEGY 2023/24

- Attachments:
1. Rate Setting Statement 2023-24 
  2. Statement of Objects and Reasons for the Proposed Differential Rates and Minimum Payments for 2023-24 
  3. Community Consultation 

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ADVERTISES** by local public notice for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Section 6.36(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, its intention to levy the following differential rates and minimum rates in 2023/2024 as set out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons for the Proposed Differential Rates and Minimum Payments for 2023/2024, at Attachment 2;
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to invite submissions from electors and ratepayers on the proposed differential rates and minimum payments for 2023/2024:

Rating Category	2023/2024	
	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate
Residential	0.0752480	\$1,395.41
Vacant-Residential	0.0782155	\$1,233.10
Vacant-Commercial	0.1366890	\$1,705.07
Other	0.0708997	\$1,346.72

3. **NOTES** any public submissions received in response to 1 and 2 above will be presented to Council for consideration;

At 7.01pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting.

At 7.01pm Manager Engineering left the meeting.

At 7.03pm A/Manager Development & Design returned to the meeting.

At 7.03pm Manager Engineering returned to the meeting.

#### COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5

**Moved:** Cr Loden, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**10.5 DRAFT BIKE PLAN 2023-2028 CONSULTATION**

- Attachments:
1. Draft Bike Plan 
  2. Bike Plan 2023-2028 Online Survey 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

- **RECEIVES** the Draft Bike Plan 2023 – 2028 at Attachment 2; and
- **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to provide 21 days local public notice of the Draft Bike Plan 2023 – 2028 for the purpose of public consultation.

At 7.05pm Chief Financial Officer left the meeting and did not return.

At 7.08pm A/Manager Rangers Services left the meeting and did not return.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.5**

**Moved:** Cr Loden, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (8-0)**







**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.2 NOS. 334-336 (LOTS: 4 & 5, D/P: 1304) BEAUFORT STREET, PERTH - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SHOP (ROLLER SHUTTERS) (UNAUTHORISED EXISTING DEVELOPMENT)**

**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Applicant Justification 
  4. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
  5. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
  6. Determination Advice Notes 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. In accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, REFUSES the application for proposed Alterations and Additions to Shop (Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development) at Nos. 334-336 (Lots: 4 & 5; D/P: 1304) Beaufort Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, for the following reasons:
  - 1.1 The development does not satisfy the objectives of the Commercial zone under Clause 16 of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, as the roller shutters are incompatible with the design of facades within the streetscape. This is as a result of the roller shutters providing for reduced activation to the street frontage;
  - 1.2 The development does not satisfy the Policy Objectives of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form, as:
    - 1.2.1 The development does not contribute to public spaces, maximise street level interest, interaction between inside and outside, or minimise blank facades; and
    - 1.2.2 As a result of the roller shutters, the use does not provide for a visual connection with the adjoining public spaces and does not adhere to the performance criteria of the Western Australian Planning Commissions, Designing Out Crime Planning Guidelines;
  - 1.3 The development does not satisfy the Element Objectives of Clause 1.13 Façade Design and Clause 1.4 Adaptive Reuse of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form as:
    - 1.3.1 The appearance of the roller shutters as a security measure adversely impacts on and does not reflect the character of the local area or complement the existing building; and
    - 1.3.2 The roller shutters reduce activation provided to the street frontage, which reduces visibility of the internal use from the street;
  - 1.4 As a consequence of the adverse appearance of the roller shutter addition and subsequent reduced street surveillance, the proposed development:
    - 1.4.1 Is not compatible nor complimentary to the area in which it is located (Clause 67(2)(m) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*); and
    - 1.4.2 Would detract from the amenity and character of the locality and would set an undesirable precedence (Clause 67(2)(n)(ii) and (iii) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*); and
2. INSTRUCTS the applicant, within 28 days from the issuing of the notice of determination, to remove the roller shutters from the building façade and the affected areas of the façade made good, to the satisfaction of the City.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2**

**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Wallace**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

At 7.24pm A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance left the meeting.

At 7.25pm A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance returned to the meeting.

At 7.32pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects left the meeting.

At 7.34pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects returned to the meeting.

**LOST (0-8)**

**For:** Nil

**Against:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2****ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett**

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme:

1. **APPROVES** part of the application for proposed Alterations and Additions to Shop (Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development) at Nos. 334-336 (Lots: 4 & 5; D/P: 1304) Beaufort Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions and determination advice notes:

- 1.1 **Development Plans**

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to Shop (Doorway Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development) as shown on the approved plans dated 21 October 2022. No other development forms part of this approval;

- 1.2 **Term of Approval**

The roller shutter located above the entry door, shown as 'Existing Roller Shutter' on the approved plans, shall be removed when the service, supply and sale of bicycles and/or bicycle parts use ceases at the premises or at the time the existing sliding entry door is modified to an alternative design. At the time of required removal, the roller shutters must be removed from the building façade and the affected areas of the façade made good, to the satisfaction of the City;

- 1.3 **Active Frontage**

The roller shutter located above the entry door, shown as 'Existing Roller Shutter' on the approved plans, shall be fully open and the use shall maintain an active and interactive relationship and uninterrupted views between the use and Beaufort Street during the hours of the business operation, being:

- 9:00am to 5:00pm Monday – Wednesday & Friday;
- 9:00am to 7:00pm Thursday;
- 9:30am to 4:00pm Saturday; and
- 11:00am to 3:00pm Sunday.

- 1.4 **Glazing Treatment**

Doors, windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Beaufort Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with the street, to the City's satisfaction. Darkened obscured, mirrored or tinted glass or other similar materials as considered by the City is prohibited.

2. **REFUSES** part of the application for proposed Alterations and Additions to Shop (Roller Shutters) (Unauthorised Existing Development) at Nos. 334-336 (Lots: 4 & 5; D/P: 1304) Beaufort Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, for the following reasons:

- 2.1 The development does not satisfy the objectives of the Commercial zone under Clause 16 of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, as the window roller shutters are incompatible with the design of facades within the streetscape. This is as a result of the window roller shutters providing for reduced activation to the street frontage;

- 2.2 The development does not satisfy the Policy Objectives of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form, as:

- 2.2.1 The development does not contribute to public spaces, maximise street level interest, interaction between inside and outside, or minimise blank facades; and



- 2.2.2 As a result of the roller shutters, the use does not provide for a visual connection with the adjoining public spaces and does not adhere to the performance criteria of the Western Australian Planning Commissions, Designing Out Crime Planning Guidelines;
- 2.3 The development does not satisfy the Element Objectives of Clause 1.13 Façade Design and Clause 1.4 Adaptive Reuse of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form as:
- 2.3.1 The appearance of the roller shutters as a security measure adversely impacts on and does not reflect the character of the local area or complement the existing building; and
- 2.3.2 The roller shutters reduce activation provided to the street frontage, which reduces visibility of the internal use from the street;
- 2.4 As a consequence of the adverse appearance of the roller shutter addition and subsequent reduced street surveillance, the proposed development:
- 2.4.1 Is not compatible nor complimentary to the area in which it is located (Clause 67(2)(m) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015); and
- 2.4.2 Would detract from the amenity and character of the locality and would set an undesirable precedence (Clause 67(2)(n)(ii) and (iii) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015); and
3. **INSTRUCTS** the applicant, within six (6) months from the issuing of the notice of determination, to remove the window roller shutters from the building façade and the affected areas of the façade made good, to the satisfaction of the City.

**ADVICE NOTES:**

1. In relation to Condition 1.2, the owner should consult with the City prior to removal of the window roller shutters from the façade.
2. This is a development approval issued under the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme only. It is not an approval to commence or carry out development under any other law. It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to obtain any other necessary approvals and to commence and carry out development in accordance with all other laws.
3. If an applicant or owner is aggrieved by this determination there is a right of review by the State Administrative Tribunal in accordance with the *Planning and Development Act 2005* Part 14. An application must be made within 28 days of the determination.
4. This approval is not an authority to ignore any constraint to development on the land, which may exist through statute, regulation, contract or on title, such as an easement or restrictive covenant. It is the responsibility of the applicant and not the City to investigate any such constraints before commencing development. This approval will not necessarily have regard to any such constraint to development, regardless of whether or not it has been drawn to the City's attention.
5. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries as shown on the approved plans are correct.

**REASON:**

The alternate recommendation recognises that the configuration of the sliding entry door does not provide the ability for alternate internal security measures to be provided. Active frontage and street surveillance is provided by the removal of the roller shutters on the windows.

The local context is also an important consideration in the removal of the window roller shutters, noting the proposed longer timeframe of 6 months.

The shop is located on the Beaufort Street Activity corridor, besides a public carpark and adjacent a public park. The carpark is active at night time due to the customers of the Brisbane Hotel. The shop has residential apartments to the rear. The corner shop, on the corner of Bulwer and Brisbane, is in the process of removing signage film from its corner windows to create an active frontage. The new Woolworths development was designed to actively address Bulwer Street and is adding to the transitioning nature of the neighbourhood to a more open, active and attractive area.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration recognises the existence of the existing sliding entry door that was installed to comply with public building standards. Administration recognises that the configuration of the entry door limits the ability for the applicant to provide alternative security measures and that the windows adjacent to the doorway will provide street surveillance and an engaging street presence at all times.

The longer period to allow for the roller shutters located over the windows to be removed is considered fair and reasonable and is consistent with the objectives of the City's Development Compliance Enforcement Policy. Upon review of other roller shutter matters, six (6) months is a reasonable time period for the applicant to investigate other security measures and install them and is consistent with previous decisions by Administration.

**CARRIED (5-3)**












**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Hallett and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Cr Alexander, Cr Worner and Cr Ioppolo

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 7:48 pm, Cr Dan Loden left the meeting.

**9.3 NO. 12 BROOKMAN STREET (LOTS: 69 AND 90; PLAN: 4576) - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SINGLE HOUSE****Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Heritage Impact Statement 
  4. Perspectives 
  5. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response 
  6. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response 
  7. 22 July 2022 Plans 
  8. 24 November 2022 Plans 
  9. Overshadowing Analysis 
  10. Public Domain View 
  11. Determination Advice Notes 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, REFUSES the application for Alterations and Additions to Single House at No. 12 (Lots: 69 and 90; P: 4576) Brookman Street, Perth in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2 with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 11, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed provision of open space does not satisfy the Design Principles of Clause 5.1.4 of State Planning Policy 7.3: Residential Design Codes – Volume 1, the development considerations of the City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual Appendix 6 – Brookman and Moir Streets Development Guidelines, and performance criteria of Policy No. 7.6.1 – Heritage Management – Development Guidelines for Heritage and Adjacent Properties, for the following reasons:
  - 1.1 The building footprint of the additions would result in building bulk on the site that is inconsistent with the expectations of the R25 density code and the modest scale of the Brookman and Moir Streets Precinct; and
  - 1.2 The building footprint and scale would not be compatible with or respectful of the adjoining properties and wider precinct;
2. The proposed solar access to adjoining sites does not satisfy the Design Principles of Clause 5.4.2 of State Planning Policy 7.3: Residential Design Codes – Volume 1 or objectives of the Brookman and Moir Streets Development Guidelines because the shadow from the additions would adversely impact the amenity of the adjoining property by restricting existing solar access to an outdoor living area;
3. The demolition of the rear water closet does not satisfy the development controls of the City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual Appendix No. 6 Brookman and Moir Streets Development Guidelines because it has not been demonstrated that it would not adversely impact the cultural heritage significance associated with the heritage place, through the removal of development which represents an original component of the subdivision of the Brookman and Moir Streets Precinct;
4. The scale, form and architectural detailing of the proposed two storey addition would not satisfy the objectives of the City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual Appendix No. 6 Brookman and Moir Streets Development Guidelines, objectives of City of Vincent Policy No. 7.6.1 – Heritage Management – Development Guidelines for Heritage and Adjacent Properties or development principles of State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation. This is because it would not be respectful of, or compatible with, the heritage fabric of the subject site and adjoining properties, and would not appropriately interpret the heritage significance of the dwellings within the Brookman and Moir Streets Precinct with a high quality contemporary design;

5. As a result of the demolition and cumulative impact of building bulk, scale, appearance and overshadowing from the proposed additions, for reasons 1 to 4, the development would:
- 5.1 adversely affect the cultural heritage significance of the subject site and broader Brookman and Moir Streets Heritage Precinct (Clause 67(2)(k), (l) (f) (g) and (x) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*);
  - 5.2 not be compatible with the existing or desired character of the local area, as defined by the Brookman and Moir Streets Development Guidelines (Clause 67(2)(g) and (m) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*);
  - 5.3 have an adverse and detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining property and character of the locality in accordance with Clause 67(n) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
  - 5.4 not enhance the amenity and character of the existing neighbourhood and is not compatible with the established area in accordance with the objectives of the Residential Zone under Local Planning Scheme No. 2.

At 7.48pm Executive Director Strategy & Development left the meeting.

At 7:49 pm, Cr Dan Loden returned to the meeting.

At 7.49 pm, Cr Jonathan Hallett left the meeting.

At 7:51 pm, Cr Jonathan Hallett returned to the meeting.

### **COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3**

**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**



**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**10.1 RESPONSE TO PETITION – ALMA/LEAKE INTERSECTION DIAGONAL DIVERSION**

- Attachments:
1. Petition - Alma/Leake Intersection Diagonal Diversion - Confidential
  2. Traffic Flow Diagram Alma Road and Leake Street 
  3. Traffic Data for North Perth Traffic Calming 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the discontinuance of the diagonal diversion trial at the intersection of Alma Road and Leake Street, North Perth; and
2. **APPROVES** the installation of a 4-way raised plateau at the above intersection in the current financial year.

At 7.54pm Executive Director Strategy & Development returned to the meeting.

**Moved: Cr Loden, Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

At 8.00pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects left the meeting.

At 8.01pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects returned to the meeting.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

**Moved: Cr Ioppolo**

**That the motion be deferred, to allow more information to be provided.**

**MOTION LAPSED DUE TO LACK OF A SECONDER**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the discontinuance of the diagonal diversion trial at the intersection of Alma Road and Leake Street, North Perth; and
2. **APPROVES** the installation of a 4-way raised plateau at the above intersection in the current financial year.

**CARRIED (7-1)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Cr Ioppolo

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**MOTION TO CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Hallett**

That Council bring forward Item 13.1 Notice of Motion for discussion, as it was raised by members of the public who were in attendance.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)**

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)

**13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - CR ALEXANDER- REINTRODUCTION OF THE FIRST HOUR FREE IN CAR PARKS**

That Council:

1. **REQUESTS that the first hour free be reintroduced in the car parks listed in the report as soon as possible; and**
2. **REQUESTS that a comprehensive marketing/advertising campaign be undertaken with the aim of attracting back those customers who have left because of the loss of the first hour free.**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.1**

**Moved: Cr Alexander, Seconded: Cr Ioppolo**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

At 8.29pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects left the meeting.

At 8.32pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects returned to the meeting.

**LOST (3-5)**



**For:** Cr Alexander, Cr Worner and Cr Ioppolo

**Against:** Mayor Cole, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Hallett and Cr Wallace

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 8.47pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting.

**9.4 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF LEEDERVILLE CARPARKS**

- Attachments:
1. Redevelopment Proposals Selection Criteria 
  2. Stage 1 Submission 1 - Confidential
  3. Stage 1 Submission 2 - Confidential
  4. Stage 1 Submission 3 - Confidential
  5. Stage 2 Request for Detailed Proposals 
  6. Stage 2 Submission 1 - Confidential
  7. Stage 2 Submission 2 - Confidential
  8. Stage 2 Submission 3 - Confidential
  9. Redevelopment Proposals Evaluation Worksheet - Confidential
  10. The Avenue and Frame Court Carpark Land Valuation - Confidential
  11. Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment - Confidential
  12. Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment - Summary Following Valuation - Confidential
  13. Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Review - Confidential
  14. Risk Assessment Workshop Report - Confidential
  15. Redevelopment Proposals Preliminary Statutory Planning Assessment - Confidential

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. **NOTES** the evaluation outcome for the Stage 2 Request for Detailed Proposals, relating to The Avenue and Frame Court Car Parks, Leederville;
2. **ENDORSES** the proposal as outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, as the preferred proposal;
3. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer to progress development of a Heads of Agreement with the preferred proponent in relation to their proposal, as outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, provided that the Heads of Agreement:
  - 3.1 **Is not** a binding agreement to sell or undertake any redevelopment of the land;
  - 3.2 **Contains** a binding acknowledgement by the proponent as to the City's obligations under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the Local Government Act that must be complied with before the City can agree to proceed with any major land transaction;
  - 3.3 **Addresses** the risks outlined in the Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment, included in Attachment 11;
  - 3.4 **Addresses** point 1 in the conclusion of the PwC Leederville Expression of Interest: Commercial Review included in Attachment 13;
  - 3.5 **Addresses** the findings of the Redevelopment Proposals Preliminary Statutory Planning Assessment, included at Attachment 15; and
  - 3.6 **States** that the City of Vincent would have the first right of refusal for the management of the public car park(s);
4. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer prepare a Business Plan under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995* in relation to the proposal outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, that addresses the:
  - 4.1 **risks** outlined in the Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment, included in Attachment 11;
  - 4.2 **points** in the conclusion of the PwC Leederville Expression of Interest: Commercial Review included in Attachment 13; and
  - 4.3 **Risks and Opportunities** set out in the Risk Assessment Workshop Report, included in Attachment 14; and



5. **NOTES that the Heads of Agreement, along with a Business Plan, would be presented to Council for approval to invite and consider public submissions on that Business Plan before Council then considers whether to enter into a major land transaction under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.**

At 8.47pm Ian Mickle and John del Dosso joined the meeting

At 8.47pm A/Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment left the meeting and did not return.

At 8.48pm Manager Engineering left the meeting and did not return.

At 8.48pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting.

**Moved: Cr Loden, Seconded: Cr Hallett**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

#### **PROCEDURAL MOTION**

**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That pursuant to Section 5.23(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and clause 2.14 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, Council proceeds “behind closed doors” to consider the confidential attachment.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 9.19pm the livestream was stopped to discuss the confidential amendment for Item 9.4.

At 9.20pm A/Executive Director Corporate Strategy & Governance left the meeting.

At 9.20pm A/Executive Director Corporate Strategy & Governance returned to the meeting.

**AMENDMENT****Moved:** Cr Ioppolo, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the Recommendations 2-5 be deleted and replaced with the following:

**2. REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to:**

- 2.1 action PwC's five (5) concluding recommendations in Attachment 11 to address key risks to Cygnet West's preliminary business case and the Commercial Assessment of Stage 2 submissions and obtain written confirmation from PwC that it is satisfied that the 5 key risks have been satisfactorily addressed;**
- 2.2 Schedule a series of Council Workshops to provide additional time to consider Proponent's Stage 2 submissions and key considerations including, but not limited to:**
- 2.2.1 Determination of the optimal qualitative outcome the City is seeking from the development of the subject sites and the degree this outcome is represented in any Proponent's submission; and**
- 2.2.2 Information generated from addressing PwC's recommendations under 2 above; and**
- 2.3 present its recommendation on this item, having regard to the above, at a future meeting of Council.**

**REASON:**

Related to matters contained in the confidential attachments.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration recommends that the implementation of PwC's points and these Workshops occur once a preferred proponent is determined by Council. This would allow the City to request clarification from this proponent in order to inform this work and these workshops.

If following this work and Workshops Council is not satisfied either because the offer is not consistent with the proponent's submission or because it is not the best outcome for the City, then Council could decide to abandon the process or select another proponent as the preferred proponent and go through the same process with that proponent.

At 9:35 pm, Cr Jonathan Hallett left the meeting.

At 9:37 pm, Cr Jonathan Hallett returned to the meeting.

At 9:38 pm, Cr Alex Castle left the meeting.

At 9:40 pm, Cr Alex Castle returned to the meeting.

**AMENDMENT LOST (2-6)****For:** Cr Alexander and Cr Ioppolo**Against:** Mayor Cole, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett and Cr Wallace**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 9:50 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace left the meeting.

At 9:50 pm, Cr Dan Loden left the meeting.

At 9:51 pm, Mayor Emma Cole left the meeting and Cr Jonathan Hallett assumed the Chair.

At 9:52 pm, Cr Dan Loden returned to the meeting.

At 9:53 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace returned to the meeting.

At 9:55 pm, Mayor Emma Cole returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

At 9:57pm Chief Executive Officer left the meeting.

At 9:58pm Chief Executive Officer returned to the meeting.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Loden

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

**That the Council resume an “open meeting”.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 10.02pm the livestream resumed.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4**

That Council:

1. **NOTES** the evaluation outcome for the Stage 2 Request for Detailed Proposals, relating to The Avenue and Frame Court Car Parks, Leederville;
2. **ENDORSES** the proposal as outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, as the preferred proposal;
3. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer to progress development of a Heads of Agreement with the preferred proponent in relation to their proposal, as outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, provided that the Heads of Agreement:
  - 3.1 **Is not** a binding agreement to sell or undertake any redevelopment of the land;
  - 3.2 **Contains** a binding acknowledgement by the proponent as to the City's obligations under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the Local Government Act that must be complied with before the City can agree to proceed with any major land transaction;
  - 3.3 **Addresses** the risks outlined in the Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment, included in Attachment 11;
  - 3.4 **Addresses** point 1 in the conclusion of the PwC Leederville Expression of Interest: Commercial Review included in Attachment 13;
  - 3.5 **Addresses** the findings of the Redevelopment Proposals Preliminary Statutory Planning Assessment, included at Attachment 15; and
  - 3.6 **States** that the City of Vincent would have the first right of refusal for the management of the public car park(s);
4. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer prepare a Business Plan under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995* in relation to the proposal outlined in Attachments 3 and 7, that addresses the:
  - 4.1 **risks** outlined in the Redevelopment Proposals Commercial Assessment, included in Attachment 11;
  - 4.2 **points** in the conclusion of the PwC Leederville Expression of Interest: Commercial Review included in Attachment 13; and
  - 4.3 **Risks and Opportunities** set out in the Risk Assessment Workshop Report, included in Attachment 14; and
5. **NOTES** that the Heads of Agreement, along with a Business Plan, would be presented to Council for approval to invite and consider public submissions on that Business Plan before Council then considers whether to enter into a major land transaction under sections 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

**CARRIED (6-2)**





**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Cr Alexander and Cr Ioppolo

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 10.07pm Ian Mickle, John Del Dosso and Kevin Donnelly left the meeting and did not return.  
At 10.05pm A/Executive Director Development & Design returned to the meeting.

**9.1 NO. 4 (LOT: 1; S/P: 24447) PRIMROSE STREET, PERTH - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO GROUPED DWELLING****Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Applicant Justification 
  4. Determination Advice Notes 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, APPROVES the application for and Alterations and Additions to Grouped Dwelling at No. 4 (Lot: 1; S/P: 24447) Primrose Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 4:

**1. Development Plans**

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to a Grouped Dwelling as shown on the approved plans dated 29 March 2023 and 21 April 2023. No other development forms part of this approval;

**2. External Fixtures**

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, satellite dishes, solar panels, external hot water heaters, air conditioners, and the like, shall not be visible from the street(s), are designed integrally with the building, and be located so as not to be visually obtrusive, to the satisfaction of the City;

**3. Colour and Materials**

The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with the details and annotations as indicated on the approved plans which forms part of this approval, to the satisfaction of the City;

**4. Stormwater**

Stormwater from all roofed and paved areas shall be collected and contained on site. Stormwater must not affect or be allowed to flow onto or into any other property or road reserve;

**5. Landscaping**

5.1 Prior to use of the approved development, all landscaping works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans dated 29 March 2023 and 21 April 2023, to the satisfaction of the City;

5.2 Prior to use of the approved terraces, the planter boxes shall be installed to the satisfaction of the City. The terrace planter boxes shall not be removed unless further approval of the City is obtained; and

5.3 The landscaping installed to the planter boxes to the eastern edge of Terrace 1 shall be to a minimum height of 1.6 metres above the finished floor level to ensure compliance with the visual privacy requirements of the Residential Design Codes and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City; and

**6. Visual Privacy**

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, all privacy screening shown on the approved plans shall be installed and shall be visually impermeable and are to comply in all respects with the visual privacy requirements of the Residential Design Codes, to the satisfaction of the City.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1**

**Moved: Cr Ioppolo, Seconded: Cr Loden**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 10pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

**9.5 RFT PP249/2023 MOUNT HAWTHORN YOUTH SKATE SPACE****Attachments: 1. Evaluation Summary - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender PP249/2023 Mount Hawthorn Youth Skate Space (Design and Construct); and**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Skate Sculpture for Tender PP249/2023 Mount Hawthorn Youth Skate Space (Design and Construct).**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5****Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (8-0)****For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace**Against:** Nil**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.8 ADVERTISING OF NEW POLICY - PICKLE DISTRICT PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

- Attachments:
1. Draft Pickle District Planning Framework 
  2. Survey Submissions 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council PREPARES Local Planning Framework: Pickle District as at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

Moved: Cr Loden, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

**AMENDMENT**

Moved: Cr Loden, Seconded: Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council:

1. PREPARES Local Planning Framework: Pickle District as at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
2. **REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to investigate mechanisms through the Local Planning Framework: Pickle District that enable the Pickle District to increase the number of commercial premises that service the creative arts and cultural industries.**

**REASON:**

To support and enhance creative and creative arts and cultural industries within the Pickle District.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration can investigate planning mechanisms that would support this amendment.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)



**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.8**

That Council:

1. **PREPARES Local Planning Framework: Pickle District as at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and**
2. **REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to investigate mechanisms through the Local Planning Framework: Pickle District that enable the Pickle District to increase the number of commercial premises that service the creative arts and cultural industries.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.9 CITY OF VINCENT ARTS PLAN - APPROVAL TO ADVERTISE**

- Attachments:
1. Arts Development Action Plan 2018-2020 Review 
  2. Stakeholder Engagement Findings Report June 2022 
  3. Draft Arts Plan 2023-2028 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council APPROVES the draft Arts Plan 2023-2028, at Attachment 3, for the purpose of advertising.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.9**

**Moved:** Cr Ioppolo, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.11 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING - STRATEGIC COMMUNITY PLAN 2022 - 2032**

- Attachments:
1. Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2032 
  2. Engagement Summary and Verbatim Comments 
  3. Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2032 - Marked-up 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**, in accordance with Part 5, Division 3, Regulation 19C (7) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*, the Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 at Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.11**

**Moved:** Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.13 EXTENSION OF LEASES TO CHILD & ADOLESCENT HEALTH SERVICE FOR CHILD HEALTH CLINICS**

Attachments: Nil

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** an extension to Child and Adolescent Health Service of the Leases for:
  - 1.1 Loftus Child Health Clinic located at portion of No. 99 (Lot 501) Loftus Street, Leederville;
  - 1.2 Mount Hawthorn Child Health Clinic located at portion of No. 197 (Lot 274) Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn; and
  - 1.3 Highgate Child Health Clinic located at 84 (lot 150) Harold St, Mount Lawley;commencing on 1 July 2023 and expiring on 30 June 2028;
2. **SUBJECT** to final satisfactory negotiations carried out by the Chief Executive Officer, **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to carry out final negotiations and execution of the Deeds of Extension of Lease in accordance with the Execution of Documents Policy; and
3. **NOTES** that the North Perth Child Health Clinic has ceased its operations at 20 (Lot 4) View Street, North Perth as of 1 May 2023 and a future report will be presented for Council to consider tenancy arrangements of the site.

At 10.20pm Executive Manager Urban Design & Strategic Projects left the meeting and did not return.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.13**

**Moved:** Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**9.14 OFFERS FOR SALE - 25 (LOT 93) SYDNEY STREET, NORTH PERTH**

- Attachments:
1. 19 May 2022 - Market Valuation Report - Confidential
  2. Offers - Outcomes of Expression of Interest - Confidential
  3. 9 May 2023 - Real estate agent's marketing report - Confidential

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

**1. NOTES:**

- 1.1 the offers submitted by the real estate agent for sale of 25 (Lot 93) Sydney St, North Perth (Land) as at Confidential Attachment 2;
- 1.2 that no offers meet the market valuation stated in scenario 1 of the 2022 Market Valuation Report as at Confidential Attachment 1;
- 1.3 that the proceeds from the sale of the Land will be applied towards:
  - 1.3.1 the development of the park on Haynes Street Reserve; and
  - 1.3.2 any excess, after application of funds in Recommendation 7.1, the Public Open Space Reserve;

2. **APPROVES** the sale and transfer of Land in Offer 3 set out in Confidential Attachment 2 at \$876,000 excluding GST.

**3. AUTHORISES the:**

- 3.1 Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to affix the common seal and execute the Offer and Acceptance Form in respect of Recommendation 2;
- 3.2 Chief Executive Officer to:
  - 3.2.1 provide local public notice of the transfer in accordance with section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and
  - 3.2.2 consider any submissions received and to determine whether to proceed with the proposed transfer; and
- 3.3 Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to affix the common seal and execute the Transfer of Land document subject to the Chief Executive Officer determining to proceed with the transfer set out in Recommendation 3.2.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.14**

**Moved: Cr Loden, Seconded: Cr Worner**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**12.1 ANNUAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL DELEGATIONS**

Attachments: 1. Register of Council Delegations - Marked up for 2023 Review 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. NOTES the annual review of its delegations in accordance with Section 5.46(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, as outlined in this report; and
2. DELEGATES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the local government functions listed in the City's Council Delegated Authority Register included as Attachment 1.

**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Worner**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION****DEFERRED**

**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Worner**

That the motion be deferred to the next Council Meeting.




**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**12.2 LEEDERVILLE OVAL SPONSORSHIP AND NAMING RIGHTS**

- Attachments:
1. Leederville Oval - Naming Rights Sponsorship Proposal Document (2022) 
  2. 21 Mar 2023 - Playbookx Letter 
  3. Leederville Oval Map of Leased Areas 
  4. Sponsorship Agreement dated 27 July 2006 - Medibank Private Limited - Confidential

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** giving public notice and inviting submissions under the provisions of section 3.58(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* for the proposal by Sullivan Logistics for sponsorship and naming rights of Leederville Oval located at No. 246 (Lot 500) Vincent Street, Leederville;
2. If no submissions are received as a result of public notice period in Recommendation 1. above, **AUTHORISES** the:
  - 2.1 Chief Executive Officer to:
    - 2.1.1 prepare the relevant legal agreement to include the matters detailed in this report;
    - 2.1.2 negotiate the terms of the legal agreement;
    - 2.1.3 execute all documentation; and
    - 2.1.4 comply with all applicable legislation as required to give effect to the proposal in Recommendation 1; and
  - 2.2 Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to affix the common seal and execute the legal agreement in accordance with the Execution of Documents Policy; and
3. **NOTES** that if any submissions are received as a result of the public notice period in Recommendation 1. above, the Chief Executive Officer will provide the submissions to Council for consideration and determination whether to proceed with the proposal.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2**

**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Loden

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (7-1)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett and Cr Ioppolo

**Against:** Cr Wallace

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**



**12.4 REPORT AND MINUTES OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4 MAY 2023**

- Attachments:**
1. **Audit Committee Minutes - 4 May 2023** 
  2. **Audit Log Attachments - Confidential**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **RECEIVES** the minutes of the Audit Committee Meeting of 4 May 2023, as at Attachment 1; and
2. **ENDORSES** the remaining recommendations contained within the Audit Committee minutes of 4 May 2023.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4**

**Moved: Cr Ioppolo, Seconded: Cr Wallace**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

**For:** Mayor Cole, Cr Alexander, Cr Castle, Cr Loden, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett, Cr Ioppolo and Cr Wallace

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Gontaszewski was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

This item was discussed earlier in the agenda as it was the subject of a public question.

**14 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)**

Nil

**15 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES**

Nil

**16 URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil

**17 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

Nil

**18 CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Emma Cole, declared the meeting closed at 10.30pm with the following persons present:

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>Mayor Emma Cole</b>	<b>Presiding Member</b>
	<b>Cr Ron Alexander</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Alex Castle</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Dan Loden</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Suzanne Worner</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Jonathan Hallett</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ross Ioppolo</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashley Wallace</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<b>David MacLennan</b>	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
	<b>John Corbellini</b>	<b>Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development</b>
	<b>Wendy Barnard</b>	<b>Council Liaison Officer</b>
	<b>Joslin Colli</b>	<b>A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance</b>

**Public:** No members of the public.

These Minutes were confirmed at the 20 June 2023 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 16 May 2023.

Signed: Mayor Emma Cole



Dated 20 June 2023