



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

10 December 2024

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country..... | 4 |
| 2 | Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence..... | 4 |
| 3 | (A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements | 5 |
| | (B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice..... | 12 |
| 4 | Applications for Leave of Absence | 15 |
| 5 | The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations | 15 |
| 6 | Confirmation of Minutes | 15 |
| 7 | Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) | 15 |
| | 7.1 Planning Awards | 15 |
| | 7.2 Year End | 16 |
| 8 | Declarations of Interest | 16 |
| | Reports | 16 |
| | Items Approved "En Bloc": | 17 |
| | 10.3 Review of Policy No. 4.1.16 - Vehicle Management..... | 18 |
| | 11.1 Financial Statements as at 31 October 2024..... | 19 |
| | 11.6 Advertising of Amended Policy No. 4.1.4 - Freedom of Information..... | 20 |
| | 12.3 Review of Policy Framework and Advertising of Amended Policy Development and Review Policy..... | 21 |
| | 12.4 Information Bulletin | 22 |
| | Reports with Discussion..... | 23 |
| | 9.1 Review of Policy No. 7.6.3 - Trees of Significance | 23 |
| | 9.2 Expansion of Greentrack Incentive Program [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]..... | 24 |
| | 9.3 Outcome of Advertising - Draft Auckland Street Character Area Guidelines | 26 |
| | 9.4 RFT PP347/2024 Robertson Park Stage 1B Construction..... | 27 |
| | 10.2 Club Night Lights Program (CNLP) - Floodlighting Project Proposals..... | 28 |
| | 11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 October 2024 to 31 October 2024 | 30 |
| | 9.5 Nos. 193-195 (Lot: 267-269; D/P: 3642) Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn - Cash-in-Lieu Car Parking Contribution Debt Write Off [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]..... | 31 |
| | 9.6 No. 9/663 (Lot: 8; STR: 10630) Newcastle Street, Leederville - Cash-in-Lieu Car Parking Contribution Debt Write Off [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 32 |
| | 10.1 Review of Policy No. 2.1.7 - Parks, Reserves and Hall Facilities - Conditions of Hire and Use..... | 33 |
| | 11.3 Investment Report as at 31 October 2024..... | 34 |
| | 11.4 Advertising of amended Community Funding Policy | 35 |
| | 11.5 Outcome of advertising and adoption of Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan..... | 37 |
| | 12.1 Council Recess Period 2024-25 - Delegated Authority to the Chief Executive Officer [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]..... | 38 |
| | 12.2 Appointment of a Council Member for the Mindarie Regional Council from 1 January 2025 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 39 |
| 13 | Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given..... | 41 |
| 14 | Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion)..... | 41 |

15 Representation on Committees and Public Bodies41
16 Urgent Business41
17 Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed41
18 Closure41

**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, 10 DECEMBER 2024 AT 6.00PM**

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| PRESENT: | <p>Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Sophie Greer Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</p> | <p>Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward</p> |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | <p>David MacLennan Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Dale Morrissy Lisa Williams Prue Reddingius Mitchell Hoad Aaron Griffiths Joslin Colli Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard</p> | <p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment A/Executive Director Community & Business Services A/Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Community Facilities Executive Manager Communications & Engagement (left at 7.35pm after Item 11.5) Manager Public Health & Built Environment (left at 7.12pm after Item 9.6) A/Manager Strategic Planning Manager Waste & Recycling (left at 6.27pm before Item 9.1) Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support</p> |

Public: Approximately seven members of the public.

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon 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, and acknowledge that the City of Vincent has a role in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Ron Alexander 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 Caroline Cohen of East Perth – Item 9.1

Spoke in support of Item 9.1. The full statement can be found [here](#).

3.2 Bryce Stewart of North Perth – Item 9.3

Spoke in opposition to Item 9.3. The full statement can be found [here](#).

3.3 Yimeng Chen of North Perth - Item 9.3

Raised concerns in relation to Item 9.3. The full statement can be found [here](#).

3.4 Ian Poustie of Mt Hawthorn – Item 10.2

Raised concerns in relation to Item 10.2 and presented the following questions.

1. Did the risk assessment, completed by the Council for this proposal, take into account the current condition of the grounds, the stormwater drainage and the vulnerability of Menzies to overuse?
2. Was Les Lilleyman Reserve considered as a zero cost option to ratepayers, where the Cardies have priority use to train and play, in preference to it being used by a club that is not based in the City of Vincent?

These questions were responded to during discussion of Item 10.2.

Questions and full statement can be found [here](#).

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

3.5 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Items 9.1 and 9.4

1. The list for expenditure for the period ending 31 October 2024 show a payment of \$5,703.05 to “The Factory” for “Pine Tree Christmas Lights 2024”. Was this a one-off payment (i.e. just for lights to be used once) and where were the lights/tree located?
2. At the November council meeting I asked questions about payments concerning the transport and storage of an artwork to be located in Leederville. The final question was:

Are the delays in installation the artist’s responsibility or have the final payments been held up because of delays outside their area of control?

The response was:

To date the City has paid the artist a total of \$80,000 this includes a variation of \$8,000 due to the need to redesign the artwork to accommodate changes to the install location. An amount of \$8,000 remains outstanding and will be paid on installation. Delay to completion of the project is due to the servicing constraints previously advised and the approvals required prior to installation being permitted.

This did not answer my question which was about who was responsible for the delay in installation, and therefore the delay in making the final payment to the artist.

Who was responsible for arranging the necessary infrastructure that has been referred to in previous answers – was it the artist’s responsibility, or was it the City’s? If it was the City’s, don’t you consider it unfair to hold off on the final payment to the artist, who seems to have completed construction of the work over a year ago, when it is not their fault?

3. With regards to the proposed Significant Tree Policy, did the City seek external legal advice as to the legal standing of concepts such as 'secondary owner' and the rights of neighbours who have trees hanging over their property to cut down those branches.
4. In answer to a previous question about fee reductions for obtaining Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) it was stated that 13 applicants have received fee reductions since February. Are Life Cycle Assessments mandatory? Were the applicants informed prior to obtaining the LCAs that these were mandatory? Does Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy imply that applicants need to provide a Life Cycle Assessment in Accordance with EN15978? Does the WAPC have to approve the requirements of Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy? If so, have they provided approval?
5. In Part 2, Clause 3.2, dot point 3 of the Draft Significant Tree Policy it makes reference to Part 2 Clause 2.3 and 2.4. On what page of the draft policy can those two clauses be found?
6. The recommendation in Item 9.4 – Robertson Park Stage 1B it states that \$1,477,000 is required to be included in the 2025/26 budget. Why is this so given that the tender is for approximately \$2,851,305 and \$1,579,000 of this has been included in the 2024/25 budget? Shouldn't only approximately \$1,272,000 be included in the 2025/56 budget?

Statement in relation to item 9.1

I think the proposed approach is superficial and has not been thought through. It might be used to generate some positive press, and is likely to appeal to members of the community who naively think that, by being adversarial, the city has become the champions of tree preservation. The reality is that is more likely to result in trees being cut down as a precautionary measure by owners who don't want to take a risk of having their trees listed.

There are three categories of tree owners, without getting into the murky and probably over-ambitious legal area of 'primary' and 'secondary' owners:

- Primary owners who self-nominate;
- Primary owners whose tree is nominated by a third party and who have no objection; and
- Primary owners who do object to listing.

For the first two categories there probably is very little risk of the tree being removed – the owner was always likely to retain the tree.

It is the third category who are the ones in play. Put yourself in the place of a person who has a tree and who gets a letter from the City saying that the tree has been nominated. They are told that listing means they can't get rid of the tree, and that the Council will make the final decision if the owner objects to the listing.

What do you think they would do, remembering that they are in the third category – the objectors. They have two choices – hope the council will see their point of view and not list the tree, or chop the tree down, or at least cut it back so that it is less than 4 metres high.

It would only be natural for them to think that retaining the tree may reduce the perceived value of their land as a sub-division proposal, or if it would impede any future development by themselves or a future owner. As objectors the obvious choice is to remove the tree.

So basically you have three groups of people: the policy will have no impact on the first two – they are happy to keep the tree; and it is highly likely to encourage owners in the final group to cut down the tree in the time between they are notified and when it goes to council. It is only human nature.

I see that the recommendation now has a waffly fourth part which says that the staff will still look at incentives. This is just putting off meaningful changes to the never-never.

The reality is that the biggest problem with tree loss is the assessments of the planning staff. There are so many developments around where the staff 'ignore' the open space provisions and approve developments that cover most of the block, which means that the current owners, let alone future owners, cannot plant a significant tree. The planning staff are the enablers for a lot of tree removal.

If you were serious about coming up with a meaningful solution you would look at:

- Putting provisions in the LPS to maintain a certain level of open space for all new developments. Maybe not to the same level as the deemed to comply provisions of the R-Codes, but something significant. Of course, the staff will argue against this as they always want to retain some flexibility – flexibility which has so far resulted in effective boundary-to-boundary development and no ability to plant trees;
- Investigate financial incentives such as an annual rates reduction/bonus for people with listed significant trees.

Yes, this sounds too difficult but unless you bite the bullet and actually do something difficult all you will achieve is the ability to say “we tried”.

Of course you will get push back from the Department and the minister, who somehow thinks it is all about the quantity of housing and not the quality/liveability. But you should have that fight.

As to a financial incentive scheme: it could go along the lines of people apply via a stat-dec, including a photo of the tree(s); the list is made public (as the current one is) along with the photos; invite people to do-b-in any cheats. The fact that the nomination is via a stat-dec means that the breach is of a false stat-dec rather than a piddly fib on a form. And I'm not even sure that the City would have to spend time and money prosecuting. The threat of a do-b-in encourages people to be honest.

If you take an arbitrary payment of \$100 (large enough to be a significant recognition, but small enough to not be a great impost) it would mean that if there were 1,000 significant trees it would cost residential ratepayers \$5.65 on average – the tree owners would also pay this so they would be \$94 better off. If you had 2,000 significant trees the amounts become \$11.30 and \$89 better off etc. Not only would this send a signal that here is a recognition that trees are a cost to maintain, but more importantly, that they are also a significant benefit; plus it might encourage some people to plant a tree so that they can join the cool gang.

Of course the staff will come up with a lot of reasons this won't work – that's the nature of the beast. When it was initially proposed that there be a financial assistance for maintaining significant trees all the staff did was put in a vague clause to say that owner may be eligible for financial assistance. It was the council that pushed the process – specified how much, over what time frame, and that people had to pay it back if they later cut down the tree. [OMC 12 March 2013 – Item 9.1.8]

All it takes is a bit of imagination; a realisation that unless there is an overnight, heavy-handed listing of trees you will drive some owners to prematurely chop down trees; the way to get kudos is by doing something bold that is positive and is based on sound principle – the community benefits from having more trees.

It would also be interesting to see if the (wacky) notion of primary and secondary owners has been tested legalLife Cycle Assessment in Accordance with EN15978lly (i.e. the city obtained legal advice) - both the notion of there being a 'secondary owner', but also stopping neighbours who suffer from an inappropriate tree from doing anything about it – I thought that if a tree had branches hanging over your property you could cut them back and throw the branches on the owner's property – if that is law how can this policy override that?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda of the 11 February 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

3.6 - Yimeng Chen of North Perth – Item 9.3

Thank you for discussing my concerns during the December 3rd Council Briefing.

While several questions were addressed, I wish to voice three critical concerns pending answers during the Council Briefing:

- A - Non-representative responses and inclusion of unaffected properties potentially bias policy deliberation
- B - Inadequate information about the nomination, policy implications, and methodological concerns
- C - Unintended adverse policy outcomes to preserve streetscape

I note that Agenda Item 9.3 for the December 10th meeting hasn't been updated since the December 3rd Council Briefing (previously Agenda 5.3). My references are based on the currently available version. I kindly request my following concerns be given due consideration in your policy deliberations.

Potential bias in survey representativeness (pp.12-13):

- The survey response rate of 35% (11 of 31 character area properties) does not provide a statistically representative sample for policy determination (<40%).

A - Non-representative responses and inclusion of unaffected properties are potentially biased for policy deliberation

Effective support rate = 17%

- Members previously questioned the support rate calculation as percentage of total affected for context - this remains unaddressed in the current online version of Agenda 9.3.
- While Local Planning Policy doesn't specify a minimum community support threshold for Council approval, a 40% support rate is needed for initial nomination consideration.
- The 40% nomination threshold even sets a higher standard for preliminary consideration, yet the final policy approval is now being primarily based on a response rate of 35% (= 11/31) and 17% of effective supporters.

Interpretation on non-representative submissions

- In addition, the current interpretation based on a non-representative sample provides insufficient information on total affected and therefore is biased or potentially misleading for decision-making.
- To illustration: If 2 out of a total of 10 affected, both respond positively, this shouldn't be interpreted as unanimous support (2/2 = 100%). The actual support rate is only 20% (2/10) of the total affected population.

The interpretation of survey results from a non-representative sample raises significant methodological concerns and were echoed by multiple participants during the briefing session.

- The purported 55% majority in support (6 of 11 respondents) represents only 17% of total street properties, raising questions about the conclusiveness of these findings.
- Whether all six supporting responses are from front-facing properties that would be directly impacted by the proposed amendments

Inclusion of unaffected properties

- The briefing confirmed that, of the 6 'Yes' responses received, 5 were from properties directly affected by the policy (street-facing properties and Unit A in subdivided blocks). 1 'Yes' vote was from an unaffected Unit B property
- Excluding the unaffected property shows an equal 5-5 split between support and opposition among affected properties, rather than the 55% majority support initially reported.

The submission method (survey) may also suffer from potential a self-selection bias where properties that have already undertaken modifications inconsistent with the proposed amendments may not be included.

- When accounting for properties with existing non-consistent modifications (6 opposition 5 non-character modifications) and survey objectors (5), the effective opposition rate would be 65% 63% [= $(5 + 6 \cdot 5) / (11 \text{ responses} + 6 \cdot 5)$].

'No' by action

- Among the 31 affected properties, there are 5 non-character properties or exhibiting inconsistent modifications as the proposed amendments
- When these properties are considered as explicit 'No' based on their actions, the total opposition adds to 10 properties (almost double the number of supporting votes)

B - Inadequate information of the nomination, policy implications and methodological concerns

On page 1, regarding "the nomination was supported by 66 percent of landowners (26 landowners in total). This exceeded the threshold of 40 percent support that is outlined in the Character Area Policy for the City to progress with a nomination"

While this 40% threshold only applies to nominations, there is no minimum rule-based threshold for draft policies to be mandated through Council approval.

Nevertheless, as the nomination serves as a critical pre-requisite for initial consideration, these numbers require careful review and validation

- What was numerator and denominator to arrive at a 66%? with consistent application of only including front-facing property criteria?

Validity of nomination results

- The denominator and numerator and the calculation method of the 66% was undisclosed.
- Back-calculating from 26 supporting landowners suggests a total of 39 properties (26/66%), yet there are only 31 affected properties on the street (as illustrated in Figure 1).
- On page [2], "47 letters distributed to owners and occupiers of properties in the proposed Auckland Street character area."; How do we reconcile 47 to 31 affected properties

Inadequate communication of policy implications

- How do we reconcile 11 survey submissions to 26 landowners, suggesting less support of nomination for new amendments to date?
- Were the policy implications (both direct and indirect) clearly communicated to all stakeholders during nomination?
- If not clearly communicated, how do we ensure if landowners made informed decisions of supporting the nomination with full understanding of the consequential policy implications?

How do we reconcile the gap between the 26 landowners to 6 supporting submissions eventually? suggesting supporters of nomination do NOT support policy amendments (a significant of drop after fully understood the policy implications which is different from the from the understanding from nomination communication?).

- On page [2], "A street meeting held on 9 October 2024 at Hobart Street Reserve on the corner of Hobart and Auckland Streets that was attended by 10 residents."
- On page [3], "At the conclusion of this period a total of 11 submissions were received from property owners on Auckland Street and within the proposed Character Area
- The above references indicate a consistent engagement from only 10-11 affected properties, with 5 of these opposing the proposal (as noted on page 12). This actual engagement level stands in sharp contrast to the unverifiable 66% support of nomination
- Is 26 landowners based on the properties count (without multiple votes from single property)?

Methodology verification

- The briefing confirmed that survey submission were calculated per property (removing duplicate responses from the same address)
- However, it was unclear whether this method has been applied consistently to the nomination response and whether non-affected properties are excluded?
- Are these land owners verified as registered land owners in land title? (as opposed to rental residents)?
- Is there clear documentation of inclusion and exclusion method and criteria to ensure accurate representation of affected properties throughout?

Nature of information accessibility

On page [5], "The draft Guidelines included in Attachment 1 have been developed in consultation with residents (surveys and working group)"

- As a registered landowner of the affected property, I received no formal notification about either the nomination process or working group opportunities until the announcement of successful nomination and the October 9, 2024 meeting at Hobart Reserve - which was presented as for information nature
- The practice of 'door-knocking' and scheduling working group meetings during business hours effectively precluded employed residents from participating in the process
- On page [2], only 3 out of the 6 listed are directly addressed to the affected audience; the rest are passive communication to any targeted audience.
 - [Passive] Notices published on the City's website, the City's social media, and displayed at the City's Administration and Library and Local History Centre.
 - [Passive] Noticed published on the City's 2 October E-news publication.
 - [Passive] A Notice published on the 28 September 2024 issue of the Perth Voice.
 - 47 letters distributed to owners and occupiers of properties in the proposed Auckland Street character area.
 - A street meeting held on 9 October 2024 at Hobart Street Reserve on the corner of Hobart and Auckland Streets that was attended by 10 residents.
 - A survey hosted on the Imagine Vincent project page for the duration of community consultation activities.

Policy Implications:

The proposed amendments raise several equity concerns:

- They would impose disproportionate regulatory burdens on remaining character properties while exempting previously modified properties
- They would create an inequitable advantage for properties that have already undertaken inconsistent modifications
- Current policies, if properly enforced, are sufficient to preserve street character while maintaining appropriate architectural diversity

Based on the above-mentioned concerns, I don't support the proposed amendments to be mandated through the planning policy.

I believe a voluntary design guideline approach would better serve the street's character while avoiding potential policy complications (e.g., voluntary guideline of 3 meters and 2 meters as minimum requirement in current planning policy).

C - Unintended adverse policy outcomes to preserve streetscape

The proposed increase in upper floor setback from 2 to 3 meters for Unit A properties presents several critical implications that contradict the policy's core objectives and sustainability implications (page 2):

- The expanded setback requirement renders upper-floor extensions economically unfeasible
- Without viable upper-floor extensions, owners may be forced to demolish ground-floor structures to, compromising original facades
- Such demolition or structural alterations would directly contradict the intended objective of preserving character

Proposed solution: I respectfully request the Council consider exempting Unit A properties from [C1.2] should the proposed amendment proceed.

- As advised in the briefing session, 2 out of total affected 3 Unit A properties on the street voted NO.
- An exemption would maximise preserve the street's architectural heritage (no impact to Unit A YES) while maintaining development flexibility in the intent of preserving rather than demolishing character.
- This approach would align with sustainability goals by encouraging building retention rather than demolition

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda of the 11 February 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

3.7 - Judy Burrows of North Perth – Item 9.3

I am responding to Item 9.3 on Tuesdays Agenda after watching the replay of last weeks meeting.

Firstly, I want to address the 6 Yes to 5 No reported on the survey of 37 homes including rear subdivisions or 32 homes that are directly affected by streetscape.

- History shows that anyone who was unhappy would have sent in their objection as this is the most passionate group – total 5.
- Anyone who felt it was needed would have sent in their support –total 6.
- The remainder who have supported the Character area in writing may have felt they had already conveyed their support previously, so it was not necessary.
- Based on 32 homes that face the street, that leaves 21 and I would take odds that the majority of those approve however feel they have already advised this in the past, so why do you need it again. This is a comment I get often. Cosi also took this option on one of the early surveys, after all we had meetings with Michael in person and he knew where we all stood.
- Last time this came to Council and there was a threat of it being cancelled all together you will remember it resulted in a petition of 14 approvals in writing gained from a less than 1 hour survey of the street by Cosi from those who were home at the time – No-one objected. (You were sent a copy at the time). You will also remember that you had many people from the street contacting you with their approval. I am not organising this again but hope you would understand that the results would be similar.

With this in mind, I would ask you to please approve this Character Area as it does nothing to change the Planning Codes to affect a potential DA, providing they are building to the current regulations*. This is just an extra level of protection for the Streetscape only which is open and community friendly. This is supported by the officer in the notes.

The comments made at the meeting by two residents are offensive and based on misinformation/disinformation they were also voiced on 9th Oct - Both were offered the opportunity to talk to the officer in July 2023 to have him come to their homes and discuss before signing and this was again offered in person at the recent meeting in the park on October 9th when the officer affirmed they would not be affected if renovating. To my knowledge they did not take advantage of this, which shows no real commitment to deciding based on truth.

The original Character Nomination Form they referred to allows for signatures of Support or Objection in proceeding to creating a residents working group to decide what they felt needed to be included for a Character Area. This form provided by the officer in no way contained any information as to what the Character Area would look like because no working group had been nominated or decisions made which both parties were told. So, no-one tricked them at any stage and I can guarantee that had the percentages favoured a No Vote I would not have proceeded – but to me it is as always a fully inclusive Street vote – including them.

This initial survey resulted in 28 supporting setting up a Character Area proposal. In giving you this information I have removed Tom's signature in giving this total, this I had done previously so he could talk to his wife however he added it again after a final chat before submitting to the officer. In addition both these couples were obviously primed by someone that this would affect their ability to renovate prior to being approached with the survey and were very defensive believing this to be true based on no substance.

Apologies I am still severely suffering from chronic vertigo and unable to attend in person.

I thank you all for taking a considered approach to this item, thank you for all your hard work throughout the year, it is greatly appreciated and wishing you all Seasons blessings for Christmas and the Holiday Season.

*The only impact, which is low, is a change from 2m to 3m upper level setback which considering these are big blocks with 50.3m depth on the Eastern Side and 42.1m depth on the Western Side, it is not a huge impact. Reminding you also that only 3 blocks on the Eastern side can still be subdivided and none on the Western Side.

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda of the 11 February 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.14pm.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Dudley Maier of Highgate

1. Since the introduction of the GreenTrack fee reduction for Life Cycle Assessment Reports in November 2023 how many DAs have been charged the reduced amount?

13 development applications have received a \$200.00 fee reduction under the GreenTrack incentive program that launched in February 2024.

2. At the October Council meeting I asked a question about the City's current (as at October 2024) capacity to borrow funds. I sought an answer in dollar terms. The response was couched in terms of borrowing for the underground power project although this was not what I asked or intended. I am interested in the overall borrowing capacity of the City based on the WATC's indicative borrowing calculator.

So my question is: What is the City's overall current borrowing capacity, in dollar terms, based on the WATC's indicative borrowing calculator?

The indicative borrowing calculator is used by the City as a guideline to assess future borrowing capacity with WATC and is not a guarantee of future lending.

The calculator shows that the City has an estimated total borrowing capacity including existing loans of ~\$24m based on the 2023/24 financial statements. The borrowing capacity of the City is not a fixed amount and will change from year to year depending on the City's current and future financial position.

3. At the October Council meeting I asked questions about an artwork that is to be installed in Leederville. The staff said that \$12,298 had been spent on transport and storage of the piece, and that the work may be installed in December.

However, monthly expenditure figure show that approximately \$19,043 had been spent on transport and storage up until 22 October. Why did the answer I was given only say that \$12,298 had been spent when the actual figure was over \$19,000?

The previous response only accounted for payments made since March 2024.

We have reviewed expenses incurred for storage and transport commencing July 2023 and wish to advise the correct cost incurred to date for storage and transport is \$24,413.73.

Transport costs were first paid in December 2023 which indicates that the artwork had been constructed, but not installed, by that time. So far the artist has been paid \$56,000 for the artwork and project management. The initial indication when the artwork was approved was that the work would cost \$80,000, implying that the artist is still owed \$24,000. Has the artist been waiting for the final payment of \$24,000 because of the failure to install the work?

Are the delays in installation the artist's responsibility or have the final payments been held up because of delays outside their area of control?

To date the City has paid the artist a total of \$80,000 this includes a variation of \$8,000 due to the need to redesign the artwork to accommodate changes to the install location. An amount of \$8,000 remains outstanding and will be paid on installation. Delay to completion of the project is due to the servicing constraints previously advised and the approvals required prior to installation being permitted.

Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

1. Is Western Power fully aware of the extent of the City's stormwater problem?

The City's Administration works closely with Western Power throughout the underground power network design process and shares all information pertinent to the placement of Western Power assets.

2. Is Western Power fully informed about the location of all stormwater infrastructure, including drainage capacity issues and flooding hotspots?

Western Power is provided with all relevant information about stormwater drainage infrastructure to inform the underground power network design, including the location of flooding hot spots.

3. Will the underground power lines be installed above or below the City's stormwater pipes?

That is a matter for Western Power to determine, based on the relevant standards and proximity requirements for different types of underground services.

4. How safe is the underground power in low lying areas where stormwater infrastructure is failing and deteriorating?

Underground power assets are designed to relevant standards and insulated to ensure safety. Further questions on this matter should be directed to Western Power.

5. How safe is underground power in areas with high water tables and old deteriorating stormwater pipes and joints, all of which are past their service life?

See answer above.

Norelle O’Neille – Item 9.2

1. What disincentives in the program are in place if an applicant does not save a significant tree or include plantings or other commitments to revegetation?

Administration would secure the ongoing retention of Significant Trees through conditions of approval in instances where the tree proposed for retention is tied to the acceptability of certain departures under the planning framework or where the applicant agrees to a condition.

The applicant would be required to comply with the condition of approval in perpetuity, unless amended through a further development application.

Any alleged non-compliance with conditions of development approval would be investigated by the City, in accordance with the Development Compliance Enforcement Policy, to ensure adherence to approved commitments.

2. Why are there no provisions for paying back the original fee, paying a fine and/or paying the cost for fast tracking the original application?

The GreenTrack program seeks to prioritise enhanced environmental outcomes by encouraging sustainable design standards and tree retention/planting. The incentives keep the focus on genuine commitment to sustainability rather than creating financial barriers or penalties.

Focusing on incentives rather than penalties ensures the program remains a positive, motivating program for sustainable development. Administration considers that fines or penalties could discourage participation and contradict the program’s positive intent.

3. Why aren’t the funds that are apparently available to support this plan instead used to employ someone to verify that development applications across the City are being adhered to?

The funds allocated to GreenTrack are specifically designed to encourage and reward environmentally sustainable design, aligning with the City’s strategic priorities for sustainability.

Employing staff for compliance verification would require a different funding approach and does not achieve the proactive outcomes GreenTrack aims for.

Additionally, the City’s Compliance Services team investigate alleged breaches of development approvals in accordance with the Development Compliance Enforcement Policy, ensuring adherence to planning requirements through a separate, dedicated process.

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That Cr Castle's request for leave of absence from 1 – 9 February 2025 be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 19 November 2024 be confirmed.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcements:

7.1 PLANNING AWARDS

Mayor Xamon congratulated the City's Planning Team for winning the Planning Institute of Australia State Award in the category of Local Government Team of the Year, Bands 2–4, and noted two commendations for the SPUD team's *Link and Place Guidelines*.

The Mayor highlighted the team's achievements in managing complex planning matters, including work on the *Vibrant Public Spaces* policy, *Business Enhancement Grants*, new town centre frameworks for the Pickle District and North Claisebrook, and transit-oriented developments such as the major land transaction in Leederville. The Mayor also acknowledged streamlined planning approvals and the *Green Track* initiative for energy-efficient homes.

Further progress was noted on key projects, including the relocation of concrete batching plants, the *Smoke-Free Town Centres and Smoking Premises* policy, and other significant reforms.

7.2 YEAR END

Mayor Xamon reflected on the year-end graduation and awards season, noting visits to local schools, including Highgate, North Perth, Kyilla, Mount Hawthorn Primary Schools, the Mount Hawthorn Education Support Centre, Sacred Heart Primary School, Aranmore College, and Aranmore Primary School. Presenting the *Spirit of Christmas* awards and Citizenship certificates was a highlight.

The Mayor celebrated the festive season with events such as the Maker's Market, Carols in the Park, activities by the Columbian Association of WA and the Beaufort Street Christmas Festival.

The Mayor wished everyone a peaceful Christmas and Happy New Year and encouraged local shopping or gifting experiences. A reminder was shared about changes to bin collection schedules over the holiday period, with a message of gratitude extended to the City's Waste team, Rangers, and other staff working through the holidays.

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

REPORTS

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, advised the meeting of:

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**
Items 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 10.2 and 11.2
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Items 9.2, 9.5, 9.6, 12.1 and 12.2.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Nil.

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, 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 |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| Cr Castle | 10.1 |
| Cr Worner | 11.4 |
| Cr Woolf | 11.5 |

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon therefore requested the Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance, to advise the meeting of:

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved "En Bloc", being:**
Items 10.3, 11.1, 11.6, 12.3 and 12.4
- (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 Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:
Items 10.3, 11.1, 11.6, 12.3 and 12.4**



CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

10.3 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 4.1.16 - VEHICLE MANAGEMENT

- Attachments:
1. Assessment of Policy No. 4.1.16 - Vehicle Management 
 2. Policy No. 4.1.16 - Vehicle Management 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council REPEALS Policy No. 4.1.16 – Vehicle Management at Attachment 2.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.3

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2024

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 31 October 2024 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 October 2024 as shown in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1


Moved: Cr Woolf, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.6 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED POLICY NO. 4.1.4 - FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Attachments: 1. Policy Freedom of Information Requests July 2022 (Draft) 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES the proposed amendments to the Freedom of Information Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.6

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

12.3 REVIEW OF POLICY FRAMEWORK AND ADVERTISING OF AMENDED POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Policy Review Summary 
 2. Policy Document Register and Review Plan (marked up) 
 3. Indicative Policy Review Schedule 2025 
 4. Policy Development and Review Policy (marked up) 
 5. Policy Development and Review Policy (clean copy) 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the Policy Review Summary at Attachment 1; and
2. APPROVES the:
 - 2.1 updated Policy Document Register and Review Plan, at Attachment 2;
 - 2.2 Policy Review Schedule for 2025 at Attachment 3; and
 - 2.3 proposed amendments to the [Policy Development and Review Policy](#) at Attachment 4, for the purpose of community consultation.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3















Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

12.4 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:
1. Minutes for Arts Advisory Group Meeting 7 August 2024 
 2. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Catalina Regional Council Meeting held on 17 October 2024 
 3. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of November 2024 
 4. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 5. Register of Legal Action - Orders and Notices Quarterly - Confidential
 6. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 14 November 2024 
 7. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 8. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 9. Unrecoverable Parking Infringements Write-Off 
 10. Annual Update - Asset Management & Sustainability Strategy Implementation 2020-2030 
 11. Safer Vincent Plan 2025 - 2030 
 12. Register of Petitions - Progress Report December 2024 
 13. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - December 2024 
 14. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - December 2024 
 15. Council Workshop Items since 17 November 2024 
 16. Council Briefing Notes - 15 October 2024 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated December 2024.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 6.27pm Manager Waste and Recycling left the meeting and did not return.

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

9.1 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 7.6.3 - TREES OF SIGNIFICANCE

- Attachments:
1. Draft Local Planning Policy - Trees of Significance 
 2. Review of Policy No. 7.6.3 - Trees of Significance 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council

1. PREPARES the amendments to Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance as included as Attachment 1 in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the proposed amendments in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
3. NOTES that the amendments proposed in the review of Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance would require amendments to the City’s Register of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments. These would be considered at a future Council Meeting concurrently when the amended Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance is considered for final approval; and
4. SUPPORTS Administration continuing to progress efforts for greater tree retention on private property through a multi-faceted approach by coordinating incentives, public education, advocacy and planning controls, while monitoring and adapting strategies to ensure ongoing effectiveness.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (7-1)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Cr Wallace

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.2 EXPANSION OF GREENTRACK INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Attachments: 1. Amended Fees and Charges 2024.25 (pages 16-17) 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**, in accordance with Section 6.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, to adopt the following amendment to the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2024/2025 and as shown in red text in Attachment 1:

1.1 To reduce development application fees for single houses, grouped and multiple dwellings, commercial and mixed-use development, including additions with a construction cost greater than the value of \$50,000, which retain significant trees.

A significant tree is one that meets the following:

- *Healthy specimens with ongoing viability; and*
- *Species is not included on a National, State or local area weed register; and*
- *Height of at least 4 metres. Xanthorrhoea (grass tree) species from a height of at least 1.2 metres and Banksia species from a height of at least 3 metres will be considered; and/or*
- *Trunk diameter of at least 160 millimetres, measured 1m from the ground; and/or*
- *Average canopy diameter of at least 4 metres; and/or*
- *Any other species likely to be a remnant or regrowth local native tree with a height or canopy width deemed significant by the City; and/or*
- *Established trees that are significant from an Aboriginal Heritage perspective. These can include Nuytsia floribunda (Western Australian Christmas Tree); and/or*
- *Any mature specimens that provide habitat or food for local fauna. For example, Banksia and Hakea are known food sources for the Carnaby's Black Cockatoo.*

1.2 This will not apply to Development Assessment Panel applications. The development application fee shall be reduced by \$200.00 per development application;

2. **SUPPORTS** Administration to:

2.1 continue the pre-lodgement consultation service until the end of the 2025/26 financial year for homeowners, developers and designers to receive advice from a member of the City's Design Review Panel on how they can improve energy efficiency in their design and retain significant trees in their design;

2.2 expand the existing GreenTrack Priority Assessment Process to include proposals for single houses, grouped and multiple dwellings, commercial and mixed use development, including alterations and additions, that retain significant trees. This would not apply to applications being considered by the Development Assessment Panel; and

2.3 continue to progress efforts for greater tree retention on private property through a multi-faceted approach by coordinating incentives, public education, advocacy and planning controls, while monitoring and adapting strategies to ensure ongoing effectiveness.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.3 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING - DRAFT AUCKLAND STREET CHARACTER AREA GUIDELINES

- Attachments:
1. Draft Auckland Street Character Area Guidelines 
 2. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response 

RECOMMENDATION:**That Council:**

1. **PROCEEDS** with amendments to Local Planning Policy: Character Area Guidelines with modifications, including the Character Area Guidelines for Auckland Street in Attachment 1, pursuant to *Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 5 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
2. **NOTES** that Administration will publish a notice in accordance with Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

Moved: Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil



(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.4 RFT PP347/2024 ROBERTSON PARK STAGE 1B CONSTRUCTION**Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE347-2024 - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender PP347/2024 Robertson Park Stage 1B Construction;**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Phase3 for Tender IE347/2024 Robertson Park Stage 1B Construction. and**
- 3. NOTES that the 2025/26 Budget will include provision of \$1,477,000 for the remainder of the Stage 1B contract with Phase3 Landscape Construction Pty Ltd.**

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (8-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil**(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)**

10.2 CLUB NIGHT LIGHTS PROGRAM (CNLP) - FLOODLIGHTING PROJECT PROPOSALS

- Attachments:
1. Menzies Park Floodlighting - Specification, Electrical and Lighting Design - Confidential
 2. Litis Stadium Floodlighting - Specification, Electrical and Lighting Design - Confidential
 3. Birdwood Square Floodlighting - Specification, Electrical and Lighting Design - Confidential
 4. Menzies Park Floodlighting - Communications Report 
 5. Menzies Park Floodlighting - Survey Report 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ENDORSES** the proposal to upgrade the floodlighting at Menzies Park;
2. **NOTES** the community consultation for floodlighting upgrades at Menzies Park;
3. **Subject to clauses 1 and 2 above,**
 - 3.1 **CONSIDERS** the inclusion of \$143,523.56 (ex GST) for the Menzies Park floodlighting upgrade in the draft 2025/2026 budget being the City's contribution to the upgrade;
 - 3.2 **APPROVES** that all supporting documentation, including the completed application form, be forwarded to the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries by the deadline 31 March 2025;
4. **ENDORSES** the proposal to upgrade the floodlighting at Litis Stadium (200lux only);
5. **Subject to clause 4 above,**
 - 5.1 **CONSIDERS** the inclusion of \$169,380.81 (ex GST) for the Litis Stadium floodlighting upgrade in the draft 2025/2026 budget being the City's contribution to upgrade floodlighting at Litis Stadium (200lux only);
 - 5.2 **APPROVES** that all supporting documentation, including the completed application form, be forwarded to the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries by the deadline 31 March 2025; and
6. **NOTES** the estimated cost of the Birdwood Square floodlighting upgrade for future budget considerations.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2

Moved: Cr Woolf, **Seconded:** Cr La Fontaine

That the recommendation be adopted.





CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 OCTOBER 2024 TO 31 OCTOBER 2024

- Attachments:
1. October 2024 - Payments by EFT and Payroll 
 2. October 2024 - Payments by Direct Debit 
 3. October 2024 - Payments by Cheques 
 4. October 2024 - Payments by Fuel Cards 

Recommendation:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 October 2024 to 31 October 2024 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| EFT payments, including payroll | | \$7,977,776.64 |
| Cheques | 82781-82782 | \$1,204.19 |
| Direct debits, including credit cards | | \$127,334.13 |
| | | |
| Total payments for October 2024 | | \$8,106,314.96 |

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.5 NOS. 193-195 (LOT: 267-269; D/P: 3642) SCARBOROUGH BEACH ROAD, MOUNT HAWTHORN - CASH-IN-LIEU CAR PARKING CONTRIBUTION DEBT WRITE OFF

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY writing off the cash-in-lieu car parking contribution debt of \$31,542, for the development at Nos. 193-195 (Lots 267-269) Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn, in accordance with clause 6.12(1)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.6 NO. 9/663 (LOT: 8; STR: 10630) NEWCASTLE STREET, LEEDERVILLE - CASH-IN-LIEU CAR PARKING CONTRIBUTION DEBT WRITE OFF

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY writing off the outstanding cash-in-lieu car parking contribution debt of \$8,902.10, for the development at No. 9/663 Newcastle Street, Leederville, in accordance with clause 6.12(1)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.6

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.12pm Manager Public Health & Built Environment left the meeting and did not return.

10.1 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 2.1.7 - PARKS, RESERVES AND HALL FACILITIES - CONDITIONS OF HIRE AND USE

- Attachments:
1. Policy No. 2.1.7 - Parks, Reserves and Hall Facilities - Conditions of Hire and Use 
 2. Assessment of Policy No. 2.1.7 - Parks, Reserves and Hall Facilities 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Councils REPEALS Policy No. 2.1.7 – Parks, Reserves and Hall Facilities – Conditions of Hire and Use at Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1

Moved: Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2024**Attachments:** 1. Investment Statistics as at 31 October 2024 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 October 2024 as detailed in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Woolf****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (8-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil**(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)**

11.4 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED COMMUNITY FUNDING POLICY

- Attachments:**
1. **Community Funding Policy - Marked Up Version** 
 2. **Community Funding Policy - Clean Version** 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Community Funding Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation.

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the Recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Community Funding Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, **subject to the deletion of the proposed change to remove Council endorsement of individual Festival and Event sponsorship applications.**

REASON:

Removing the requirement for Council to endorse individual event and festival funding risks removing an important layer of community representation, transparency, and strategic planning. The Council's involvement in event funding is a safeguard to ensure that public money is used in ways that are aligned with the community's interests and values, helping to strengthen local governance and cohesion.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Noted.

The proposed process change to the policy would align the Festival and Event sponsorship process with all other community grant funding provided by the City.

The event funding criteria, guidelines and acquittal process is reviewed and updated every year. These informing documents would be presented to Council at a workshop to ensure they reflect strategic goals as well as Council and community priorities for the year ahead.

This proposed change would also provide a more flexible program of event funding enabling more timely decisions to be made on the reallocation of funds in instances when events do not proceed. There is currently insufficient time to re-advertise and attract new event applications resulting in lost opportunities for the community.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (7-1)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Cr Hallett

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

That Council **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Community Funding Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, subject to the deletion of the proposed change to remove Council endorsement of individual Festival and Event sponsorship applications.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.5 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF STRETCH RECONCILIATION ACTION PLAN

- Attachments:**
1. **Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan Deliverables** 
 2. **Draft Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan - Summary of Submissions** 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ADOPTS** the Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan deliverables at Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5

Moved: Cr Woolf, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.35pm The Executive Manager Communications & Engagement left the meeting and did not return.

12.1 COUNCIL RECESS PERIOD 2024-25 - DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**Attachments:** Nil**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council DELEGATES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, pursuant to section 5.42 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, to the Chief Executive Officer, the power to deal with any items of business that may arise between 11 December 2024 and 3 February 2025, and which are not the subject of delegated authority already granted by Council, subject to:
 - 1.1 Reports being issued to all Council Members for a period of three business days with Council Members notified by phone prior to the delegated decision being made and no requests for 'call-in' of the matter being received from Council Members;
 - 1.2 Reports being displayed on the City's website for a period of three business days prior to the delegated decision being made;
 - 1.3 A report summarising the items of business dealt with under delegated authority being submitted for information to Council at its Ordinary Meeting to be held on 11 February 2025; and
 - 1.4 A Register of Items Approved under this Delegated Authority is being kept and made available for public inspection on the City's website during the period that the delegation applies.
2. DETERMINES for the purpose of section 5.43(b) of the Local Government Act 1995 that the Chief Executive Officer can accept tenders up to a maximum value of \$500,000 for the period 10 December 2024 to 4 February 2025 subject to the conditions in recommendation 1.1 to 1.4 above.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Worner**

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)**For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil**(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 7.35pm the Presiding Member, Alison Xamon, declared her interest in this item, and asked the Deputy Mayor, Cr Castle to assume the Chair.

At 7.36pm Cr Castle assumed the Chair.

12.2 APPOINTMENT OF A COUNCIL MEMBER FOR THE MINDARIE REGIONAL COUNCIL FROM 1 JANUARY 2025

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. NOTES that Cr Alex Castle will resign from her position as the City's representative on the Mindarie Regional Council, effective 31 December 2024;
2. NOTES the nominations received from Mayor Xamon and Cr Alexander at the Council Briefing on 3 December 2024; and
3. APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the appointment of:

Cr _____

to represent the City on the Mindarie Regional Council from 1 January 2025 until the next ordinary local government election, being 18 October 2025.

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

The Presiding Member Cr Alex Castle outlined the required ballot process and advised that to enable each candidate to speak to their nomination, and to conduct the ballot process, the City's Meeting Procedures Local Law should be suspended.

PROCEDURAL MOTION MEETING PROCEDURES LOCAL LAW BE SUSPENDED

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the Meeting Procedures Local Law be suspended

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

Following the suspension of standing orders, the CEO confirmed two nominees: Mayor Xamon and Cr Alexander.

Mayor Xamon spoke in support of her nomination.

Cr Alexander was an apology for this meeting.

A secret ballot was conducted. The CEO, assisted by the Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance, counted the votes.

The results were announced as follows:

- Mayor Xamon: 8 votes
- Cr Alexander: 0 votes

Presiding Member Cr Alex Castle, called for a motion that Council resume the Meeting Procedures Local Law.

PROCEDURAL MOTION RESUMPTION OF MEETING PROCEDURES LOCAL LAW

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Woolf

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

That Council:

1. **NOTES that Cr Alex Castle will resign from her position as the City's representative on the Mindarie Regional Council, effective 31 December 2024;**
2. **NOTES the nominations received from Mayor Xamon and Cr Alexander at the Council Briefing on 3 December 2024; and**
3. **APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the appointment of:**

Mayor Xamon

to represent the City on the Mindarie Regional Council from 1 January 2025 until the next ordinary local government election, being 18 October 2025.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.47pm Mayor Xamon resumed the Chair.

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

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

Nil

At

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 Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 7.47pm with the following persons present:

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| PRESENT: | Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Sophie Greer Cr Ashlee La Fontaine | Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | David MacLennan Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Dale Morrissy Mitchell Hoad Joslin Colli Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard | Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment A/Executive Director Community & Business Services A/Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Community Facilities A/Manager Strategic Planning Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support |
| Public: | No members of the public. | |

These Minutes were confirmed at the 11 February 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council Meeting held on 10 December 2024.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated