



**CITY OF VINCENT**

# **MINUTES**

**Ordinary Council Meeting**

**11 February 2025**

## Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country.....	5
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence.....	5
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements .....	6
	(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .....	10
4	Applications for Leave of Absence .....	14
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations .....	14
6	Confirmation of Minutes .....	14
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) .....	15
	7.1 Political Donations .....	15
	7.2 Perth Festival Launch .....	15
8	Declarations of Interest .....	15
	Reports .....	16
	Items Approved "En Bloc": .....	17
	9.2 No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth - Proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Cafe to Restaurant/Cafe and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved).....	18
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 30 November 2024.....	20
	11.2 Financial Statements as at 31 December 2024.....	21
	11.3 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 November 2024 to 30 November 2024 .....	22
	11.4 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 December 2024 to 31 December 2024 .....	23
	11.5 Investment Report as at 30 November 2024 .....	24
	11.6 Investment Report as at 31 December 2024 .....	25
	12.2 Review of Council Proceedings - Recording and Web Streaming Policy.....	26
	12.3 Council Recess Period 2024-2025 - Receiving of items dealt with under Delegated Authority between 10 December 2024 and 4 February 2025.....	27
	12.5 Information Bulletin .....	28
	Reports with Discussion.....	29
	10.1 Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities Fund (CSRFF) application - North Perth Tennis Club Female and Accessible Amenities Upgrade.....	29
	9.4 Advertising of the Draft Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework .....	30
	9.1 No. 173 (Lot: 7; D/P: 867) Oxford Street, Leederville - Proposed Change of Use from Small Bar to Tavern including Alterations and Additions.....	32
	9.5 Advertising of the Draft William Street Planning Framework .....	34
	9.3 Proposed Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Review of Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation .....	37
	9.6 Response to Petition - William Street Town Centre Public Artwork Commission .....	42
	10.2 RFT IE371/2024 Level 1, Administration Building HVAC Renewal .....	45
	10.3 RFT IE360/2024 Asbestos Removal and Encapsulation BPLC Grandstand [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	46
	12.1 Appointment of Electoral Commissioner to conduct the City of Vincent Ordinary Election 18 October 2025 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	47

---

12.4	Responses to Motions Carried at the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 11 December 2024.....	48
<b>13</b>	<b>Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....</b>	<b>50</b>
13.1	Notice of Motion - Mayor Xamon - Animal Local Law - Cat Containment .....	50
<b>14</b>	<b>Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Representation on Committees and Public Bodies .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Urgent Business .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Closure .....</b>	<b>53</b>



**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT  
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AT THE E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,  
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE  
ON TUESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2025 AT 6:00 PM**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p>Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander 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 North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward</p>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<p>David MacLennan Peter Varris</p> <p>Dale Morrissy</p> <p>Ruth Markham</p> <p>Rhys Taylor</p> <p>Jay Naidoo</p> <p>Karsen Reynolds</p> <p>Mitchell Hoad</p> <p>Joslin Colli</p> <p>Emma Simmons</p> <p>Carrie Miller</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure &amp; Environment (left at 8.24pm prior to item 17.1)</p> <p>Manager Community Facilities (left at 8:04pm after item 10.3)</p> <p>Manager City Buildings and Asset Management (Online) (left at 8:05pm after item 10.3)</p> <p>A/Executive Director Community &amp; Business Services (left at 8.24pm prior to item 17.1)</p> <p>A/Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development (left at 8.24pm prior to item 17.1)</p> <p>A/Manager Development &amp; Design (left at 7:22pm after item 9.5)</p> <p>A/Manager Strategic Planning (left at 8:10pm after item 12.4)</p> <p>Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance (left at 7:59pm after item 10.2)</p> <p>Coordinator Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance (left at 8.24pm prior to item 17.1)</p> <p>Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance Officer</p>
<b>Public:</b>	Approximately 14 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 as a Council the City of Vincent has a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

## **2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil

### 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 Michael Cornes of Mt Lawley – Item 10.1

Spoke in support of Item 10.1. The full statement can be found [here](#).

#### 3.2 Dr Robert Madden of Innaloo – Item 13.1

Spoke in support of Item 13.1. The full statement can be found [here](#).

#### 3.3 Ross Catalano of Mt Lawley – Item 9.4

Spoke in support of item 9.4. The full statement can be found [here](#).

#### 3.4 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

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

The following questions were raised:

- Since the GHD drainage technical memorandum has the City of Vincent identified all stormwater pipers running through private property?
- How much has the City of Vincent spent in relocating, demolishing and refurbishing the reception area for a third time?

#### 3.5 Yvonne Alexander Sharpe of Leederville – Item 9.1

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

#### 3.6 Jake Spinner of Leederville – Item 9.1

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

#### 3.7 Robert McNally of Leederville – Item 9.1

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

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

#### **Dudley Maier of Highgate**

1. At the December 2024 council meeting I asked some questions about the requirement to provide Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) when submitting a DA. The response states that LCAs are only mandatory if an applicant opts in to the GreenTrack pathway. The response then goes on to confirm that the local housing objectives of Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy require the submission of an LCA (in order to demonstrate adherence to global warming and fresh water requirements) – a clear indication that the (advertised) Built Form Policy requires the submission of an LCA. The response then goes on to state that the WAPC have not yet approved the Built Form Policy as advertised.

My further questions are:

- Does the Built Form Policy document clearly state that, even though the local housing objectives require the submission of an LCA, applicants are not required to submit an LCA until such time as the WAPC has approved the proposed policy?

- Are the vague/general references to WAPC approval on pages 13 and 18 the only indication that some, undefined, requirements are not enforceable until approved by the WAPC?
  - When was the requirement for a LCA as part of the Built Form policy endorsed by Council?
  - When was the requirement for a LCA as part of the Built Form policy submitted to the WAPC for approval?
  - Are applicants provided with any documentation, other than the Built Form Policy, that clearly states that they are not required to provide an LCA until such time as the WAPC approves the requirement?
  - Isn't the City's failure to make it clear that applicants are not required to provide an LCA just a crude way of bluffing applicants into providing a document, at some cost to the applicant, when no such requirement exists?
  - Do you agree that it is likely that 'professional' developers would know that there was no legal requirement to provide an LCA, but that first-time or less informed applicants would be bluffed into providing an LCA when none is required?
  - Don't you agree that it would have been clearer, and less deceptive, if the City published a version of the Built Form policy without the requirements needing WAPC approval, and then modified the document to include additional requirements when they were finally approved by the WAPC?
2. Why did the city pay Comex Civil \$14,821 (including GST) on 19 December 2024 for "*East Power Station - General landscape & Pick up 15 tonne of road base*"? Did this relate to the area that is proposed to be leased by the City? If so, why was this payment made in December when the lease was only agreed, under delegation, on 29 January 2025? Did the city undertake work on the area before the lease was approved or actioned?
  3. Why do the monthly 'fuel card' payments only show where a purchase was made and not who made the purchase, or even what vehicle it related to? How is this being accountable?
  4. At the last council meeting I asked if external legal advice was obtained regarding the Significant Tree policy. The answer was that legal advice was obtained, but did not say from whom. To clarify the matter: from which external body was legal advice obtained, when was it obtained, and how much did it cost?
  5. At the last council meeting I asked why \$1,477,000 is proposed to be included in the 2025/2026 budget for the completion of Robertson Park Stage 1B when only approximately \$1,272,000 is required given that a contract has been entered into. The impression it created was that the administration had simply proposed the original 2025/2026 budget without taking into account the fact that the contract had come in over \$200,000 under budget. The response from the administration was that they had in fact included a contingency of about 7% which coincidentally results in the same 2025/2026 budget allocation as initially proposed. Why is there a need for a contingency – aren't the contracts for a fixed price?
  6. The report on the William Street art project indicates that the cost of the footings (\$150,000) has made the project inviable in the proposed location. When the contract was signed with the artist, did it make it clear who would be responsible for the cost of the footings – was it part of the proposal or was the City explicitly required to pay for the footings?
  7. I have previously asked about issues with the installation of another art project in Leederville. The last answer I received indicated that the City was responsible for the delay of the installation of the artwork. Did the City make any payments, other than to the artist, for any infrastructure required before the artwork could be installed?
  8. Property owners in Underground Power Area 1 were asked to indicate, by 16 December 2024, if they wished to pay up-front, or wished to pay over a four-year period:
    - how many owners were contacted;
    - how many replied;
    - how many of those who replied chose to pay up-front;
    - how many chose other options;
    - how many owners, who did not reply, will be required to pay up front?

**Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 9.4 and 9.5**

I have two initial concerns with both of these documents, and I'd like to suggest a couple of amendments that should be moved at the meeting.

Consultation

The consultation is purely the same old 'we'll advertise it and review what comes back' approach. I think these two proposals will cause a lot of concern within the community, particularly with people living in the immediate proximity. The previous consultation policy had a provision which required community meetings to be held when contentious proposals are made. The reasoning behind this requirement was so that community members could be made aware exactly what is being proposed, and why – thereby trying to address ill-informed information that tends to spread via social media.

Suggested amendment 1 is along the lines of “**requests the administration to hold community information meetings in locations that are convenient to residents in the immediate area.**”

I think information sessions where the community are presented with facts and then can ask questions in an open forum are far more valuable than the one-on-one sessions that seem to be the norm nowadays – you know, “we'll be there from 1pm to 3pm so come along and ask a question”. People like to hear what other people have to say and enter into discussion.

Building heights

The proposed heights are just a guideline and are not enforceable. I'm not a betting person but I will wager that one of the first applications will be for a building over 15 storeys, perhaps 20 storeys, and it will be approved.

Developments of the suggested height will not be decided by the City, it will be the DAP or the WAPC. They are not constrained by policy provisions such as the building height. They supposedly look at 'objectives' which are so vague you can justify anything. The result is that the process of consulting the community about things like planning policies is a farce and a waste of time.

You just have to think back to the Celsius proposal on Fitzgerald to see how this has played out.

The only way to ensure that the community's agreed visions, whatever that may be (6, 8, 10, 20 storeys), is respected is to include provisions like height in the Local Planning Scheme.

This should be advertised at the same time as the policies are advertised – the results will need to be consistent which can be ensured by advertising the two (policy and LPS amendment) at the same time. They do not have to be sequential – that just wastes time.

I expect that the staff will not support this. Arguments could be along the lines of:

- The WAPC won't support this. This should be formally tested, not just rely on second-guessing. If the WAPC does not support such a change then they should be held to account in a public forum. Local government should stand up more and make a fuss.
- This will unnecessarily constrain outstanding designs. This is, of course, the usual BS that is dished up. When have you seen an outstanding design? I've seen very ordinary designs get 'bonuses' by claiming they were outstanding. If a design is really outstanding, and the council agrees that is worthy of extra height, then a scheme amendment can be initiated. I've ridden around Stirling and seen signs advertising scheme amendments to change a single lot from R30 to R40. Individual lot amendments do happen. And the advantage of this approach is that the City initiates the change – it takes back some power with regards to planning.
- Scheme amendments will take too long. That is a reflection on the (in)efficiency of the Department of Planning staff. Simple changes to Schemes should take days, not months or years. Again, local government should be making a noise about how long simple scheme amendments take – the current timeframes would not be accepted in private industry.

My suggestion is that there be an amendment, for each item, that “**requests a scheme amendment that specifies maximum heights for each area; and that scheme amendment be presented to council at the April meeting (or before); and that the scheme amendment and proposed policies be advertised concurrently**”. It is important that you give a timeframe for the scheme amendment. There is not a lot of work involved, just some cut-and-paste and a clause (with subclauses for each 'zone') – it's not rocket science.



**Reece Harley of Perth**

1. During the 2023/2024 Financial year what was the total Capital Expenditure of the City?
2. Please break down these Capital Expenditure expenses by postcode, i.e. a table providing the capital expenditure amounts for the suburbs of Perth, East Perth, West Perth, Leederville, Mount Lawley, Mount Hawthorn, North Perth etc
3. Please provide a summary of the property rates derived by Council during the 2023/2024 Financial year by postcode of the rateable property.
4. If these figures are not yet available for the 2023/2024 financial year, please provide them for the previous financial year.

**Christopher Hilton of Perth**

I have some questions regarding the Town of Vincents tree maintenance.

1. Does the City of Vincent have the authority to cut trees that are hanging over parked cars that are parked in allocated parking bays on the street?
2. Does the City of Vincent have the authority to allow its contractors to touch, clean, use commercial blowers on the general public's personal property that being a car?
3. What safety measures does the city of Vincent have in place when cutting trees that are hanging above parked cars. ( I am asking for the city of Vincent safety measures not the contractors safety measures )
4. Does the city of Vincent have its own Safety Management plan that its contractors must adhere to when conducting work?  
( i am not asking for the contractor's own safety management plan )
5. Does the city of Vincent allow the general public to see (read, allowed a copy) of the contract and safety management plan it has with its contractor?
6. Why DOES the city of Vincent not inform its local residents and car parking permitholders that this work is taking place in their area?

For over 2 years your PARKS Department which i believe is in charge of this tree maintenance contract has been aware of the city of Vincint's tree maintenance contractors cutting trees above the general public's cars which results in the cars being covered in debris which the contractors then remove from the cars. This is extremely dangerous to the public and causes damage to the cars.

Your PARKS Department has defended this very unsafe practice.

I have photos and videos of the city of Vincent tree maintenance contractors working in the middle of the road and on the foot path with NO I will repeat NO safety measures in place. No signs. NO traffic controllers .NO spotters. I have given the city of Vincent Parks department photos that clearly showing heavy machinery working in the middle of the road, above parked cars, and on footpaths without any safety measures in place.

7. What has the city of Vincent done to rectify these safety breaches

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 11 March 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6:20pm.

**(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE****Dudley Maier of Highgate**

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?

*The payment of \$5,703.05 is a 50% deposit for the annual hire, installation and removal of Christmas lights for a tree in Braithwaite Park.*

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?

*The City is responsible for the delay in installation due to the previously stated servicing approvals. The City is paying the artist storage and transport fees incurred by the delays. The final payment is tied to the contract terms which state installation of the artwork.*

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.

*The City has received legal advice regarding who is authorised to undertake maintenance pruning to trees listed on the Significant Tree Inventory. This advice informed the definition of ‘secondary owners’ in the draft Trees of Significance Policy.*

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?

*The GreenTrack assessment pathway is opt-in.*

*The lodgement of a Life Cycle Assessment is only mandatory if applicants are lodging a development application for assessment through the GreenTrack pathway.*

*Where a Life Cycle Assessment is not provided by an applicant, these applications are not eligible for a refund of application fees or a prioritised assessment.*

*The local housing objectives of Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy require a development to demonstrate that it is capable of achieving a reduction in global warming potential and net fresh water use through the submission of a Life Cycle Assessment.*

*The WAPC is required to approve the local housing objectives of Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy. The WAPC has yet to make a determination on the Built Form Policy.*

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?

*This clause incorrectly references Clause 2.3 and 2.4. This should instead reference Clauses 3.3 and 3.4 which can be found on page 5 of the draft Trees of Significance Policy.*

*This error will be corrected following community consultation and before Council considers the outcomes of this.*

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 2025/26 budget?

*Administration have maintained a contingency allowance of approximately 7% with consideration of the uncertainties within the current construction industry, specifically around the supply of labour and materials. This construction contingency will also cover the risk of variations and unforeseen items encountered during construction.*

7. 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 dob-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 dob-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?

*The draft Trees of Significance Policy allows secondary owners, including those who have the canopy of a tree overhanging their property, to undertake works to a listed tree. Specifically, the Policy provides for exemptions for maintenance pruning to not require a development application. For any works that are over and above this, a development application would be required to be lodged by the secondary owner and approved by the City before the works could occur.*

### **Yimeng Chen of North Perth – Item 9.3**

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

*At the time of nomination there were 40 properties within the proposed character area. There was 26 properties in support of the nomination. This equals 65 percent.*

*Further to the responses providing in the minutes from the Council Briefing from 3 December 2024, there are five sites that have been subdivided.*

*If the five rear properties were excluded from this, there would be 35 properties in the proposed Character Area at the time of the nomination. 23 properties were in support of the nomination. This equals 66 percent.*

**2. How do we reconcile 11 survey submissions to 26 landowners, suggesting less support of nomination for new amendments to date?**

*A response to this question was provided in the minutes from the Council Briefing from 3 December 2024. In summary the reasons why there were less responses received during the consultation period compared to the original nomination are unclear and could include either consultation fatigue, a lack of interest in the Character Area and/or Guidelines, or individuals choosing not to make a formal submission*

**3. Were the policy implications (both direct and indirect) clearly communicated to all stakeholders during nomination?**

*An information sheet was available on the City's website which outlined the implications of the proposed Character Area. Letters were distributed to all owners of the proposed Character Area which directed to this information sheet.*

**4. 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?**

*Refer to response 3 above.*

**5. 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?).**

*Refer to response 2 above.*

**6. Is 26 landowners based on the properties count (without multiple votes from single property)?**

*A response to this question was provided in the minutes from the Council Briefing from 3 December 2024. The 26 responses did not include where multiple owners of the same property support the nomination. In these instances it was counted as one support.*

**7. However, it was unclear whether this method has been applied consistently to the nomination response and whether non-affected properties are excluded?**

*The Character Area Guidelines would apply to allow properties in the designated Character Area, not just those that are street facing.*

*Because of this the 26 supportive of the nomination included a combination of front and rear properties.*

**8. Are these land owners verified as registered land owners in land title? (as opposed to rental residents)?**

*Administration verified those in support as being landowners of the respective properties based on the City's records.*

**9. Is there clear documentation of inclusion and exclusion method and criteria to ensure accurate representation of affected properties throughout?**

*As outline in response 7, the Character Area Guidelines would apply to allow properties in the designated Character Area, not just those that are street facing. Administration's clearly outlines how the nomination threshold of 40 percent was achieved.*

#### **Ian Poustie of Mt Hawthorn – Item 10.2**

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

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?  
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.*

*The discussion can be found [here](#).*

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

### **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

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

**That Cr Hallett's request for leave of absence from 3-9 March 2025 be approved.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0)**

## **5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

### **5.1 Bruce Webber of Mt Hawthorn – Item 13.1**

Spoke in support of Item 13.1. The full statement can be found [here](#).

## **6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

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

**That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 10 December 2024 be confirmed.**

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

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

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

### **7.1 POLITICAL DONATIONS**

Mayor Xamon discussed the impact of political donations on planning and development decisions, emphasising the need for transparency and safeguards to prevent corruption and prioritise community interests.

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

### **7.2 PERTH FESTIVAL LAUNCH**

Mayor Xamon commended the successful launch of the Perth Festival at the East Perth Power Station, highlighting the collaborative efforts of the City of Vincent team and the potential for future events at the venue.

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

## **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, 9.4, 10.1 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 10.3 and 12.1.
- (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
Mayor Xamon	10.2, 12.4
Cr Worner	9.6
Cr Hallett	9.5
Cr Wallace	17.1
Cr Greer	9.3

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 9.2, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**  
Items 17.1.



**ITEMS APPROVED "EN BLOC":**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION**

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

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:  
Items 9.2, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5**








**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**9.2 NO. 500 (LOT: 41; D/P: 418433) FITZGERALD STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM RESTAURANT/CAFE TO RESTAURANT/CAFE AND SMALL BAR (AMENDMENT TO APPROVED)**

**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Acoustic Assessment 
  4. Previous Joint Development Assessment Panel Approval 
  5. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
  6. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
  7. Clause 67 Assessment 

**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 development application for a proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Café to Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) at No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions, requirements and advice notes detailed on the development approval 5.2023.218.1 granted on 12 December 2023 continue to apply to this approval except as follows:

**1.1 Condition 1 is modified as follows:**

This approval is for a Change of Use from Restaurant/Café to Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) as shown on the approved plans dated 18 August 2023, 3 July 2024, 11 December 2024 and 10 January 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

**1.2 Condition 2.3 is modified as follows:**

The Restaurant/Café and Small Bar shall be limited to the following hours of operation:

- Monday to Sunday: 7:00am to 5:00pm; and
- All deliveries shall be limited to 7:00am to 2:00pm, Monday to Friday;

**1.3 Condition 3.1 is modified as follows:**

Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, an amended Venue Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The amended Venue Management Plan shall outline the approved operating hours of the development and shall be prepared in accordance with City's Policy No. 7.5.7 – Licensed Premises, to the satisfaction of the City;

**1.4 Condition 6 is modified as follows:**

Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, eight parking bays on-site, as identified in Attachment 2, shall be line marked with painted letters which read 'Café Parking', to the satisfaction of the City;

**1.5 Condition 9 'Signage' is added as follows:**

**9.1** Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, the existing signs highlighted in red on the plans shall be removed, to the satisfaction of the City.

**9.2** Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, all

signage shown on the approved plans shall be installed to the dimensions and locations shown on the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the City. The sign located to the northern elevation of the bin store shall be installed to the top left corner of the wall, replacing existing signage in this location, to the satisfaction of the City.

9.3 All signage is to be in strict accordance with the City's Local Planning Policy: Signs and Advertising, unless further development approval is obtained.

9.4 All signage shall be kept in a good state of repair, safe, non-climbable, and free from graffiti for the duration of its display on-site.

1.6 Condition 10 'Acoustic Report' is added as follows:

The premises shall operate at all times in accordance with the criteria and all recommended conditions/restrictions outlined approved acoustic report (Herring Storer Acoustics, dated 22 November 2024) to the satisfaction of the City.

### **COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (9-0)**

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2024

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 30 November 2024 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 30 November 2024 as shown in Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

**11.2 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2024****Attachments:** 1. Financial Statements as at 31 December 2024 **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2****Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace**

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

**11.3 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 NOVEMBER 2024 TO 30 NOVEMBER 2024**

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

**Recommendation:**

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 November 2024 to 30 November 2024 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$9,091,467.81
Cheques	\$1,571.81
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$327,866.65
Total payments for November 2024	<b>\$9,420,906.27</b>

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

**11.4 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 DECEMBER 2024 TO 31 DECEMBER 2024**

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

**Recommendation:**

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 December 2024 to 31 December 2024 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$9,572,461.49
Cheques	\$860.35
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$176,830.89
Total payments for December 2024	<b>\$9,750,152.73</b>

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

11.5 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2024

Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 30 November 2024 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 30 November 2024 as detailed in Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**



11.6 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2024

Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 31 December 2024 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.6**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

12.2 REVIEW OF COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS - RECORDING AND WEB STREAMING POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Council Proceedings - Recording and Web Streaming Policy 
  2. Assessment of Policy 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council REPEAL the Council Proceedings – Recording and Web Streaming Policy at Attachment 1.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**


















**12.3 COUNCIL RECESS PERIOD 2024-2025 - RECEIVING OF ITEMS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BETWEEN 10 DECEMBER 2024 AND 4 FEBRUARY 2025****TRIM Ref: D25/1424****Author: Joslin Colli, Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance****Authoriser: David MacLennan, Chief Executive Officer****Attachments: Nil****RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the report on the items of business was dealt with under delegated authority during the Council recess period, 11 December 2024 and 3 February 2025:

1. Enter into lease with Western Australian Land Authority – Portion 11 Summers Street, East Perth (East Perth Power Station Land).

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3****Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

**12.5 INFORMATION BULLETIN**

- Attachments:
1. Minutes for Arts Advisory Group 13 November 2024 
  2. Unconfirmed Minutes Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group 28 November 2024 
  3. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 28 November 2024 
  4. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Catalina Regional Council Meeting held on 5 December 2024 
  5. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting - 12 December 2024 
  6. Unconfirmed Catalina Regional Council Special Council Meeting Minutes - 19 December 2024 
  7. Minutes for Arts Advisory Group Meeting 7 August 2024 
  8. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of December 2024 
  9. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
  10. Register of Legal Action - Orders and Notices Quarterly - Confidential
  11. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 6 February 2025 
  12. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
  13. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
  14. Quarterly Street Tree Removal Information 
  15. Register of Petitions - Progress Report February 2025 
  16. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - February 2025 
  17. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - February 2025 
  18. Council Workshop Items since 17 November 2024 
  19. Council Briefing Notes - 10 December 2024 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated February 2025.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.5**


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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

**REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION****10.1 COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (CSRFF) APPLICATION - NORTH PERTH TENNIS CLUB FEMALE AND ACCESSIBLE AMENITIES UPGRADE**

**Attachments:**

1. North Perth Tennis Club - Draft Grant Application - Confidential
2. North Perth Tennis Club - Female and Accessible Amenities Drawing 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **ENDORSES** the proposal from North Perth Tennis Club to upgrade its female and accessible amenities; and
2. **APPROVES** the inclusion of \$9,983.33 (ex GST) for North Perth Tennis Club female and accessible amenity upgrade on the 2025/2026 budget, subject to confirmation of the required financial contribution through external grant funding and North Perth Tennis Club, and the submission of the grant application to the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1**

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

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

#### 9.4 ADVERTISING OF THE DRAFT BEAUFORT STREET TOWN CENTRE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Attachments: 1. Draft Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework 

#### RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. PREPARES the draft Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework as included as 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*;
2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the draft Beaufort Street Planning Framework in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
3. NOTES that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

#### AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the Recommendation 1 be amended as follows:

1. PREPARES the draft Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework as included as 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*, **subject to the following:**

**Attachment 1 being modified:**

- 1.1 Throughout the document modifying all references to the term “maximum building height” to “Community Benefit height”; and
- 1.2 Throughout the document modifying all references to building height to be as follows:
  - Uptown, Midtown and Downtown sub-precincts – An acceptable height of 8 storeys unless a Strategic Development Site; and
  - Urban Frame A sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 3 storeys; and
  - Urban Frame B sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 6 storeys; and
  - Strategic Development Sites – An acceptable height of 8 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 16 storeys.

#### REASON:

Modifying the terminology from ‘maximum’ building height would provide flexibility for future decision-makers to consider a proposal that may go above this but is an innovative development that would benefit the community.

There are current construction market challenges that would impact on the likelihood of redevelopment occurring. Increasing building heights on Strategic Development sites of up to 16 storeys would respond to these and encourage high quality redevelopment to occur to support greater housing diversity and enhance the vibrancy of the Beaufort Street Town Centre.

Increasing the building heights now would give an opportunity for Council to consider community feedback on this before it makes a decision on the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration supports this amendment.

'Community Benefit' Terminology

The use of 'Community Benefit height' would reflect the construct of the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework where a proposal can exceed the acceptable height subject to providing community benefits.

Irrespective of the terminology used the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework is a local planning policy and a decision-maker could approve an application which exceeds the 'Community Benefit height' standard if it meets the relevant policy objectives.

Increasing Building Heights for Strategic Development Sites

The proposed increase to the maximum building heights for Strategic Development Sites would be in keeping with the intent to facilitate the amalgamation of sites to provide for consolidated redevelopment, and to provide taller buildings on larger sites where off-site impacts could be better managed.

The building heights were informed from feedback received during preliminary engagement with the community and the Design Review. Because of this it would be important to consult with the community as part of the formal advertising period on whether we have got the building height standards right.

Council would have the opportunity to consider any submissions received before it makes a decision on whether or not to approve the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework. This would give Council an opportunity to modify the building heights based on feedback at that time.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-1)**

**For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace and Cr Greer

**Against:** Cr La Fontaine

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4**

1. **PREPARES** the draft Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework as included as 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*, subject to the following:

Attachment 1 being modified:










- 1.1 Throughout the document modifying all references to the term "maximum building height" to "Community Benefit height"; and
- 1.2 Throughout the document modifying all references to building height to be as follows:
  - Uptown, Midtown and Downtown sub-precincts – An acceptable height of 8 storeys unless a Strategic Development Site; and
  - Urban Frame A sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 3 storeys; and
  - Urban Frame B sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 6 storeys; and
  - Strategic Development Sites – An acceptable height of 8 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 16 storeys.

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**9.1 NO. 173 (LOT: 7; D/P: 867) OXFORD STREET, LEEDERVILLE - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM SMALL BAR TO TAVERN INCLUDING ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS****Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Acoustic Report 
  4. Transport Impact Statement 
  5. Venue Management Plan 
  6. Summary of Submissions - Administrations Response 
  7. Summary of Submissions - Applicants Response 
  8. Clause 67 Assessment 
  9. 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 a proposed Change of Use from Small Bar to Tavern including Additions and Alterations at No. 173 (Lot: 7; D/P: 867) Oxford Street, Leederville in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 9:

**1. Development Approval**

This approval relates to a Change of Use from Small Bar to Tavern including Additions and Alterations as shown on the approved plans dated 15 January 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

**2. Use of Premises**

2.1 This approval is for a Tavern as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2. The use of the subject land for any other land use may require further approval from the City;

2.2 The hours of operation of the Tavern shall be limited to:

- 6:00am to 12:00am Monday to Saturday
- 6:00am to 10:00pm Sunday;

2.3 The Tavern shall be limited to a maximum of 200 patrons and 8 staff at any one time;

**3. Acoustic Report and Noise Management**

3.1 All operational measures, recommendations and construction specifications outlined approved acoustic report (Acoustic Engineering Solutions, dated 29 October 2024) shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development the subject of this approval, and maintained thereafter, to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers. This includes the rear garden roof that should be constructed in accordance with the materials and specifications as detailed within Figure 4 of the Acoustic Report, to the satisfaction of the City;

3.2 The Tavern shall operate in accordance with operational scenarios and recommendations of the approved Acoustic Report at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

**4. Venue Management**

The premises shall operate in accordance with the approved Venue Management Plan dated 13 January 2025 at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;



**5. Façade Design**

- 5.1 Doors and windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Oxford Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with the street, to the satisfaction of the City;
- 5.2 Glazing and/or tinting shall have a minimum of 70 percent visible light transmission to provide unobscured visibility between the street and the interior of the tenancy, to the satisfaction of the City;
- 5.3 Internal security and privacy treatments shall be located and installed internally behind the glazing line or recessed, and shall be transparent and visually permeable to allow views inside the building and enable internal light sources to be seen from the street, to the satisfaction of the City;

**6. Landscaping**

All landscaping shown in the approved plans shall be undertaken prior to occupancy or use of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

**7. Bicycle Facilities**

A minimum of six long-term bicycle bays shall be provided on-site and designed in accordance with AS2890.3 prior to the occupation or use of the development the subject of this approval and maintained thereafter, to the satisfaction of the City; and

**8. 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.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1**

**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Worner**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (8-1)**

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

**Against:** Cr Alexander

**9.5 ADVERTISING OF THE DRAFT WILLIAM STREET PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

- Attachments:
1. Draft William Street Planning Framework 
  2. Review of Central Perth Design Policies and New Northbridge Design Guidelines 

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

1. PREPARES the draft William Street Planning Framework as included in 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*;
2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the draft William Street Planning Framework in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
3. PREPARES a notice of proposed revocation of the New Northbridge Design Guidelines and Central Perth Development Policies, for the purpose of community consultation pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 6 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
4. NOTES that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

**AMENDMENT**

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the Recommendation 1 be amended as follows:

1. PREPARES the draft William Street Planning Framework as included as 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*, **subject to the following:**

**Attachment 1 being modified:**

1. Throughout the document modifying all references to the term “maximum building height” to “Community Benefit height”; and
2. Throughout the document modifying all references to building height to be as follows:
  - William Core and Newcastle Street sub-precincts – An acceptable height of 8 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 9 storeys unless a Strategic Development Site;
  - Urban Frame A sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 6 storeys;
  - Urban Frame B sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 4 storeys;
  - William Street North sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 5 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 7 storeys;
  - Residential sub-precinct – As per R Codes;
  - City Toyota Strategic Development Site – A Community Benefit height of 20 storeys;
  - William Street Car Park Strategic Development Site – A Community Benefit height of 20 storeys; and
  - Other Strategic Development Sites greater than 1,000 square metres – A Community Benefit height of 16 storeys.

**REASON:**

Modifying the terminology from 'maximum' building height would provide flexibility for future decision-makers to consider a proposal that may go above this but is an innovative development that would benefit the community.

There are current construction market challenges that would impact on the likelihood of redevelopment occurring. Increasing building heights on Strategic Development sites to up to 16 storeys and 20 storeys on the City Toyota and William Street Carpark sites would respond to these and encourage high quality redevelopment to occur to support greater housing diversity and enhance the vibrancy of the William Street Town Centre.

Increasing the building heights now would give an opportunity for Council to consider community feedback on this before it makes a decision on the William Street Planning Framework.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration supports this amendment.

'Community Benefit' Terminology

The use of 'Community Benefit height' would reflect the construct of the William Street Planning Framework where a proposal can exceed the acceptable height subject to providing community benefits.

Irrespective of the terminology used the William Street Planning Framework is a local planning policy and a decision-maker could approve an application which exceeds the 'Community Benefit height standard if it meets the relevant policy objectives.

Increasing Building Heights for Strategic Development Sites

The proposed increase to the maximum building heights for Strategic Development Sites and the City Toyota and William Street Carpark sites would be in keeping with the intent to facilitate the amalgamation of sites to provide for consolidated redevelopment, and to provide taller buildings on larger sites where off-site impacts could be better managed.

The building heights were informed from feedback received during preliminary engagement with the community and the Design Review. Because of this it would be important to consult with the community as part of the formal advertising period on whether we have got the building height standards right.

Council would have the opportunity to consider any submissions received before it makes a decision on whether or not to approve the William Street Planning Framework. This would give Council an opportunity to modify the building heights based on feedback at that time.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-1)**

**For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace and Cr Greer

**Against:** Cr La Fontaine

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5**

1. PREPARES the draft William Street Planning Framework as included as 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*, subject to the following:

Attachment 1 being modified:

1. Throughout the document modifying all references to the term “maximum building height” to “Community Benefit height”; and
2. Throughout the document modifying all references to building height to be as follows:
  - William Core and Newcastle Street sub-precincts – An acceptable height of 8 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 9 storeys unless a Strategic Development Site;
  - Urban Frame A sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 6 storeys;
  - Urban Frame B sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 4 storeys;
  - William Street North sub-precinct – An acceptable height of 5 storeys and a Community Benefit height of 7 storeys;
  - Residential sub-precinct – As per R Codes;
  - City Toyota Strategic Development Site – A Community Benefit height of 20 storeys;
  - William Street Car Park Strategic Development Site – A Community Benefit height of 20 storeys; and
  - Other Strategic Development Sites greater than 1,000 square metres – A Community Benefit height of 16 storeys.

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

At 7.22pm The A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

**9.3 PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 AND REVIEW OF LOCAL PLANNING POLICY: SHORT TERM ACCOMMODATION**

- Attachments:
1. Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 
  2. Short Term Rental Accommodation Local Planning Policy 
  3. Review of Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. PREPARES Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as included in Attachment 1 for the purposes of community consultation, pursuant to section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
2. CONSIDERS Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to be a standard amendment pursuant to Clause 35 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* as the amendment:
  - Would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not subject to the amendment;
  - Would be consistent with the intent of the Urban zone under the Metropolitan Region Scheme to provide for a range of commercial activities;
  - Would not result in significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area;
  - Would be consistent with Planning Bulletin 115/2024 which states that if a scheme amendment introduces or changes permissibility for new short-term rental and traditional accommodation uses, it will be generally progressed as a standard amendment; and
  - Is not considered a complex or basic amendment;
3. SUBMITS Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to the Western Australian Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Minister for Planning to approve the proposed amendment for advertising pursuant to Clause 46B of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
4. Subject to receiving approval from the Minister for Planning PROCEEDS to advertise Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 pursuant to Clause 47(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulations 2015*;
5. PREPARES a notice of amendment for Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation as modified and included in Attachment 2 for the purpose of advertising, pursuant to Schedule 2, Clauses 5 and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
6. NOTES that:
  - In accordance with Section 81(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 is not required to be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority.

This is because it is an amendment to include or alter a definition of a land use category that would not materially impact the operation of the planning scheme. The proposed amendments would replace existing short-term rental accommodation land use definitions and would not have effect on the substantive nature or operation of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2;
  - Public notice of Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation will be undertaken concurrently; and
  - Any submissions received during the advertising period for Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation would be presented to Council for consideration.

**Moved:** Cr Greer, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

### **AMENDMENT 1**

**Moved:** Cr Greer, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That Recommendation 5 be amended as follows:

5. PREPARES a notice of amendment for Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation as modified and included in Attachment 2 for the purpose of advertising, pursuant to Schedule 2, Clauses 5 and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* subject to the following:

5.1 A new Clause 2.1 being included in Attachment 2 to read as follows:

2.1 **Cumulative Nights**

2.1.1 Shall not operate for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.

5.2 The remaining clauses being renumbered accordingly.

#### **REASON:**

Limiting the number of nights a property can be used as Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation would increase the opportunity for long-term rentals. This would also minimise the amount of time that anti-social behaviour and noise disturbances associated with poorly managed short-term accommodation would impact on neighbouring properties.

#### **ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration does not support the amendment.

This is because the appropriate location and management of Unhosted Short-Term Accommodation is important to minimising impacts on residential amenity irrespective of the number of nights that it operates.

The draft Policy provides for stricter controls to guide the location of this use and to minimise anti-social behaviour. This includes minimum night stay over the weekend, limiting the number of guests, and limiting the number and timing of visitors.

#### **AMENDMENT CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**AMENDMENT 2****Moved:** Cr Greer, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That Recommendation 5 be amended as follows:

1. PREPARES a notice of amendment for Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation as modified and included in Attachment 2 for the purpose of advertising, pursuant to Schedule 2, Clauses 5 and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* subject to the following:

**5.3 Amend Attachment 2 at Time Limited Approvals to read as follows:**

**Any approval for Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation will be limited to an initial period of 12 months in accordance with Clause 72 of Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.**

**A development application can be lodged upon lapse of the planning approval, where any further time limited approval would be at the discretion of the City.**

**REASON:**

Limiting approvals to an initial 12 month period would allow for the continued monitoring of whether the management measures are suitable in minimising disturbances and amenity impacts on surrounding properties and residents.

Following the 12 month period, operators could reapply which would give the City an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of management measures and the suitability of the land use long-term.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration does not support this amendment.

Within the planning framework time-limited approvals are typically used to allow unique or unusual land uses to operate for a period of time to demonstrate its suitability in a location. Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation is not an uncommon use and a blanket time limited approval period for all proposals would be unreasonable.

In recognition that there can be off-site impacts from this use, Administration has strengthened the draft Policy to include stricter locational criteria to ensure that Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation is directed towards areas with existing activity and away from traditional suburban settings and sensitive uses.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3**

That Council:

1. PREPARES Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as included in Attachment 1 for the purposes of community consultation, pursuant to section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
2. CONSIDERS Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to be a standard amendment pursuant to Clause 35 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* as the amendment:
  - Would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not subject to the amendment;
  - Would be consistent with the intent of the Urban zone under the Metropolitan Region Scheme to provide for a range of commercial activities;
  - Would not result in significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area;
  - Would be consistent with Planning Bulletin 115/2024 which states that if a scheme amendment introduces or changes permissibility for new short-term rental and traditional accommodation uses, it will be generally progressed as a standard amendment; and
  - Is not considered a complex or basic amendment;
3. SUBMITS Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to the Western Australian Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Minister for Planning to approve the proposed amendment for advertising pursuant to Clause 46B of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
4. Subject to receiving approval from the Minister for Planning PROCEEDS to advertise Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 pursuant to Clause 47(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulations 2015*;
5. PREPARES a notice of amendment for Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation as modified and included in Attachment 2 for the purpose of advertising, pursuant to Schedule 2, Clauses 5 and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* subject to the following:
  - 5.1 A new Clause 2.1 being included in Attachment 2 to read as follows:
    - 2.1 Cumulative Nights
      - 2.1.2 Shall not operate for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.
  - 5.2 The remaining clauses being renumbered accordingly.
  - 5.3 Amend Attachment 2 at Time Limited Approvals to read as follows:

Any approval for Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation will be limited to an initial period of 12 months in accordance with Clause 72 of Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

A development application can be lodged upon lapse of the planning approval, where any further time limited approval would be at the discretion of the City.



## 6. NOTES that:

- In accordance with Section 81(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 is not required to be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority.

This is because it is an amendment to include or alter a definition of a land use category that would not materially impact the operation of the planning scheme. The proposed amendments would replace existing short-term rental accommodation land use definitions and would not have effect on the substantive nature or operation of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2;

- Public notice of Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation will be undertaken concurrently; and
- Any submissions received during the advertising period for Amendment No. 13 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation would be presented to Council for consideration.

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**9.6 RESPONSE TO PETITION - WILLIAM STREET TOWN CENTRE PUBLIC ARTWORK COMMISSION**

- Attachments:
1. Arts Rebound: Town Centre Artwork EOI 
  2. Arts Rebound: Town Centre Artworks Brief 
  3. Arts Rebound: William Street Town Centre Concept Design Proposals - Panel Assessment - Confidential
  4. Globe Information Pack - Confidential

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. NOTES the response to the petition;
2. RESOLVES not to proceed with the artwork in the current approved location; and
3. REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer investigate alternate locations for the artwork and present a report back to Council by June 2025.

**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:

1. NOTES the response to the petition;
2. RESOLVES not to proceed with the artwork in the current approved location; and
3. REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer investigate alternate locations for the artwork and present a report back to Council by June 2025.
4. RECEIVES a project closure report following practical completion which includes:
  - Outline of the EOI process including conception and assessment for this project and how this can be improved for future projects.
  - Identify a process to obtain Engineering feedback and assess key services; and
  - Identify an approach for the accurate assessment of proposed projects before financial commitments are made and executed.

**REASON:**

Two artworks were commissioned for \$200,000 worth of ratepayer funds in 2021. In February 2025, neither have been delivered. A review of the processes is required to establish what issues have arisen and how they can be avoided in the future so that Vincent can pursue its objective to be the *Arts Capital of Perth* and be responsible and diligent with community funding.

**ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Council at its meeting [14 December 2021](#) endorsed the updated City of Vincent Project Management

Framework 2021.

The Framework includes four key steps:

1. Initiation
2. Project Planning
3. Project Delivery
4. Project Completion.

At step 4 project owners are required to complete a Project Closure and Lessons Learned template. This is an opportunity to present what worked well and what could be improved, so the City can benefit from what was learned on the project. The Project Closure report is signed off by the relevant Manager and Director before being tabled at an Executive Management Committee meeting. Given this project is currently in step 3 'Project Delivery' it would be most appropriate to present the requested report at step 4 'Project Completion'.



**AMENDMENT CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.6**

**That Council:**

1. **NOTES** the response to the petition;
2. **RESOLVES** not to proceed with the artwork in the current approved location; and
3. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer investigate alternate locations for the artwork and present a report back to Council by June 2025.
4. **RECEIVES** a project closure report following practical completion which includes:
  - **Outline of the EOI process including conception and assessment for this project and how this can be improved for future projects.**
  - **Identify a process to obtain Engineering feedback and assess key services; and**
  - **Identify an approach for the accurate assessment of proposed projects before financial commitments are made and executed.**

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

Against: Nil

**10.2 RFT IE371/2024 LEVEL 1, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING HVAC RENEWAL****Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE371-2024 - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE371/2024 Administration Building Level 1 HVAC Upgrade; and**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Grosvenor Engineering Group Pty Ltd for Tender IE371/2024 Administration Building Level 1 HVAC Upgrade.**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2****Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (9-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil

At 7.59pm The Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance left the meeting and did not return.

**10.3 RFT IE360/2024 ASBESTOS REMOVAL AND ENCAPSULATION BPLC GRANDSTAND****Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT 1E360-2024 - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE360/2024 Asbestos removal and Encapsulation, and ACCEPTS the tender submission of Kilmore Group Pty Ltd to undertake and deliver Option 1 - (Encapsulate the existing contaminated window mastic material internal and external);**
- 2. APPROVES by Absolute Majority, the sum of \$931,648.09 to be funded through the Mid-Year Budget Review to enable remediation works to be commenced; and**
- 3. NOTES this project will be delivered over the 2024/25 and 2025/26 financial years. This work makes the grandstand safe in terms of asbestos. Additional work is required for the grandstand to be made accessible to the general public which is not within this current scope of work.**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.3****Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil

At 8:04pm The Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:05pm The Manager City Buildings and Asset Management left the meeting and did not return (online).

**12.1 APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORAL COMMISSIONER TO CONDUCT THE CITY OF VINCENT ORDINARY ELECTION 18 OCTOBER 2025****TRIM Ref:** D24/131058**Author:** Emma Simmons, Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance**Authoriser:** David MacLennan, Chief Executive Officer**Attachments:**

1. Letter from WA Electoral Commissioner dated 12 December 2024 - conduct of City's 2025 ordinary election 
2. Written Agreement from WA Electoral Commission to conduct 2025 election 

**RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

1. **APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**, in accordance with:
  - 1.1 section 4.20(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the ordinary election, together with any other elections or polls which may also be required; **AND**
  - 1.2 section 4.61(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, that the method of conducting the 2025 ordinary election will be as a Postal election; and
2. **NOTES** that the estimated cost of the Electoral Commissioner conducting the City's 2025 ordinary election by postal vote is \$137,678 (including GST).

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1****Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil

**12.4 RESPONSES TO MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD ON 11 DECEMBER 2024**

TRIM Ref: D25/1602

Authors: Joslin Colli, Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance

Mitchell Hoad, A/Manager Strategic Planning

Tim Elliott, Senior Strategic Planner

Rhianna Waugh, Specialist Sustainability Advisor

Authoriser: David MacLennan, Chief Executive Officer

Attachments: 1. Annual General Meeting of Electors - 11 December 2024 Minutes **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **NOTES** and **ENDORSES** the following recommendations provided by Administration to the General Business motions carried at the Annual Meeting of Electors held on Wednesday 11 December 2024 for the reasons outlined in the report:

**1. Motion 4.2 – Scheme Amendment – That Council **NOTES**:**

- Community consultation on proposed amendments to Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance will conclude on 13 February 2025 pursuant to its resolution from its meeting on 10 December 2024. The outcomes of community consultation would be presented to a future meeting by mid-2025;
- The review of Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance is one part of Administration's broader approach to improving tree canopy on private land. Other measures would include a further review of planning controls in the City's local planning framework, investigation of financial and non-financial incentives, community education and awareness, and advocacy to the State Government; and
- If ultimately approved by Council, Administration would continue to monitor the implementation of an amended Policy No. 7.6.3 – Trees of Significance as part of this broader approach to tree protection.

**2. Motion 4.3****(1) Gas Appliances (Residential) – That Council **NOTES**:**

- There is currently no legislative ability for the City to ban gas connections for new residential development or to require removal in existing residences. Any change to this would be required to be made by the State Government; and
- Administration is currently investigating opportunities to promote electrification within the local planning framework through a review of Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form and 7.5.10 – Sustainable Design. This review would be presented to Council by mid-2025 prior to undertaking community consultation.

**(2) Gas Appliances (Businesses) – That Council **NOTES**:**

- There is currently no legislative ability for the City to ban gas connections for new businesses or to require removal in existing businesses. Any change to this would be required to be made by the State Government; and
- Administration is currently investigating opportunities to promote electrification within the local planning framework through a review of Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form and 7.5.10 – Sustainable Design. This review would be presented to Council by mid-2025 prior to undertaking community consultation.



**(3) Gas Appliances (Incentives)** – That Council NOTES Administration is currently investigating opportunities to incentivise electrification as part of the GreenTrack program through the review of Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form and 7.5.10 – Sustainable Design that will be progressed in 2025, and the Climate Transition Adaption Plan that is scheduled to be developed in 2025/26.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4**

**Moved:** Cr Greer, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

At 8:06pm Cr La Fontaine left the chamber.

At 8:09pm Cr La Fontaine returned to the chamber.

At 8:10pm The A/Manager Strategic Planning left the meeting and did not return.

**13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN****13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - MAYOR XAMON - ANIMAL LOCAL LAW - CAT CONTAINMENT**

That Council REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to:

1. Seek further additional external legal advice on whether cat containment provisions are currently enabled within the *Cat Act 2011*;
2. Request that the State Government bring forward the review of the *Cat Act 2011* to include provisions to enable Local Governments to enact Local Laws with cat containment provisions;
3. Present this advice to Council for consideration to go out for consultation on whether the Animal Local Law 2022 should be amended accordingly; and
4. Consider further consultation on amending the Animal Local 2022 to include provisions for cat containment, pending the additional external legal advice received.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.1**

**Moved: Mayor Xamon, Seconded: Cr Castle**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**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****COUNCIL DECISION****Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Woolf****PROCEDURAL MOTION**

Pursuant to Section 5.23(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and clause 2.14 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, proceeds “behind closed doors” at the conclusion of the items, to consider the confidential reports.

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

At 8:24pm the livestream was paused to consider Item 17.1 Appointment of Executive Director Strategy & Development.

At 8:24pm Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:24pm Executive Director Community & Business Services left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:24pm A/Executive Director Strategy & Development left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:24pm Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance left the meeting and did not return. .

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

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

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

At 8:32pm after consideration of Item 17.1 the livestream recommenced and the Presiding Member, Mayor Xamon, advised of the below decision, as carried behind closed doors.

#### **17.1 APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT**

##### **COUNCIL DECISION 17.1**

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

That Council, pursuant to section 5.37(2) of the Local Government Act 1995, **ACCEPTS** the recommendation of the Chief Executive Officer to employ the preferred candidate, Mr Jay Naidoo, as the City's Executive Director Strategy and Development on a five-year (5) contract of employment, subject to the terms and conditions as determined by the Chief Executive Officer.

**CARRIED (9-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**18 CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 8:33pm with the following persons present:

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>Mayor Alison Xamon</b>	<b>Presiding Member</b>
	<b>Cr Alex Castle</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ron Alexander</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Suzanne Worner</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Nicole Woolf</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Jonathan Hallett</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashley Wallace</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Sophie Greer</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<b>David MacLennan</b>	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
	<b>Carrie Miller</b>	<b>Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance Officer</b>
<b>Public:</b>	No members of the public.	

These Minutes were confirmed at the 11 March 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council Meeting (Ordinary and Special) held on 11 February 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated