



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

11 March 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country.....	3
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence	3
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	4
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice.....	6
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	10
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	11
6	Confirmation of Minutes	11
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	11
	7.1 State Elections	11
8	Declarations of Interest	12
	Reports	12
	Items Approved " <i>En Bloc</i> ":	13
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 31 January 2025.....	15
	11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 January 2025 to 31 January 2025	17
	11.3 Investment Report as at 31 January 2025	18
	12.2 Advertising of Amended Execution of Documents Policy	19
	12.4 Report and Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting held on 26 February 2025	20
	12.5 Information Bulletin	22
	Reports with Discussion.....	23
	9.1 Outcome of Advertising - Revocation of Policy No. 7.6.9 - Heritage Assistance Fund	23
	11.5 Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amendments to Community Funding Policy	24
	9.2 Road Dedication of Various Rights of Way.....	25
	11.4 Mid Year Budget Review 2024/25 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	26
	12.3 National General Assembly of Local Government (NGA) 2025: Elected Member Proposed Attendance & 40km/h speed zone motion.....	27
	17.1 Unsolicited Bid for the Acquisition of Land	28
	12.1 Management Order for Portion of Western Power's Vacated Mount Claremont Depot – WITHDRAWN BY ADMINISTRATION.....	29
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....	30
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....	30
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	30
16	Urgent Business	30
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	30
18	Closure	30

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

PRESENT:	<p>Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ashley Wallace</p> <p>Cr Sophie Greer Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</p>	<p>Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward (arrived at 6.02pm during Item 3A) South Ward South Ward</p>
IN ATTENDANCE:	<p>David MacLennan Peter Varris</p> <p>Rhys Taylor</p> <p>Jay Naidoo</p> <p>John Corbellini Mitchell Hoad Lisa Williams</p> <p>Joslin Colli</p> <p>Emma Simmons</p> <p>Wendy Barnard</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development Director Major Projects A/Manager Strategic Planning Executive Manager Communications & Engagement (Left at 6.27pm after Item 11.5) Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support</p>
Public:	Approximately four 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 asked at the meeting. Statements will not be transcribed.

3.1 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

I would like to query the City of Vincent expenditure on legal services in the 2023/24 financial year, specifically:

1. The total amount spent engaging legal advice from Denis McLeod and other legal professionals or firms on a general retainer used by the City; and
2. The number of lawyers currently sitting on legal panels with retainer agreements with the City of Vincent.

Her full statement can be heard [here](#).

3.2 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 9.1 and 11.5

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

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

Christopher Hilton of Perth

I am asking for the following to be tabled at tonight's council meeting. This is in response to your reply to my questions from the council meeting on 11 February 2025. As the City has indicated in its response to my questions that the City of Vincent has no safety measures in place and is relying on the contractor to ensure it manages its own safety measures.

I have attached photos of your contractors at work with no safety measures in place. I have video evidence that I am happy to provide the council for your next council meeting if you would like more information. Please advise me if you would like me to provide that video evidence, approximately 15 minutes long. If not, why do you not want it?

Can you please inform me if the council is going to investigate this matter and if the council is going to recommend changes to its safety policies regarding this matter?

Regarding the issue of working over the top of parked vehicles, what safety measures do you have in place? In your response to my questions, you have stated that the contractors do not undertake pruning of trees with a car park underneath unless the pruning is minor with small leafy vegetation. I would say that's a lie and I have photos and video evidence to prove it.

Can the City of Vincent inform me what safety measures your contractor has in place before it conducts work above parked vehicles? I would think that your contractor does not have any safety measures in place, including their SWMS, JSA, or any other safety measures.

Will the City of Vincent council be investigating what safety measures the contractor has in place when working above parked vehicles? Who is responsible for determining what you call soft foliage? What law allows the City of Vincent to employ contractors to touch, clean, or use commercial blowers on the general public's personal property, such as a vehicle?

Photographic evidence uploaded separately.

Dudley Maier of Highgate -

1. Under LPS2 Woodville Reserve is shown as “Restricted Public Open Space”. Most other ‘parks’ are simply shown as ‘public open space’ without the ‘restricted’ refinement. What are the ‘restricted’ uses that can be contemplated on Woodville Reserve?
2. Can you confirm that the Public Open Space Strategy 2018 shows one of the tasks for Woodville Reserve to be ‘*maximising the potential for additional green space*’ and that was given a ‘short’ timeframe?
3. Why has the Public Open Space Strategy 2018 been removed from the City’s web site given that the strategy has not been replaced.
4. The prop to move the city’s depot from Osbourne Park to Mount Claremont has with it some quantifiable costs, in particular the loss of productivity due to employees having to travel further to get from the depot to work sites in Vincent. When asked about this in April 2024, and mentioning the possibility of a ‘virtual depot’ for employees to start work from, the administration stated that ‘*these [costs] are unknown at this stage*’. Has the administration subsequently identified the possible annual cost due to lost productivity? If so, what numbers were used for: the number of employees affected, the daily lost hours per employee, the hourly cost per employee, and the total annual cost?
5. Council recently approved a change to the Greentrack Program to allow a \$200 reduction in Development Application fees for retaining ‘significant trees’. However, this change did not define what is meant by ‘retain’.
 - If I have a ‘significant tree’ at the front of my block and am only proposing changes at the back of my block, will I receive the \$200 reduction for retaining the tree?
 - If I have a ‘significant tree’ near the rear boundary of my block and am proposing development close to the house, say 10metre from the tree, will I receive a \$200 reduction for retaining the tree?
 - If I have a ‘significant tree’ close to the existing building, in a place that clashes with a proposed addition, do the staff think that a \$200 incentive will be sufficient to outweigh re-design or extra development costs?
 - If a person receives a fee reduction, will it be contingent upon them agreeing to add the tree to the ‘significant tree list’, thereby locking them into the provisions of LPS2?
 - What penalties, if any, will a person receive if they receive a fee reduction but subsequently remove the tree?
6. In developing the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework (BSTCPF) the City intended to hold a ‘Character and streetscape walkshop’ on 8 June 2024. Why was this walkshop cancelled and not subsequently held?
7. The list of ‘Closed Tenders’ on the City’s web site generally shows estimated expenditure over a time period if the tender is a rates based tender (e.g. \$3,000,000 over three years for IE318/2024 – pruning street trees; or \$1,000,000 over 5 years for IE269/2023 – plumbing and gas maintenance). However, no such amount or time period is shown for Tender IE216/2022 – Traffic Management Services. Why is the amount and time period not shown for this tender, and what are the amount and time period?
8. The administration previously recommended selling the Monmouth Street Reserve, but this was rejected by council, and at the OMC of 8 February 2022 (over three years ago!) the council approved the implementation of eco-zoning at the reserve with \$10,000 already on the 2021/22 budget. \$9,916 was carried forward to the 2022/23 budget. \$8,136 was carried forward to the 2023/24 budget. And \$8,136 was carried forward to the 2024/25 budget.

This item has been on four consecutive capital budgets, yet the Council’s approval has not been implemented, and locals have not seen even the most basic of improvements implemented (i.e. two seats).

The current capital works plan shows that the administration, once again, is trying to sell the reserve. One interpretation could be that the administration has simply stalled implementing council's decision in the hope that a new council will go back on the previous decision, and that the administration has used issues to do with an adjoining fence as a stalling technique. Why didn't the administration implement council's decision of February 2022 given that the money has been on the budget for four years?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 8 April 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.06pm.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Administration responses are in italics below:

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?

Yes, the 'Assessment Process' section of the Built Form Policy explains how it operates and its relationship to the R Codes.

In relation to Single Houses and Grouped Dwellings, the R Codes Volume 1 allows local governments to provide local housing objectives to guide judgements for residential developments where there are no requirements provided for.

The Built Form Policy provides for local housing objectives to guide environmentally sustainable design outcomes, which is not covered by the R Codes for single houses and grouped dwellings. This is outlined on Page 10 of the Built Form Policy.

The WAPC's approval is not required for local housing objectives.

The Built Form Policy provides for Acceptable Outcomes in relation to energy efficiency that seek to replace those of the R Codes Volume 2 for Multiple Dwellings and Mixed Use developments. These Acceptable Outcomes would require the approval of the WAPC before they can be applied. This is set out on Page 18 of the Built Form 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?

The start of each section of the Built Form Policy includes a table showing its relationship to the R Codes. Provisions needing WAPC approval are marked with an asterisk, corresponding to references on pages 13 and 18.

- When was the requirement for a LCA as part of the Built Form policy endorsed by Council?

Council approved the Built Form Policy on 13 December 2016 which included local housing objectives that would apply to all development that is subject to the R Codes. These local housing objectives set out that development is to demonstrate the environment performance of the development through an LCA. These local housing objectives were maintained when Amendment No. 2 to the Built Form Policy was approved by Council on 16 June 2020.

- When was the requirement for a LCA as part of the Built Form policy submitted to the WAPC for approval?

The Built Form Policy was submitted to the WAPC for approval on 11 September 2020.

- 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?

The Built Form Policy is the only document that references the need for WAPC approval for requiring an LCA. This is only in relation to Multiple Dwellings and Mixed Use developments as set out in the response to Question 1.

- 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?

No, because the City promotes best-practice environmental sustainability but does ¹not mandate applicants to submit an LCA with their development application. Applications for Single Houses and Grouped Dwellings are assessed and accepted without an LCA. The GreenTrack initiative, which includes the submission of an LCA and development application fee reduction, is entirely voluntary and aims to incentivise environmentally sustainable design choices.

- 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?

No, the City seeks to provide clear and accessible information to all applicants, regardless of their experience or familiarity with the planning system. The requirement for an LCA only applies to those who voluntarily choose to lodge through the GreenTrack pathway, and the City ensures that both developers and first-time applicants understand their options. Applicants are encouraged to seek clarification if they have any questions about the process, ensuring they are fully informed before submitting any documents.

- 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?

No, the inclusion of LCA provisions in the Built Form Policy reflects Council's adopted position on sustainability. This approach ensures transparency and accuracy about the City's policy position on environmental sustainability while awaiting WAPC approval. If the WAPC does not approve these provisions, the Built Form Policy will be updated accordingly.

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?

The foreshore land that was fenced within the Development WA site comprises approximately 60% DevWA land and approximately 40% crown land (that would otherwise fall under the City's control and management). The City has been in negotiation with DevWA for over twelve months to access all the land to provide increased community access to the foreshore. Council has been kept informed of the proposal, which was also supported in writing by the Minister for Lands dated 24 March 2024. The City has progressed works with in principle agreement of DevWA and assurance that the lease would proceed.

¹ Word added

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?

The fuel card monthly payments report complies with the requirements of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 and guidance provided by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries.

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?

The City obtained legal advice from Mcleods Lawyers at a cost of \$599.50 (ex GST).

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?

The agreed contract is based on the known project deliverables. Sound project management plans for the unexpected and in a project of this scale and at a site of this age it is prudent to plan 5-10% contingency.

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?

The cost of the footings was not explicitly stated.

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?

Yes.

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;

All property owners in the first project area were sent a letter. In total 1,664 letters were sent on 4 November 2024 with a follow up letter sent on 29 November 2024 to those who hadn't responded.

- how many replied;

A total of 1,104 responses have been received.

- how many of those who replied chose to pay up-front;

Of the responses received 607 (55%) have elected to pay up front.

- how many chose other options;

The remaining 497 who responded have elected for the 4 year option.

- how many owners, who did not reply, will be required to pay up front?

As outlined on both the underground power service charges letter sent, if a response is not received for a property, the property owner will be charged the full amount on their rates notice in July 2025. There are currently 560 properties who haven't responded to the letter.

The City will contact pensioners and seniors with a health care card once again to give them the option of the 4 year pay back period.

The responses received will help inform the amount of borrowings included in the Annual Budget 2025/26.

Reece Harley of Perth

1. During the 2023/2024 Financial year what was the total Capital Expenditure of the City?

\$14,751,638

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

S6.10 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires that separate ward accounts are not to be kept and that the local government is to have regard to the needs of the district as a whole.

Further details of the 4 Year Capital works program can be found in the City's Corporate Business Plan available on the City's website.

3. Please provide a summary of the property rates derived by Council during the 2023/2024 Financial year by postcode of the rateable property.

Please see response to question 2.

Further details of rates revenue can be found in the City's Annual Report 2023/2024 available on the City's website.

4. If these figures are not yet available for the 2023/2024 financial year, please provide them for the previous financial year.

Please refer to responses above.

Christopher Hilton of Perth

I have some questions regarding the City 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 shows 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.

The City of Vincent contracts out all street tree pruning which is carried out on an annual basis predominantly to clear vegetation from Western Power assets and ensure safe access for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

The City's tree pruning contractor are required to provide the City with detailed information specific to the works they are conducting including traffic management plans, Safe Work Method Statements, Job Safety Analysis, site-specific risk assessments, and any other necessary documentation to ensure the job is completed safely.

The City conduct regular site audits and hold meetings with our contractors to address any issues that may arise. The safety documentation provided by the contractor to the City is reviewed to ensure it is compliant and relates specifically to the works they are completing. These documents are the property of the contractor and are considered confidential.

Undertaking the annual street tree pruning program is a complex process owing to the traffic management requirements and ongoing issues of parked cars on road and verges. Contractors do not undertake pruning of a tree with a car parked underneath unless the pruning is minor with only small leafy vegetation being removed. In these instances, and instances where matter is wind borne onto nearby vehicles, contractors will endeavour to remove leaf litter by hand or using a leaf blower.

The City endeavours to notify residents of the pruning program via the City's website and social media. In problematic locations where there are ongoing issues with parked cars, letter drops (to effected residents) and no parking signage may also be employed.

Lesley Florey of Mount Hawthorn

1. Since the GHD drainage technical memorandum has the City of Vincent identified all stormwater pipers running through private property?

The City of Vincent has undertaken a desktop analysis and identified private land parcels that have City of Vincent stormwater drainage infrastructure within the property boundaries. The analysis also considers those land parcels where such stormwater infrastructure is under buildings. On-ground inspection is being undertaken to verify the desktop analysis and where necessary, maintenance works is scheduled. While both historical data and more recent data from surveys and inspections is reflected, the City is unable conclusively state that the entire stormwater network is fully captured.

2. How much has the City of Vincent spent in relocating, demolishing and refurbishing the reception area for a third time?

Stage three of the Administration Centre Foyer refurbishment works cost \$277,604.62

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**COUNCIL DECISION**

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

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 11 February 2025 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)**7.1 STATE ELECTIONS**

The Presiding Member, Alison Xamon, congratulated the Labor Government on their re-election in the State Election. The Mayor highlighted key commitments, including:

- \$30 million for the establishment of the Little Italy precinct
- Long overdue upgrades to Forrest Park
- Various upgrades for community groups and facilities
- Activation of the East Perth Power Station precinct

Additionally, the Mayor expressed enthusiasm for continuing to work with the government on these and other future projects in the City of Vincent over the next four years.

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

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 Cr Ashley Wallace disclosed a financial interest in Item 9.1 Outcome of Advertising - Revocation of Policy No. 7.6.9 - Heritage Assistance Fund and Item 11.5 Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amendments to Community Funding Policy. The extent of his interest is that his house is on the Municipal Heritage Inventory. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or vote on either matter.
- 8.2 Cr Ron Alexander disclosed a financial interest in Item 9.1 Outcome of Advertising - Revocation of Policy No. 7.6.9 - Heritage Assistance Fund and Item 11.5. Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amendments to Community Funding Policy. The extent of his interest is that his house is on the Municipal Heritage Inventory. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or vote on either matter.
- 8.3 Cr Suzanne Worner disclosed a financial interest in Item 11.5 Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amendments to Community Funding Policy. The extent of her interest is that she has been, and is likely to continue, to be involved with community and not for profit organisations who rely on City of Vincent's Community Funding programs to sustain their endeavours. She is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or vote on the matter.

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 and 11.5.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Item 11.4.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Items 9.1 and 11.5.

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, requested Council Members to indicate:

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

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Cr Castle	17.1
Cr Woolf	9.2 and 12.3

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 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.2, 12.4 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 Hallett, Seconded: Cr Alexander

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:
Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.2, 12.4 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

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 JANUARY 2025**Attachments:** 1. Financial Statements as at 31 January 2025 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 January 2025 as shown in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Alexander**

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 JANUARY 2025 TO 31 JANUARY 2025

- Attachments:
1. January 2025 - Payments by EFT and Payroll 
 2. January 2025 - Payments by Direct Debit 
 3. January 2025 - Payments by Cheques 
 4. January 2025 - Payments by Fuel Cards 

Recommendation:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 January 2025 to 31 January 2025 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$7,112,533.48
Cheques	\$862.50
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$174,310.94
Total payments for January 2025	\$7,287,706.92

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 JANUARY 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 31 January 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 January 2025 as detailed in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.2 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Execution of Documents Policy (Marked up) 
 2. Execution of Documents policy (Clean copy) 
 3. Delegated Authority 2.2.18 Proposed Amendments 

RECOMMENDATION

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.4 REPORT AND MINUTES OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY 2025

- Attachments:
1. Audit and Risk Committee Minutes - 26 February 2025 
 2. Audit and Risk Committee Attachments - 26 February 2025 - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. RECEIVES:

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting of 26 February 2025, at Attachment 1 and the Confidential Attachments Paper at Attachment 2;
- 1.2 The reports from the Office of the Auditor General for the Local Government sector issued from May 2024 to June 2024;
- 1.3 The Better Practice Guide: Supplier Master Files report from the Office of the Auditor General for all State and local government entities;
- 1.4 The review of the Fraud and Corruption Prevention Policy;
- 1.5 Swimming Pool Barrier Inspections Audit; and
- 1.6 The City's Corporate Risk Register;

2. **ADOPTS** the Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2024 to 31 December 2024.

3. **AUTHORISES** the Compliance Audit Return 2024 to be certified by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer in accordance with Regulation 15 of the *Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996*.

4. **SUPPORTS** the presentation of the updated Fraud and Corruption Prevention Policy, to Council for approval to advertise

5. APPROVES:

- 5.1 The risk management actions for the high and extreme risks;
- 5.2 The management actions for the high and extreme risks; and
- 5.3 Closure of action items noted in the City's Audit Log.

6. NOTES:

- 6.1 The audit planning summary for the 2024/2025 financial year;
- 6.2 The key findings of the Swimming Pool Barrier Inspections Audit and that the findings and management actions arising will be added to the City's Audit Log;

- 6.3 That the City of Vincent's Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2024 to 31 December 2024 was reviewed by the Audit Committee at its 26 February 2025 meeting;
- 6.4 The JLT Public Sector's report on the City's cyber security controls.
- 6.5 The alignment of Corporate Risks to risk appetite and tolerance ratings;
- 6.6 The 2025 Audit and Risk Committee Forward Agenda; and
- 6.7 The Status of the City's Audit Log.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Alexander

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (9-0)

12.5 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:
1. Catalina Regional Council - Minutes of Meeting held on 20 February 2025 
 2. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of January 2025 
 3. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 4. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 20 February 2025 
 5. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 6. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 7. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - March 2025 
 8. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - March 2025 
 9. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - March 2025 
 10. Council Workshop Items since 11 February 2025 
 11. Council Briefing Notes - 6 February 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated March 2025.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.5

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

At 6:19 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.

At 6:20 pm, Cr Ron Alexander left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.

9.1 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING - REVOCATION OF POLICY NO. 7.6.9 - HERITAGE ASSISTANCE FUND

Attachments: 1. Policy No. 7.6.9 - Heritage Assistance Fund 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council REVOKES Policy No. 7.6.9 – Heritage Assistance Fund, as included in Attachment 1, pursuant to Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995* and clause 5.8 of the City of Vincent's Policy Development and Review Policy.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (7-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was absent from the Council Chamber and did not vote.)

(Cr Wallace was absent from the Council Chamber and did not vote.)

At 6.21pm Cr Worner left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.

11.5 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO COMMUNITY FUNDING POLICY

Attachments:

1. **Community Funding Policy** 
2. **Community Consultation Comments** 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council ADOPTS the Community Funding Policy at Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (6-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Alexander was absent from the Council Chamber and did not vote.)

(Cr Wallace was absent from the Council Chamber and did not vote.)

(Cr Worner was absent from the Council Chamber and did not vote.)

At 6:25 pm, Cr Ron Alexander returned to the meeting.

At 6:25 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace returned to the meeting.

At 6.25pm, Cr Suzanne Worner returned to the meeting.

At 6.27pm Executive Manager Communications & Engagement left the meeting and did not return.

9.2 ROAD DEDICATION OF VARIOUS RIGHTS OF WAY

- Attachments:**
1. Diagram 6812 (ROW 51) 
 2. Diagram 1346 (ROW 66) 
 3. Diagram 6483 (ROW 67) 
 4. Rights of Way ownership - Certificates of Title 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **REQUESTS** the Minister for Lands to dedicate as a road pursuant to section 56(1)(c) of the *Land Administration Act 1997* (LAA) the following right of ways:
 - (a) Lot 51 on Diagram 6812 comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 1008 Folio 199;
 - (b) Lot 66 on Diagram 1346 comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 2761 Folio 264; and
 - (c) Lot 67 on Diagram 6483 comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 72 Folio 92;subject to the Chief Executive Officer:
 - 1.1 Providing public notice seeking submissions on the proposal to dedicate the right of ways pursuant to section 56(1)(c) of *Land Administration Act 1997* and Regulation 8 of *Land Administration Regulations*; and
 - 1.2 Considering and responding to any submissions or objections received.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

Moved: Cr Woolf, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

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

11.4 MID YEAR BUDGET REVIEW 2024/25

- Attachments:
1. Statement of Financial Activity 2024-25 
 2. Net Current Assets 2024-25 
 3. Cash Backed Reserves Budget 2024-25 
 4. Capital Expenditure Budget 2024-25 
 5. Operating Budget Analysis 2024-25 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY APPROVES the following amendments to the 2024/25 Annual Budget:

1. A net increase in the Operating result of \$2,220,147 as per Attachment 1;
2. A net increase in Cash Backed Reserves totalling \$3,621,883 as per Attachments 3;
3. A net decrease in the Capital Expenditure Budget of \$210,910 as per Attachment 4;
4. A net decrease in the closing surplus of \$1,187,352, resulting in a forecasted year end surplus at 30 June 2025 of nil as per Attachment 1;
5. Additional loan payment of \$480,000 towards Beatty Park Loan 10; and
6. RATES WAIVER:

Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2024/25 local government rates for the following properties:

Title Details	Rates Waiver 2024/25 \$
Lot 198 D/P 39921	1,331.75
Lot 889 D/P 426986	1,331.75
Lot 201 D/P 422599	1,331.75
Lot 300 D/P 425918	1,432.82
Lot 300 D/P 428786	1,105.53
Lot 301 D/P 428786	1,105.53
Lot 69 D/P 425941	1,331.75
Lot 888 D/P 426994	882.97
Lot 300 D/P 87141	660.40
Total	10,514.25

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

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

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

12.3 NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT (NGA) 2025: ELECTED MEMBER PROPOSED ATTENDANCE & 40KM/H SPEED ZONE MOTION

- Attachments:
1. National General Assembly of Local Government (NGA) 2025 - Invitation 
 2. ALGA Motion 40km - draft 
 3. PICG 40km Expansion Project Overview 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the attendance of Mayor Alison Xamon at the 2025 National General Assembly of Local Government (NGA) in Canberra from 24 – 27 June 2025.
2. **ENDORSES** the draft motion for the National General Assembly of Local Government Annual Meeting on 40km/h speed zones in residential streets at Attachment 2.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

Moved: Cr Hallett, **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

The Presiding Member, Alison Xamon, inquired if any Council Members had questions or wished to discuss the confidential item. As no questions or requests for debate were made, the meeting remained open to the public.

17.1 UNSOLICITED BID FOR THE ACQUISITION OF LAND

Attachments:	1. Unsolicited Bid - Confidential
	2. Appendix B - Confidential
	3. Appendix C - Confidential
	4. Selection Criteria
	5. Evaluation Plan - Confidential
	6. Evaluation Summary - Confidential
	7. Previous Evaluation Summary - Confidential
	8. Commercial Assessment - Confidential
	9. Letter to Premier - State Government Leederville Office Hub

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. **RECEIVES** the Unsolicited Bid in Attachments 1, 2 and 3;
2. **REJECTS** the Unsolicited Bid for the reasons set out in the Evaluation Panel's assessment, as captured within the Evaluation Summary, included as Attachment 6;
3. **ADVISES** the applicant of its decision; and
4. **NOTES** the potential long term advantages to the City of Vincent for transacting the land with the bidder and **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to enter private treaty discussions with the bidder for the land, and **NOTES** that Administration would Workshop with Council the requirements and priorities of the City for any transaction beforehand to guide these discussions and that any resulting offer for the land would first be presented to Council and then be subject to public notice in accordance with the Local Government Act before being considered for approval by Council.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

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

12.1 MANAGEMENT ORDER FOR PORTION OF WESTERN POWER'S VACATED MOUNT CLAREMONT DEPOT – WITHDRAWN BY ADMINISTRATION

This item was withdrawn by Administration.

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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**

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

18 CLOSURE

The Presiding Member, Alison Xamon, announced that tonight is the final meeting for the Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance for a while, as she is going on maternity leave, and read a poem written by the Governance team:

Farewell (for Now) to Our Governance Queen!

Our fearless leader, cool and wise,
Is trading meetings for lullabies.
No more audits, plans, or risk—
Just nappies, bottles, and baby bliss!
You kept the Council all in check,
Dodging conflicts—what the heck?!
Policies, plans—your mighty reign,
Now service delivery means *a baby train!*
So off you go, enjoy the ride,
With baby cuddles by your side.
We'll miss you loads (no word of a lie),
But we bet your bub won't *comply!*

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 6.39pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Ron Alexander	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward
	Cr Jonathan Hallett	South Ward
	Cr Ashley Wallace	South Ward (arrived at 6.02pm during Item 3A)
	Cr Sophie Greer	South Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	John Corbellini	Director Major Projects
	Mitchell Hoad	A/Manager Strategic Planning
	Joslin Colli	Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Emma Simmons	Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Wendy Barnard	Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support

Public: No members of the public.

These minutes were confirmed at the 8 April 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 11 March 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated: