



CITY OF VINCENT

NOTES

Council Briefing

6 May 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country	3
2	Apologies / Members on Approved Leave of Absence	3
3	Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	4
4	Declarations of Interest	14
	Reports	15
	Reports with Discussion	16
5.2	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).....	16
5.1	No. 20 (Lot: 9; Plan: 1237) Grosvenor Road, Mount Lawley - Proposed Change of Use from Single House to Holiday House	18
6.3	Response to Petition - Leake/Alma Street Eco-zoning.....	22
6.1	Draft Beaufort Street Precinct Area, Road Safety Implementation Plan	23
5.5	Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List.....	25
5.3	No. 188 (Lot: 1; D/P: 33790) Vincent Street, North Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship (Amendment to Approved).....	26
5.6	Advertising of Draft Sustainable Vincent Framework and Enhanced Environment Strategy	27
6.2	Beatty Park Reserve - Toilet Block Installation.....	29
5.4	Review of Policy No. 7.5.23 - Construction Management Plans	31
6.4	Response to Petition - Closure of Green Street - Impact Of Increased Traffic on Ellesmere Street and Surrounds.....	34
7.4	Event Sponsorship 2025/26 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	36
7.5	Differential Rating Strategy 2025/26	39
8.3	Information Bulletin	40
	Reports with no Discussion	41
6.5	RFT IE384-2025 HVAC Chiller Replacement - 246 Vincent Street Leederville	41
7.1	Financial Statements as at 31 March 2025 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	42
7.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 March 2025 to 31 March 2025.....	43
7.3	Investment Report as at 31 March 2025.....	44
7.6	Adoption of the Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 - 2034/35	45
8.1	Annual Review of Delegations [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	46
8.2	Advertising of Amended Policy - Attendance at Events Policy	47
9	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given	48
10	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	48
11	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	48
12	Closure	48

**NOTES OF CITY OF VINCENT
COUNCIL BRIEFING
HELD AS E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE
ON TUESDAY, 6 MAY 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 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>
IN ATTENDANCE:	<p>David MacLennan Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Karsen Reynolds Mitchell Hoad Thomas Gosling Lisa Williams Dale Morrissy Ruth Markham Ben Holloway Sarah Hill Luke McGuirk Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development A/Manager Development & Design (left at 7.21pm after Item 5.4) A/Manager Strategic Planning (left at 7.21pm after Item 5.4) Coordinator Sport and Recreation (left at 7.04pm after Item 6.2) Executive Manager Communications and Engagement Manager Community Facilities (left at 7.04pm after Item 6.2) Manager City Buildings and Asset Management (left at 7.04pm after Item 6.2) A/Coordinator City Infrastructure (left at 7.04pm after Item 6.2) Manager Parks ((left at 7.04pm after Item 6.2) Manager Engineering A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support</p>

Public: Approximately 18 members of the public.

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member, 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, acknowledging that as the City of Vincent we have a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people .”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The following is a summary of questions and submissions received and responses provided at the meeting. This is not a verbatim record of comments made at the meeting.

3.1 Raffaella D'Alonzo of North Perth – Item 5.2

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

3.2 Patricia Sinclair of Mt Lawley – Item 5.1

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

3.3 Stan Dzieciol of Mt Lawley – Item 5.1

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

3.4 Clare McLean of Perth – Item 5.1

Clare McLean submitted the below comments in writing and spoke to them

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

I am writing to you in relation to **Agenda Item 5.1 – No. 20 Grosvenor Road, Mount Lawley – Proposed Change of Use from Single House to Holiday House**, which is to be considered by Council at the Briefing Agenda Session on May 6.

I act on behalf of Mr Stan Dzieciol who is the registered owner of the property the subject of the Application.

I will be requesting the opportunity to present a deputation to you at this upcoming Briefing Session.

As the time available to present my deputation is limited to three (3) minutes, I am taking the opportunity to write to each Elected Member to provide a more detailed summary of the merits of this proposal, of which points I intend to highlight to you next Tuesday. I trust this summary assists in your further consideration of the merits of this Application.

My deputation is to respectfully seek the Council's support in overturning the Officer recommendation by granting conditional approval for the use of the residential dwelling under the land use classification of 'Holiday House', pursuant to Local Planning Scheme No. 2.

It is difficult to comprehend the Officer's negative recommendation to Council that the application be refused as stated in the Agenda Item. There is more than sufficient planning merit for this property to be approved for use as a 'Holiday House' for unhosted short-term rental accommodation purposes, which justification is detailed in my submission included at **Attachment 5** of the Agenda Item.

In addition to that justification, I provide the following summary of my position in support of this proposal.

Administration responses are below in italics:

1. The property is capable of being considered for approval under the land use classification of 'Holiday House' in the Residential zone.

Being capable of consideration does not equate to the land use being acceptable.

Acceptability is determined through an assessment of the proposal in the context of the site, the objectives of the Residential zone, and the relevant objectives of the Short Term Accommodation policy. For the reasons outlined in the report, the proposal is not considered acceptable due to its location and its inconsistency with these objectives.

2. The property has now been used for the permitted 90 days for unhosted short term rental accommodation (without planning approval being required). It is understood that the use has not resulted in any adverse impact on the amenity of this location.

To date, the site has been used for 84 of the allowable 90 exempt days. The City received one complaint in December 2024 with concerns relating to noise associated with guests and cleaning services, as well as guests and cleaners parking on the verge and street.

Regardless of past operation, the proposal must still be considered against the planning framework, including the objectives of the Residential zone and relevant policy objectives. This assessment includes potential impacts on amenity and the suitability of the land use within its context.

3. My client visits his family home weekly to ensure it is maintained to a high standard and has discussed the use with residents on the street. This is my client's family home. He grew up here and remains deeply connected to the property, street, and locality more generally.

4. The use of the property for unhosted short term rental purposes provides my client with weekly access for general maintenance reasons. This regular upkeep of the dwelling and the land ensures the development continues to enhance the amenity and character of the area, as well as providing a way for my client to retain the family property in his ownership and protect the original dwelling form on the land from redevelopment, which accords with the relevant objective of the Residential zone.

Regular maintenance is important, but the focus must be on whether the proposed use aligns with the Residential zone objectives and avoids land use conflicts.

This is regardless of ownership or personal connection, as these are not relevant planning considerations in this decision.

5. It is important to note that the immediately adjacent residents to both the east and west of the land have provided written support for the proposal. Copies of these **supporting letters are attached**.

We contacted the adjoining properties at Nos. 18 and 22 Grosvenor Road to confirm their current positions:

- *No. 18 Grosvenor Road (Leased Property)*
 - *Owner: Has confirmed support for the proposal*
 - *Occupier: No submission was made during community consultation*
- *No. 22 Grosvenor Road (Owner Occupied)*
 - *An objection was received during the community consultation period.*
 - *The owner advised that they initially signed a letter of support provided by the applicant but have since requested this support be retracted. They now object to the proposal.*

All other submissions were received from properties along Grosvenor Road, with one submission from Raglan Road.

6. My client has also sought further feedback from the adjacent and nearby neighbours. It is understood that the neighbours have verbally advised that the appearance of the property in the streetscape 'has never looked better'. The feedback provided by the adjoining neighbours is that the guests using the property are quiet, with no audible noise having been noticed by the residents over the last 90 days of its use.

While informal neighbour feedback regarding the property's presentation and guest behaviour is noted, there is no documented evidence to support these claims. Reference should focus on formal submissions received during the community consultation period, which provide a more reliable basis for assessment.

Irrespective, whether neighbours support or object to an application is not the determinant of whether it should be approved. Neighbour views are one of many considerations in the decision-making process and must be weighed against the broader planning framework, including zone objectives, policy provisions, and potential impacts on the locality.

7. This is an important point to highlight as the basis for the Officer Recommendation of refusal surrounds a perceived view that the use will generate levels of noise and activity which are in some way inconsistent with the residential character and amenity of this street. The crux of this position surrounds a view that the backyard of this property which shares its side lot boundaries with the backyards of the adjoining properties to the east and west in some way translates to the outdoor living area being situated immediately adjoining the outdoor living spaces and major openings of the neighbouring properties. The Officer view is that the similarly located backyards of these properties means that it is not possible to design and mitigate issues of noise and activity. This is not accurate.
8. There is more than sufficient distance between the subject property and the adjacent properties to mitigate amenity concerns, should any such issues arise.

The Officer recommendation is based on a planning assessment of the site's context, not a perceived view.

The subject property is in a tightly spaced residential environment where the outdoor living areas of adjoining homes are in close proximity. In this setting, the potential for noise and activity impacts is heightened, particularly for an unhosted short-term use.

While distance may exist between dwellings, the configuration and scale of typical residential lots in this area means outdoor areas are often directly adjacent, limiting the capacity to mitigate amenity impacts through design alone.

9. It is relevant to highlight that the outdoor living area/backyard and the built form of the dwelling on the subject land has considerable setbacks to the adjoining properties. The single storey dwelling on the property is set back from the side boundaries. There are no common walls shared by the dwellings. There are no designated outdoor living areas which adjoin each other. The guests would need to physically stand in the garden beds at the fence line in the backyard and the adjoining residents do the same in their backyards for the outdoor living areas to be considered as adjoining each other. **Please refer to the attached photograph for context.** This photograph is also included in my submission, being **Photograph 13** on **page 42** of the **Agenda Item**. I point out that the table and chairs shown on the paved area in this photograph are moveable and can easily be relocated to a more central position in the backyard. This paved area is not a designated outdoor living area.

While physical setbacks and the lack of shared walls may reduce direct impacts, they do not eliminate the potential for noise and activity to carry in a dense residential environment.

The configuration of typical suburban lots means outdoor areas are still in close proximity, and noise from an unhosted short-term use can travel easily over fences. Regardless of where furniture is placed, the planning assessment considers how the use functions over time and the potential for cumulative amenity impacts, not just the current physical setup.



10. It is important to again highlight in reference to the above point (No. 9) that the adjoining neighbours have advised my client that they have not been disturbed by noise or any other activities at the property during the time which the dwelling has been used for this purpose over the last three (3) months. The Officers are referring in the Agenda Item to general amenity impacts, which is required to be contemplated when considering the appropriateness of this type of land use in a residential area. When considering the proposal on its merits, the use has proven to have not caused a noise or general amenity issue in this location.

The assessment must still consider the potential for noise and other amenity impacts that could arise from the proposed use in the long term.

The key issue is not the recent experience of neighbours, but whether the use is compatible with the broader residential context. General amenity impacts must be assessed, as required by the planning framework, to determine the suitability of the proposal in this location.

11. I am concerned that the property is described by the Officers as a quiet residential streetscape making it sensitive to increased noise and activity. This area is not typically what would be considered a 'quiet residential streetscape'. It is a residential area comprising of single dwellings on traditional sized lots which dwellings have a direct and strong connection with the bustling main street of the District Centre of Beaufort Street. The dwelling the subject of this Application is located only 80 metres from the District Centre. There are many noise contributing factors which exist due to the close proximity of the home to Beaufort Street, which locational characteristics are described in detail in my submission (please refer to **page 34** of the **Agenda Item**). The unique characteristics of this particular location should not be dismissed. This area forms part of the inner City and high energy activity lifestyle enjoyed by residents in this location. Notwithstanding the locational context of this area, I again highlight that there has not been any mention of adverse noise or activity impacts caused by this use.

The site is zoned residential and surrounded by single houses, forming a close urban environment. The adjoining properties feature outdoor areas in close proximity, reinforcing the residential character of the area.

The site is not located at the interface of any zoning change or transitional area. While it is 80 metres from the District Centre, it is separated by three single houses (approx. one third down the street), meaning the site is not at the boundary of commercial activity.

The result of the proposal would be a commercial use surrounded by single houses.

The decision is also required to take account of future amenity. There is nothing in the applicable planning framework that suggests any planned change for the locality. As such, the future planned amenity of the locality is permanent residential.

While the broader context (Beaufort St) provides a for a varied commercial context, the immediate context is residential. A non-residential use like this does not fit with the surrounding residential character.

12. I am aware that my client has emailed you previously and referenced the following recent approvals granted by the City under delegated authority for change of use proposals from Grouped Dwellings, Multiple Dwellings, and Single Houses to Holiday House. There seems to be some inconsistency in decision making which I am highlighting to you, as it is understood that these Applications have been approved in areas which share similar attributes to the subject location of this property. It is understood that time-limited conditions may be attached to some of the decisions to provide an opportunity for the use to operate and further consideration to be given by the City in terms of noise and general amenity impacts, in the event that a renewal is sought.

Each application is assessed on its own merits, taking into account the unique context of the site and the specifics of the proposal. While other approvals may appear similar, they were supported based on their own circumstances and do not set a guiding precedent.

The focus must remain on the merits of this proposal, having regard to its individual context, potential impacts, and consistency with the objectives of the Residential zone and relevant planning policies.

The STRA approvals shown below were supported due to unique contextual and/or operational factors that, in combination, aligned with the planning framework. This includes exposure to ambient noise, separation from nearby outdoor living and sensitive areas of adjoining properties, historic long-term operation, and low-scale operations.

- 21 Alfonso Street, North Perth (R60) – **Single House** to Holiday House. The property comprises of a traditional lot layout with a similarly configured backyard. Approved on 17 April 2025.

Reasons for acceptability:

- *The property owner and Holiday House operator resides at the adjoining southern property, providing on-site management / host responsibilities for the accommodation.*
- *Time-bound to ensure the use remains tied to the owner/host residing at the adjoining property. Further approval would not be supported if this situation changes.*
- *Outdoor living areas of adjoining properties (except for the southern property) are separated from the subject site's outdoor living area, minimising noise impacts.*

- 30 Cleaver Street, West Perth – **Multiple Dwelling** to Holiday House. Approved on 9 April 2025.

Reasons for acceptability:

- *The site is within an R80 high-density area.*
- *Approval was for the entire complex (three one-bedroom apartments, and 12 studio apartments).*
- *Complex has been operating as short-term accommodation since at least 2017. The City has not received any complaints regarding its operations.*
- *Two guests permitted per booking apartment in the studio apartments, and three in the one-bedroom apartments.*
- *No outdoor living areas are adjacent to adjoining properties. Only the three one-bedroom apartments have balconies, which are orientated towards the Cleaver Street. The 12 studio apartments do not have outdoor living areas.*
- *All units are used for short term rental accommodation meaning there is no adverse impact on other neighbours within the complex.*

- 9 Ebsworth Street, Mount Lawley (R20) – **Grouped Dwelling** to Holiday House. These traditional grouped dwellings include shared common walls and adjoining outdoor living areas. Approved on 15 March 2025.

Reasons for acceptability:

- *The site and adjoining properties are affected by high-levels of ambient noise from traffic and rail. It is located 50 metres from two high-traffic primary regional roads (East Parade and Guildford Road) and 80 metres from a raised rail line.*
- *The northern adjoining properties are currently vacant and are zoned R100 for high-density development.*
- *The outdoor living area on the subject site does not adjoin any other outdoor living areas of adjoining properties.*
- *Maximum of four guests.*

- 64 Richmond Street, Leederville (Centre) – **Grouped Dwelling** to Holiday House. The outdoor living area adjoins the other grouped dwelling. The dwellings are closer in proximity to each other than the subject property. Approved on 28 February 2025.

Reasons for acceptability:

- *Corner site.*
- *Site experiences ambient noise due to its interface with the Loftus Centre Public Car Park and a kindergarten, which has outdoor play areas oriented toward Richmond Street.*
- *The site's outdoor living area is separated from neighbouring outdoor living areas, does not adjoin any major openings, and directly interfaces with Fleet Street.*
- *Maximum of two guests or one family.*
- *Time-bound approval for 12-months.*

- 114 Vincent Street, North Perth (R40) – **Grouped Dwelling** to Holiday House. There is limited separation to the second dwelling on this lot. The adjoining dwellings include outdoor spaces and major openings which are close to the dwelling. Approved on 18 March 2025.

Reasons for acceptability:

- *The site and adjoining properties are affected by ambient noise due to their interface with Hyde Park as well as Vincent Street, which is a District Distributor road with consistent traffic activity.*
- *The site's outdoor living area is:*
 - *Located within the street setback and oriented toward Vincent Street.*
 - *Not located adjacent to neighbouring outdoor living areas or windows to habitable rooms that are not already affected by existing ambient noise.*
- *Time-bound approval for 12-months.*

13. The high standard of care, management, and attention given by my client in ensuring his home is carefully vetted by the local based accommodation provider to only book the property for stays by mature and responsible guests has proven successful over the course of the last 90 days of its use.

While the management measures may help minimise impacts in some cases, they do not guarantee that issues such as noise, parking, or other amenity impacts will not arise.

Compliance with a management plan alone does not make a proposal acceptable, as amenity impacts could still occur depending on how the property is used. This is particularly relevant given the property's residential setting, where it is entirely surrounded by residential dwellings with windows and outdoor living areas in close proximity.

14. In my submission (on page 51 of the Agenda Item), reference is made to a list of the groups of people who have recently stayed at the property, which are mostly families and mature adults visiting Perth for various reasons and requiring longer stays at a house, rather than an hotel or apartment. The groups of people who have stayed have included families needing urgent accommodation due to emergency repairs on their home, families travelling from country locations needing longer stays to visit relatives in hospital, and overseas and interstate visitors coming home to visit family who live locally in the area. These types of visitors require the use of a house for accommodation. It is not possible or practical for these visitors to stay in hotels. This property caters for the needs of these visitors and has proven to be a non-residential use which is compatible with and complementary to residential development, in accordance with the relevant objective of the Residential zone.

The planning assessment must focus on the nature and intensity of the proposed land use, not individual guest circumstances or behaviour to date.

While management may reduce impacts in some cases, it cannot eliminate the potential for noise, parking issues, or general amenity concerns in all situations, particularly due the property's residential setting.

15. My client has invited all Elected Members to visit his home to better understand the operational and physical characteristics of the property. This invitation remains open to you, should you feel that it will assist in your consideration of the merits of this proposal.

A site visit has been organisation for 5.00pm on Wednesday 7 May – an invitation has been sent to all Elected Members.

It is on this basis, that we respectfully request your support in overturning the Officer recommendation and approving the use of the premises with reasonable conditions attached. Should the Council not consider it appropriate to permanently approve the use on this occasion, my client has expressed a preparedness to agree to an initial 12-month time limited period, as we have advised the City's Administration. Following this initial approval period, a renewal can be considered for a longer time (i.e., 3 to 5 years or even permanently). This is a measure which allows for appropriate management to continue to be monitored and controlled by the local government until such time that the use is proven to be appropriate for the area to warrant a permanent approval, as suggested in the *Planning for Tourism and Short-term Rental Accommodation Guidelines* (WAPC, November 2024).

I look forward to presenting to you on Tuesday evening. In the meantime, I make myself available to you to answer any questions you may have in relation to the Application, at your convenience.

3.5 Kate Hawker of Shenton Park – Item 5.1

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

3.6 Shaun Oostryk of North Perth – Item 6.3

Shaun Oostryk submitted the below comments in writing and spoke to them.

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

I provide the following comments on Item 6.3 of tonight's meeting agenda in relation to the report prepared for the proposed eco-zoning in the Leake Street and Alma Reserve:

Administration responses are below in italics:

- The top of page 7 is misleading in summarising the public comments by saying "Overall responses are in favour of eco-zoning". The consultation is specific to the Leake Street and Alma Reserve with location specific feedback showing a mixed result (9 in support, 9 not in support). It's important that this is made clear. In short, the proposed eco-zoning has some merit but can be considerably improved.

Administrations comments that there is overall support for eco-zoning at Leake/Alma Street reserve are correct. Although there are equal comments in support and not in support for eco-zoning at Leake/Alma Street Reserve (nine (9) each), there are an additional six (6) comments in support of all three eco-zoning projects and an additional five (5) comments in partial support of eco-zoning at Leak/Alma Street Reserve.

- The strong feedback from the community is that grassed, accessible areas are maintained. I feel its important that Council listens to this feedback.

This feedback was considered in conjunction with strong support for eco-zoning, particularly along the verges to improve safety for park users. Changes made to the plan as a result of this feedback, in collaboration with interested Council Members, include:

- *Moving existing sand pit northwards (approx.. 1-2m) to increase existing area of good quality usable turf area*
 - *Delaying eco-zoning around Wester Power infrastructure to after it is installed to provide temporary additional turf area and determine where any turf can be retained once equipment is installed*
 - *Reducing eco-zoned area underneath large Jacaranda tree to maintain existing shaded turf area.*
- There is an error on page 7 where the Administration comment says that there are several other parks within 500m. I confirm that there are no other comparable parks within 500m. Hyde Park is 700m away and is divided by a major road. Beatty Park is 800m away and is divided by a major road. Federation Gardens is closer but does not allow dogs and has no kid friendly facilities (play equipment etc). This is one of the key reasons why the community is pushing hard to have the grass retained.

Administration can confirm that this is not an error. Hyde Park, Beatty Park Reserve and Federation gardens are all within a 500m radius from the centre of Leake/Ama Street Reserve.

- Page 12 has a list of recommended improvements to the advertised plan (sandpit relocation, park benches, more grassed area, etc). Can we please have confirmation that these will be adopted and a marked-up plan is prepared so everyone is clear on the current proposal. This plan can be a simple PDF mark-up so there is no expense for an external architect / draftsman.

A simple plan will be developed and attached to the report to clarify changes that Administration is requesting Council approval of.

- Page 14 contains Administration concluding remarks which are misleading. It states that the majority of people are in support of eco-zoning but doesn't mention the specific 50/50 split of site specific community feedback. It suggests that eco-zoned areas are more usable than grass due to nature playground elements - there are no nature playground elements within the current plan so this doesn't make sense (happy to be corrected though).
 - *Report correctly states that: The majority of the community is in support of eco-zoning. This is evident through the City's plans and strategies, developed in consultation with community, and past feedback on the program.*
 - *Subject to available budget, Administration intends to install informal nature play elements such as logs. It is also important to note that nature play is not just the provision of built elements but also through interaction with garden spaces.*

3.7 Louise Schneider of Mt Lawley – Item 6.1

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

3.8 Suzanne Busslinger of Mt Lawley – Item 6.1

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

3.9 Mark Schneider of Mt Lawley – Item 6.1

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

3.10 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 6.1

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

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

Alex Uchanski of North Perth - Item 5.2

I recommend voting against the application to extend the operating hours of La Mortazza Cafe into the evening hours of Thursday, Fridays and Saturdays because the cafe cannot be trusted to remain within its approved operating hours and conditions, it is not in the best interests of the direct community and because it exacerbates a genuine safety hazard.

Background

I am a resident of Venn Street, having lived there for nearly 10 years. I am not anti-development or anti-cafe. I am pro-community and pro-safety. I lived here before the apartment & cafe development on the corner of Venn and Fitzgerald and I was not against the development going ahead. There are benefits that the cafe brings to the broader community, and the cafe's owners are good people. The issue I (and many of my neighbours) have with this proposal is that by extending the operating hours into the evening it will extend the issues we are already experiencing during the day and worsen them into the night (noise, parking congestion and safety). The priorities are in the wrong order, as the parking congestion in particular (with its associated safety implications) must be solved first before considering any extension of the cafe's commercial interests. The lack of suitable parking is not the cafe's fault nor a problem it can solve alone, rather it requires the City to work collaboratively with the cafe and residents to consider all options. With that in mind, I put it to the Elected Members that there are three key reasons why they should vote against the proposal as it stands.

1. **La Mortazza cannot be trusted to operate within its approved operating hours or conditions, having had a history of knowingly flouting them.**

The City's Development Compliance Officer, Nikolas Dimovski, investigated the cafe's operating hours over a series of site inspections throughout November and December 2024 when the approved hours were 8am to 5pm. The cafe was confirmed to be in breach of its approved operating hours, opening daily from as early as 6:30am (instead of the approved 8am, evidence attached to this email) and occasionally hosting public events in the evening with live music (called "Apericena", and extending well beyond the approved 5pm - evidence of this is attached to this email). The cafe's operating hours have since been approved to open from 7am, with seemingly no meaningful penalty applied by the council after years of the cafe breaching its operating hours.

Administration responses are below in italics:

Question 1: Why should the cafe be rewarded with extended operating hours, after years of knowingly flouting them? What meaningful financial penalties has the council applied to the cafe, and what precedent does this set for other businesses who may be looking to do the same?

It is acknowledged that there have been instances of non-compliance with previous development approval conditions. However, past non-compliance is not a valid planning consideration and cannot be used as a reason to refuse a new development application. Each application must be assessed on its individual merits against the relevant planning policies and the objectives of the applicable zone under the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2.

In relation to this development, once the City became aware of non-compliance with the conditions of development approval, the matter was investigated by the City's Compliance Team. In line with the City of Vincent's [Development Compliance Enforcement Policy](#), a graduated and proportionate enforcement response was undertaken.

Following correspondence with the operator, the development was brought into compliance with the approved conditions, and a development application to amend the hours of operation was lodged. Council approved the revised operating hours, including the 7:00 am opening time, at its meeting on 11 February 2025. In recognition of the operator's actions to resolve the matter proactively, the City did not issue any planning infringement notices (fines) in relation to this business.

With respect to other businesses, each alleged case of non-compliance with a development approval is assessed on its individual merits in accordance with the City's Development Compliance Enforcement Policy.

This ensures a consistent and proportionate action is taken based on the nature and extent of potential non-compliance.

Question 2: How can the cafe be trusted to stay within its noise assessment, considering it has trust issues and because it has hosted evening events with live music on multiple occasions in the past and with open doors (live music being clearly beyond the threshold of the noise assessment, which assumed only "ambient noise")?

Administration has recommended that the proposal for extended evening operating hours be refused, for the reasons outlined in the Officer Report.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised regarding past non-compliance, including the hosting of evening events with live music. However, the current proposal does not seek approval for live music or entertainment. The noise assessment supporting the application is based on ambient background noise levels only.

Should Council resolve to approve the proposed application, the development would be subject to specific conditions of approval and required to operate in accordance with an approved management plan. This would establish a clear and enforceable framework for how the premises must operate, including limitations on noise levels, hours of operation, patron numbers and use of doors/windows.

In addition, the premises is required to always comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, regardless of any planning approval. These regulations set legally enforceable limits for noise emissions.

If the City receives complaints regarding a potential breach of approval conditions or noise regulations, the matter would be investigated in accordance with the City's [Development Compliance Enforcement Policy](#). This policy outlines a consistent and proportionate approach to managing non-compliance and ensures that developments operate in accordance with their approved conditions.

2. It is not in the best interests of the immediate neighbours and residents of Venn Street.

Several residents of Venn Street including myself have expressed concern over the proposal for evening trading hours for many reasons, including but not limited to:

- a) Noise caused by patrons and their vehicles coming and going at night on Venn Street. Many houses (including my own) on Venn Street have a bedroom at the front of the house only metres away from the street.
- b) Concerns regarding removal of waste (glass and bottles) upon closure of the Small Bar in the evening.
- c) Concerns about the noise assessment (see my points above, from which recent behaviour clearly shows it is not just "ambient noise" that is the true intention of the operator).
- d) Increased frequency of kerb-side pickup into the evening (Uber Eats and similar services already park on residents driveways during the day, an ongoing issue which would extend into the night under this proposal).
- e) Increased traffic flow into the evening resulting in headlights being shone into bedroom windows of adjacent properties.
- f) Insufficient allowance for parking (despite what was in the original development approval) means patrons are congesting the street and parking on the verges of nearby residents, with the street regularly being parked up on both sides of the road resulting in cars tooting their horns as they crawl through and in some cases blocking the passage of cars altogether. This already occurs during the day, and without a proper parking solution this issue would extend into the evening under this proposal.

None of the above issues have been addressed with this latest proposal.

3. It is a genuine safety hazard.

The parking congestion creates a major safety issue on the corner of Venn Street and Fitzgerald street, which is an existing issue that a number of the Elected Members are alive to, including Mayor Xamon, Cr Woolf and Cr Worner.

As anyone who has driven down Venn Street would understand, there is anxiety as one approaches the intersection being blind to cars approaching the corner from the other direction while driving down the wrong side of the street due to the street parking congestion. Personally I have witnessed near misses, and regularly cars must mount the verge in order to get past one another. Pedestrians are also at risk when crossing the road to and from the cafe given the obscured view from parked vehicles on the street and the risky (and at times unpredictable) behaviour undertaken by moving vehicles.

Extending trading hours into the evening would extend the same issue into the evening and also exacerbate the safety aspects given the low level of lighting on the street and decreased visibility at night.

The City's Engineering department has advised the North Perth Traffic Study is understood to be looking at the intersection of Venn Street and Fitzgerald Street as an issue, and will ultimately inform treatment options for the intersection. I personally have been advocating for verge parking at the cafe to take cars off the road, a solution which both the cafe and residents are aligned on but requires alignment with the City's Engineering department. In any case, moving ahead with this proposal and worsening the safety outcomes for the intersection into the evening prior to it being treated would seem premature and irresponsible from a safety perspective.

The order of priorities must be the safety of the community passing through the intersection over the commercial interests of the cafe.

Final comment

For the reasons described above, if any of the Elected Members carry any doubt (however small) on this proposal, then I urge them to vote against the proposal rather than making a permanent change with unintended consequences. It is not the right time for this change, and priority must be given to alleviating the parking congestion and associated safety issues at the Fitzgerald / Venn intersection.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.25pm.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cr Suzanne Worner declared a financial interest in Item 7.4 Event Sponsorship 2025/26. The extent of her interest is that she is the General Manager of Revelation Perth International Film Festival, one of the events which has applied for funding. She is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.

Cr Ashley Wallace declared a financial interest in Item 5.5 Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List. The extent of his interest is that his house is included in the heritage list. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.

Cr Ron Alexander declared a financial interest in Item 5.5 Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List. The extent of his interest is that his house is included in the heritage list. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.

REPORTS

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

Items which Council Members wish to discuss which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment and the following was advised:

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Mayor Xamon	6.3 and 7.5
Cr Worner	5.1 and 5.3
Cr Woolf	5.4 and 7.4
Cr Wallace	5.6, 6.2 and 8.3
Cr La Fontaine	5.3, 6.1 and 6.4

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

5.2 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
8. Determination Advice Notes

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 REFUSES 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, for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the objectives of the Residential zone of the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, and the objectives of the City of Vincent Policy No. 7.5.21 – Sound Attenuation, the proposal to operate the Restaurant/Café and Small Bar land uses between 5:00pm and 9:00pm from Thursday to Sunday is incompatible with its setting and would have an adverse impact on the amenity and character of the locality, for the following reasons:
 - 1.1 Pursuant to Clauses 67(g), (m) and (n) in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the proposal operation would result in undue amenity impacts on surrounding residential properties due to the anticipated increase in noise and the inability to adequately mitigate these impacts during the evening period; and
 - 1.2 Pursuant to the objectives of the Residential Zone of the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Policy No. 7.5.21 – Sound Attenuation, the proposal is not compatible with, nor complementary to, the surrounding residential context. Having regard to the subject sites immediate setting, which comprises residential development, the proposal would introduce activity and noise levels that would provide undue impacts to residential properties.

CR WOOLF:

Car parking along Venn Street, as well as safety at the intersection of Venn Street and Fitzgerald Street, has been a longstanding concern within the community. Could Administration please provide an update on the North Perth Traffic Study and any parking management measures currently being considered or implemented in this area?

A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The following measures have been implemented to improve parking management at the western end of Venn Street:

1. **On-site wayfinding signage** - New wayfinding signage has been installed within the car park of the subject site, in accordance with the conditions of the development approval granted at the [Ordinary Council Meeting on 11 February 2025](#). The signage is clearly visible to vehicles entering via the accessway and directs customers to use the on-site parking when visiting the premises.

2. **On-street parking restrictions** - In August 2024, yellow 'No Stopping' line markings and accompanying signage were installed to formalise parking restrictions and improve traffic flow and safety.
3. **Increased parking patrols** - Parking patrols on Venn Street have been increased to support improved driver behaviour and compliance, particularly as the community adjusts to the recent changes in on-street parking restrictions

North Perth Traffic Study

Administration commenced the North Perth Traffic Study (NPTS) in April 2024 to assess road safety conditions across the broader area, including this intersection.

The study aims to deliver a coordinated and strategic approach to traffic and safety management in North Perth. This is in contrast to addressing individual issues in isolation, which can often lead to unintended or flow-on impacts.

The NPTS also takes into account projected future density and aims to deliver a holistic traffic and road safety plan for the North Perth area, with recommendations spanning short, medium, and long-term implementation.

The consultant's NPTS should be finished in the coming months. Once the NPTS has been prepared, Administration will review the results and discuss these with Council later this year. This will help guide the next steps for detailed planning of recommended safety and traffic improvements.

Intersection improvements for Fitzgerald Street and Venn Street will be considered in both the short and long term as part of the NPTS. This includes looking at safety related to turning movements into and out of Venn Street. The City could pursue Black Spot funding options to help with necessary safety changes following on from this.

Any works identified would be prioritised based on need and available funding, including external grant opportunities. At this stage, Administration is unable to confirm specific works or timeframes for implementation of any recommended improvements

5.1 NO. 20 (LOT: 9; PLAN: 1237) GROSVENOR ROAD, MOUNT LAWLEY - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM SINGLE HOUSE TO HOLIDAY HOUSE

Ward: South Ward

Attachments:

1. Consultation and Location Map
2. Development Plans
3. Management Plan
4. Code of Conduct
5. Applicant Justification
6. Clause 67 Assessment
7. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response
8. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, **REFUSES** the application for Change of Use from Single House to Holiday House at No. 20 (Lot: 9; Plan: 1237) Grosvenor Road, Mount Lawley for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the objectives of the Residential zone of the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, and the objectives of the City's Local Planning Policy – Short Term Accommodation, the proposed development would be incompatible with its setting and would have adverse impacts on the amenity and character of locality as:
 - 1.1 Pursuant to 67(m) and (n) in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the proposed Holiday House would not enhance the amenity of the locality. The surrounding context is characterised by single residential dwellings, and the introduction of a Holiday House, which is by nature more intensive and transient, would be incompatible with the established residential character and amenity of the area;
 - 1.2 Pursuant to the objectives of the Residential Zone in the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, the proposed Holiday is not compatible with, nor complimentary to, surrounding properties. The introduction of a commercial land use into the low-density residential area would generate levels of noise and activity that are inconsistent with the established residential character, resulting in an undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties; and
 - 1.3 Pursuant to the objectives of the City's Local Planning Policy – Short Term Accommodation, the proposed Holiday House is not appropriately located or designed to mitigate potential noise impacts on surrounding residential properties. The outdoor living area directly adjoins the private open spaces of neighbouring properties and is situated within a quiet residential streetscape. This setting is particularly sensitive to increased noise and activity, increasing the likelihood of disturbance and resulting in a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.

CR CASTLE:

There was commentary raised by the applicant about the size of the outdoor living area on the plans, resulting in it not being classified as an outdoor living area. Why is there a difference of opinion between the applicant and the Officer's report?

A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The applicant referenced the deemed-to-comply provisions for outdoor living areas under the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 (R Codes), Part B, which set minimum private open space standards for new dwellings or additions to existing dwellings.

These size standards in the R Codes are not relevant to this application, as it relates to a change of use rather than a new or modified development.

The focus of assessment should be on the amenity impacts of the proposed use on the outdoor living areas of adjoining properties.

Administration's assessment considers outdoor areas that are designed or capable of being used for active or passive recreation. These are spaces where guest activity and associated noise would likely occur. The assessment considers whether these areas are located and designed in a way that minimises noise impacts on nearby sensitive land uses, such as neighbouring outdoor living areas or windows to habitable rooms.

Shown below, the subject site includes an elevated rear verandah, a paved outdoor area with a movable dining set, and a grassed area. Each of these areas are a functional outdoor space capable of passive and active recreation. These areas are located close to the established outdoor living areas of adjoining properties, and form a key part of the assessment in considering potential amenity impacts from the proposed use.

For these reasons, the proposal does not meet the objectives of the Short Term Accommodation Policy that seeks for Holiday Houses to be located and designed in a manner that minimises the level of noise generated by guests.





CR GREER:

The applicant provided a list of recently approved short-term accommodations as part of their justification. Why were these properties deemed acceptable and why is the No. 20 Grosvenor Road proposal not?

A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The STRA approvals shown below were supported due to unique contextual and/or operational factors that, in combination, aligned with the planning framework. This includes exposure to ambient noise, separation from nearby outdoor living and sensitive areas of adjoining properties, historic long-term operation, and low-scale operations.

Each application is required to be assessed individually, based on its own merits and the site’s specific context. In assessing the subject proposal, the focus must be to consider the site’s locational context, the suitability of the proposed operation, and its alignment with the objectives of the Residential Zone and the City’s Short Term Accommodation Policy.

Address	Reasons for Acceptability
21 Alfonso Street, North Perth <i>Single House</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property owner and Holiday House operator resides at the adjoining southern property, providing on-site management / host responsibilities for the accommodation. • Time-bound to ensure the use remains tied to the owner/host residing at the adjoining property. Further approval would not be supported if this situation changes. • Outdoor living areas of adjoining properties (except for the southern property) are separated from the subject site’s outdoor living area, minimising noise impacts.
30 Cleaver Street, West Perth <i>Multiple Dwelling Development (3x one-bedroom & 12x studio apartments)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within an R80 high-density area. • Approval was for the entire complex (three one-bedroom apartments, and 12 studio apartments). • Complex has been operating as short-term accommodation since at least 2017. The City has not received any complaints regarding its operations. • Two guests permitted per booking apartment in the studio apartments, and three in the one-bedroom apartments. • No outdoor living areas are adjacent to adjoining properties. Only the three one-bedroom apartments have balconies, which are orientated towards the Cleaver Street. The 12 studio apartments do not have outdoor living areas. • All units are used for short term rental accommodation meaning there is no adverse impact on other neighbours within the complex.
9 Ebsworth Street, Mount Lawley <i>Grouped Dwelling</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site and adjoining properties are affected by high-levels of ambient noise from traffic and rail. It is located 50 metres from two high-traffic primary regional roads (East Parade and Guildford Road) and 80 metres from a raised rail line.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The northern adjoining properties are currently vacant and are zoned R100 for high-density development. • The outdoor living area on the subject site does not adjoin any other outdoor living areas of adjoining properties. • Maximum of four guests.
<p>64 Richmond Street, Leederville</p> <p><i>Single House</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corner site. • Site experiences ambient noise due to its interface with the Loftus Centre Public Car Park and a kindergarten, which has outdoor play areas oriented toward Richmond Street. • The site's outdoor living area is separated from neighbouring outdoor living areas, does not adjoin any major openings, and directly interfaces with Fleet Street. • Maximum of two guests or one family. • Time-bound approval for 12-months.
<p>114 Vincent Street, North Perth</p> <p><i>Single House</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site and adjoining properties are affected by ambient noise due to their interface with Hyde Park as well as Vincent Street, which is a District Distributor road with consistent traffic activity. • The site's outdoor living area is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Located within the street setback and oriented toward Vincent Street. ○ Not located adjacent to neighbouring outdoor living areas or windows to habitable rooms that are not already affected by existing ambient noise. • Time-bound approval for 12-months.

MAYOR XAMON:

If an approval were granted, would this be in perpetuity and would the approval run with the land?

A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Yes, all development approvals run with the land. This means the approval remains valid regardless of ownership or operator changes.

Unless a condition specifies a time limit, the approval is in perpetuity.

Administration's report explains why a time-limited approval is not supported in this instance.

6.3 RESPONSE TO PETITION - LEAKE/ALMA STREET ECO-ZONING

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in response to a petition received by Council on 8 April 2025 in relation to the proposed Eco-zoning project at Leake/Alma Street Reserve:

1. **NOTES** the comments received through consultation for the Eco-zoning project at Leake/Alma Street Reserve; and
2. **REQUESTS** Administration to implement Eco-zoning at Leake/Alma Street Reserve in-line with the revised plan.

CR HALLETT:

Please update the report to include a diagram showing the additional items discussed during the public gallery session.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

The Amended Eco Zoning Plan has been added to the report.

6.1 DRAFT BEAUFORT STREET PRECINCT AREA, ROAD SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- Attachments:**
1. Highgate - Road Safety Implementation Plan - Draft
 2. Scope of Works - IE363-2024 Highgate Precinct Wide Traffic Analysis
 3. OCM Agenda - 21 May 2024 - Item 10.2 Beaufort Street Precinct Area Road Safety
 4. OCM Minutes - 21 May 2024 - Item 10.2 Beaufort Street Precinct Area Road Safety

RECOMMENDATION:**That Council:**

1. **NOTES** the draft to date of the proposed Highgate Precinct Road Safety Implementation Plan and its key modelling findings and potential treatments as detailed in Attachment 1;
2. **REQUESTS** Administration to engage with the Highgate community regarding the key modelling findings and potential treatments of the draft plan, with particular focus on residents of Harold Street and Chatsworth Road, as well as those directly affected by the proposed twenty-two treatments;
3. **Following** community feedback, **SUPPORTS** Administration in initiating the design process for the one-way conversions on Harold Street, Chatsworth Road and St Albans Avenue and in submitting the designs to Main Roads WA for consideration; and
4. **REQUESTS** that the final Road Safety Implementation Plan be presented to the Council Workshop in early 2026, incorporating –
 - a. the Mount Lawley Precinct Area;
 - b. community feedback on the findings and proposed treatments; and
 - c. consideration of the North Perth Precinct Traffic Study.

CR CASTLE:

What is Administration seeking to achieve through this process, and when will Council next be engaged? In Clause 2, could the term "engage" be clarified—does it mean to consult, inform, or something else? The wording of Recommendation 3 appears somewhat subjective. The recommendation should more clearly reflect what Administration intends to do as a result of the consultation before the matter returns to Council.

MANAGER ENGINEERING:

The key objective is to inform the community of the precinct wide modelling, its findings and to seek feedback on the overarching plan and the proposed treatments.

The final draft plan will be presented at a Council Workshop in early 2026. Updates of significance can be provided via the Information Bulletin.

CR HALLETT:

In Recommendation 3, consider whether "community consultation" is the most appropriate term—could alternative wording be considered?

MANAGER ENGINEERING:

The resolution has been reworded.

CR LA FONTAINE:

Recommendation 2 refers to a "particular focus" on Harold and Chatsworth Streets—what does this mean in practical terms? Will different consultation methods be used based on location (e.g., addressed forms to specific residents)?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

Community engagement will inform the community on the findings and potential treatments of the draft plan, requesting community feedback which will be considered for inclusion in the detailed design of the road safety treatments where required.

CR LA FONTAINE:

Have updated versions of Appendices A–C from the consultant been provided, and if so, can these be made available?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

The updated revisions will be provided as part of the final version of the consultants Road Safety Implementation Plan in December 2025.

CR LA FONTAINE:

There appears to be an overlap between the current plan and the North Perth Precinct area. Can background information relating to this be provided? Some areas such as Joel Terrace appear to have no proposed treatments—are these addressed in a separate plan?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

The Mount Lawley area has been added to the scope and part of this will explore Road Safety treatments on Joel Terrace. This gives opportunity for the areas of Highgate, Mt Lawley to be integrated with the traffic modelling done in the North Perth precinct area, developing a base traffic model which can be used for future studies within these areas.

At 6:50 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace left the meeting.

At 6:51 pm, Cr Ron Alexander left the meeting.

5.5 ADVERTISING OF LOCAL HERITAGE SURVEY AND AMENDED HERITAGE LIST

- Attachments:
1. Draft Amended Heritage List
 2. Draft Local Heritage Survey
 3. Summary of New Nominations to the Local Heritage Survey

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. PREPARES:
 - 1.1 The draft Heritage List as included in Attachment 1 in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 3 Clause 8(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
 - 1.2 The draft Local Heritage Survey consisting of existing heritage-listed places, included in Attachment 2, and proposed nominations for inclusion on the Local Heritage Survey, included in Attachment 3, in accordance with Part 8 Clause 103(1) of the *Heritage Act 2018*;
2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise:
 - 2.1 The draft Heritage List in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 3 Clause 8(3) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
 - 2.2 The draft Local Heritage Survey in accordance with the City's Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy; and
3. NOTES that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

NO QUESTIONS ASKED AT BRIEFING

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Attachment 2 has been updated to include additional historical information within the place record forms for Baker's Terrace, Perth.

This relates to Robin Warren being a previous owner of No. 178 Lake Street, which forms part of the broader Baker's Terrace grouping. Robin Warren won the 2005 Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine.

This further strengthens the place record and historic information for this place.

At 6:51 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace returned to the meeting.

At 6:51 pm, Cr Ron Alexander returned to the meeting.

5.3 NO. 188 (LOT: 1; D/P: 33790) VINCENT STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PLACE OF WORSHIP (AMENDMENT TO APPROVED)

Ward: South

Attachments:

1. Consultation and Location Plan
2. Development Plans
3. Conservation Plan 2011

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, **APPROVES** the application for Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship (Amendment to Approved) at No. 188 (Lot: 1; D/P: 33790) Vincent 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 approvals 5.2022.280.1 granted on 13 December 2022 and 5.2023.117.1 granted on 19 September 2023 continue to apply to this approval, except as follows:

1.1 Condition 1 is deleted and replaced as follows:

1. This approval is for Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship as shown on the approved plans which are listed as follows:

<u>Plan Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date Received</u>
Site Plan Existing	DA100	11 November 2022
Site Plan	DA101	3 April 2025
Ground Floor Plan	DA201	11 November 2022
Mezzanine Plan and Section	DA202	11 November 2022
Floor Plan – Western Narthex	DA210	11 November 2022
GF Plan – Sanctuary	DA215	11 November 2022
Southern Elevation – Narthex	DA301	11 November 2022
West Elevations – Narthex	DA302	11 November 2022
Section & Upper Floor – Existing	DA400	11 November 2022
Western Narthex – Nave Opening	DA711	11 November 2022
Plan Elevations – Plantroom Existing	DA228	29 August 2023
Plan Elevations – Plantroom Proposed	DA229	29 August 2023

1.2 Condition 8 is added as follows:

8. Prior to completion of works associated with the carpark, a tree shall be planted in the location annotated on the approved plan (Reference: DA101) dated 3 April 2025. The species shall be either a Tuart Tree or Eucalyptus Rudis Tree, planted at a minimum pot size of 200 litres, and shall be maintained thereafter at the expense of the owners/occupiers, to the satisfaction of the City.

CR LA FONTAINE:

What is the required number of parking bays for the site, how many are currently provided, and how many will be provided upon completion of the proposed works?

A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The Place of Worship has a minimum parking requirement of 100 parking bays, based on a maximum number of 400 patrons.

The site currently provides 116 car parking bays, resulting in a surplus of 16 bays above the minimum requirement.

The proposed amendments would result a net reduction of 10 parking bays, bringing the total parking bays provided on-site to 106.

The proposal would maintain a overall surplus of 6 car parking bays, and the Place of Worship would continue to meet the deemed-to-comply standards of the City's Non-Residential Development Parking Policy.

5.6 ADVERTISING OF DRAFT SUSTAINABLE VINCENT FRAMEWORK AND ENHANCED ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY

- Attachments:
1. Sustainable Vincent Framework
 2. Enhanced Environment Strategy
 3. Summary of Enhanced Environment Strategy Objectives & Targets
 4. Sustainable Environment Strategy 2023/24 Progress Report
 5. Summary of Emissions Inventory

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. APPROVES the draft Sustainable Vincent Framework, included in Attachment 1, and the draft Enhanced Environment Strategy, included in Attachment 2, for public consultation for a period of 42 days in accordance with the City's Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy; and
2. NOTES that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

CR WALLACE:

The target to embed WSUD principles refers to all projects. Is the scope of this all projects or a major piece of infrastructure works?

Can this target be reviewed so that it is clear what the measure of success would be?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

This target relates to all major drainage projects, over \$50,000 in relation to the City's buildings parks and assets.

Administration has updated the wording of this target in the EES to ensure that is clear, measurable and specific (emphasis underlined):

- *"Water Sensitive Urban Design principles are incorporated into 100% of future, major drainage projects to improve the management, capture and reuse of stormwater drainage and infiltration in relevant City buildings, parks and assets."*

In support of this target the text in Objective 3 – Water Sensitive Urban Design within the EES has also been updated to provide further context to how WSUD can be and is practically implemented in the City's projects.

CR WALLACE:

Can the target to 'protect and enhance the health of the Derbal Yirragan (Swan River) and the local surrounding wetlands (Hyde Park and Lake Monger)' be reviewed so that it is clear what the measure of success would be? The target also references Lake Monger which is outside of Vincent, but doesn't include any of Vincent's wetlands aside from Hyde Park.

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

Administration has updated the wording and separated these into two targets, with one being specific to the Derbal Yirragan, and one being specific to the City's wetlands. This ensures that each target is clear, measurable and specific.

- *"Collaborate with DBCA to develop and realise shared objectives for the river and foreshore, through the River Protection Strategy, Swan River Locality Plan, the Risk Management and Adaptation Plan; and any other advocacy opportunities."*
- *"Achieve a best management practice overall score of above average (or greater) for all wetlands in the nutrient scorecard from the South East Regional Centre for Urban Landcare, for best management practices pertaining to wetland health."*

The City currently participates in the nutrient scorecard program and achieved an 'above average' overall

rating in 2024. This puts the City in the top 30% of all local governments in WA and is one step below the top rating of 'excellent'.

The nutrient scorecard assesses multiple aspects of wetland and foreshore health, including nutrient levels, fertiliser application practices, nutrient management and water quality monitoring.

Further context has also been included in the EES under Objective 4 – Healthy Waterways and Thriving Ecosystems to set out the City's ongoing efforts towards the protection and enhancement of local waterways and wetlands.

CR WALLACE:

Can the contents page be higher up in the document?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

Administration has updated the SVF to include a contents page at the start of the document. A contents page was included at the start of the EES.

6.2 BEATTY PARK RESERVE - TOILET BLOCK INSTALLATION

- Attachments:
1. Beatty Park Reserve - Toilet Block - Concept Design - Confidential
 2. Beatty Park Reserve - Comms Reach Report - Toilet and Playground
 3. Beatty Park Reserve - Survey Response Report - Toilet and Playground

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. ENDORSES the proposal to install a Toilet Block at Beatty Park Reserve;
2. NOTES that \$200,000 (ex GST) being the City's contribution to the Beatty Park Toilet Block project will be included in the 2025/2026 budget for Council consideration; and
3. NOTES the \$100,000 commitment from Perth Soccer Club through the Women's World Cup Legacy Funding program to partially fund this project.

CR WALLACE:

Can the design be improved, and if so, what additional budget would be required to achieve a better outcome? Could further detail be provided on how the project costing was determined, including any contingencies?

MANAGER COMMUNITY FACILITIES:

The opportunity to improve the design is constrained by the budget, particularly where it involves grant funds. For context and design perspective, the Banks Reserve and Birdwood Square toilet blocks have presented ongoing maintenance issues due to certain design shortcomings. As a result, these lessons have been carefully considered during the planning phase of the Beatty Park toilet facility and will be incorporated into the detailed design to ensure refinements that minimise long-term maintenance and enhance functionality over the life of the facility.

The project contingency will account for factors such as site-specific conditions, potential unknown elements, and any latent issues that may arise during construction. This approach will help ensure the project can be delivered effectively without compromising quality, functionality, or long-term performance.

To provide an indication of potential additional costs, the Town of Cambridge constructed a comparable toilet block at Lake Monger in 2022 at a cost of approximately \$360,000. It is important to note that escalation costs will need to be considered to reflect current-day prices, with similar facilities in 2025 likely to range between \$400,000 and \$450,000 due to increases in construction and material costs.



CR GREER:

The report highlights the benefits of a modular structure. Why is the focus on relocating it later, rather than identifying the optimal location from the outset?

MANAGER COMMUNITY FACILITIES:

The modular facility presents a more cost-effective option compared to a permanent build. As highlighted by the Executive Director during the briefing, the flexibility to relocate the facility in response to changing demand across different suburbs over the medium to long term is a significant advantage.

The City has continued to engage with the community surrounding Beatty Park Reserve to ensure the venue remains a publicly accessible space for both recreational and passive users, in addition to its use by Perth Soccer Club (PSC) as the active user of the reserve. The modular option also offers the added flexibility to evolve the asset—for example, by incorporating changeroom facilities should there be positive community uptake—or to relocate it within the reserve or to another site where it may better meet local needs.

City Officers, in consultation with Perth Soccer Club, agree that delivering a functional toilet block with the flexibility to be relocated in line with community needs is a key driver of this project.

At 7.04pm Manager Parks left the meeting and did not return.

At 7.04 pm Coordinator Sport and Recreation and did not return.

At 7.04pm Executive Manager Communications and Engagement and did not return.

At 7.04pm Manager Community Facilities and did not return.

At 7.04pm Manager City Buildings and Asset Management and did not return.

At 7.04pm A/Coordinator City Infrastructure and did not return.

5.4 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 7.5.23 - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLANS

- Attachments:**
1. **Draft Local Planning Policy: Construction Management**
 2. **Policy No. 7.5.23 - Construction Management Plans**
 3. **Schedule of Modifications**

RECOMMENDATION**That Council:**

1. **PREPARES** the amendments to **Local Planning Policy: Construction Management** as included in Attachment 1 in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2 Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the proposed amendments in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
3. **NOTES** that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

MAYOR XAMON:

Is there any suggestion that we are going to prohibit the shutting down of footpaths? If it is being allowed, will there be time limits on how long footpaths would be unusable?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING

Administration has updated the draft Policy to include the following standard:

"Footpaths are to be unobstructed at all times unless it can be demonstrated that:

- *It is unavoidable and no alternative arrangement is available;*
- *It is for the shortest duration necessary;*
- *Safe alternative pedestrian access can be achieved; and*
- *An obstruction permit has been issued by the City."*

This establishes that footpaths are always to be unobstructed, unless there are instances where a temporary obstruction to the footpath is required to facilitate construction activities. This would include the loading, unloading and moving of materials.

In these instances, an obstruction permit is required from the City under the Local Government Property Law 2021.

Through this the City would assess the context of the site and impact of any obstruction to ensure that safe pedestrian movement around the site and throughout the area could still occur.

Obstruction permits would include conditions which limit the length of time that a footpath obstruction can occur for, including between the hours of construction work.

This type of guidance on maintaining footpath access and the obstruction permit process would be provided in the supporting information sheet.

MAYOR XAMON:

Is there any capacity to prohibit cranes being left over adjoining properties?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING

There would be no planning basis and ability to prohibit cranes overhanging adjoining properties within the draft Policy.

This is a civil matter and would not relate to a planning matter consistent with the Planning & Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015. This provides the head of power for the draft Policy.

Building legislation allows for cranes to overhang adjoining properties provided that the consent of the affected landowner is obtained. This usually occurs through the Building Permit process.

Further guidance on the obligations of builders using cranes in relation to adjoining properties to ensure this occurs safely would be provided in the supporting information sheet.

The draft Policy provides guidance on how construction activities should be managed to minimise off-site impacts but cannot extend to forcing the completion of works within a prescribed time where delays are experienced.

The City's involvement in the construction and development process is limited to the issuing of planning approvals and building permits, and ensuring the works are undertaken in accordance with these approvals.

CR WALLACE:

Should the draft Policy include the requirement for Construction Management Plans to include targets for re-use of materials?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

There would be no planning basis to require material reuse within the draft Policy.

While material reuse and landfill diversion are key components of the City's draft EES, they fall outside the scope of planning matters consistent with the Planning & Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.

The City's Green Track initiative would provide an opportunity for this to be considered as part of new developments. This incentivises planning applications that submit a Life Cycle Assessment with reduced fees and a prioritised assessment. A Life Cycle Assessment includes consideration of material reuse and recovery as well as construction methodology when assessing the environmental performance of a new development.

The supporting information sheet would reiterate the City's target for the recovery and reuse of materials and provide guidance to support builders to implement this through construction activities.

CR WALLACE:

Should the draft Policy include details regarding contractor parking?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

The draft Policy prohibits contractors from parking in restricted on-street parking bays unless a Parking Permit has been issued by the City.

Further guidance would be provided in the supporting information sheet for contractors to consider so that parking is effectively managed. Measures to reduce reliance on public parking would include:

- *Utilising on-site parking where available.*
- *Staging development to reduce parking demands.*
- *Having agreements to use nearby vacant sites for parking.*

CR WALLACE:

Should the draft Policy detail community notification periods works occurring out of working hours and parking permits?

A/MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING:

The draft Policy requires community notification to occur 14 days before works commence and detail any anticipated disruptions. Disruptions would include any impact to public parking.

In instances of works occurring outside of working hours, Administration has updated the draft Policy so that notification is to be provided to impacted owners and occupiers (emphasis added):

"Development works are to be undertaken at the development site between 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday. No works are to be undertaken outside of these hours including on Sundays and public holidays unless a noise management plan has been approved by the City and notification has been provided to affected landowners and occupiers a minimum of 72 hours prior to commencement."

This aligns with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 which requires that notification be provided to affected properties a minimum of 24 hours prior to commencement of works where the City has approved these to occur outside of permitted construction hours.

Further guidance would be provided in the supporting information sheet.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Administration has also updated the draft Policy to clarify that the temporary use of road reserves for the storage of materials does not include the road carriageway itself and would be limited to the verge area.

At 7.21pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

At 7.21pm A/Manager Strategic Planning left the meeting and did not return.

6.4 RESPONSE TO PETITION - CLOSURE OF GREEN STREET - IMPACT OF INCREASED TRAFFIC ON ELLESMERE STREET AND SURROUNDS

Attachments: 1. Petition - Ellesmere Street - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That in response to a petition received by the Council on 24 March 2025 in relation to Road Safety issues on Ellsemere Street, in particular to speed, Council:

1. **NOTES** the request for city staff to introduce temporary traffic calming measures to slow traffic such as bollards and restrictions during the closure period for the Main Roads WA project on the corner of Green Street, Brady Street and Scarborough Beach Road is not logistically practical given the project's near completion; and
2. **REQUESTS** Administration to continue with low-cost traffic calming initiatives such as the recent deployment of the Electronic Speed Radar Signs for the entire length of Ellsemere Street, from Scarborough Beach Road through to Charles Street; and
3. **SUPPORTS** the development of a 5 – year Road Safety Implementation Plan to traffic model, design and deliver permanent Road Safety projects identified within the Mount Hawthorn Precinct area including Ellsemere St from Scarborough Beach Road through to Charles Street, and
4. The draft Road Safety Implementation Plan to be presented for Council consideration by December 2026 (with progress update via Council Workshop May 2026) with delivery of works prioritised based on the treatment of severely or seriously injured crashes identified within the Mount Hawthorn precinct, with the intersections of Ellesmere Street ranked as high priority projects; and
5. **CONSULT** with Mount Hawthorn residents on 5 – year Road Safety Implementation Plan, including the option of permanently slowing speeds to 40km/h on Ellsemere Street from Scarborough Beach Road to Charles Street.

CR LA FONTAINE:

In relation to Recommendation 3, can more information be provided about other untreated black spot locations within the proposed precinct area? How many black spots currently exist in the area, and are there any historic black spot sites (outside the current five-year period) that should be considered?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

The below is an abstract from the Main Roads WA crash map and in red, shows the casualty crashes (high severity). The 5 – year Road Safety Implementation plan for this area will look to eliminate and mitigate the severity of these crashes as well as modelling traffic congestion which is currently being experienced on Brady Street and around the Powis Street area near the Freeway on-ramp.



CR CASTLE:

In relation to Recommendation 5, what would the implementation process involve? Would a change in road classification be required? Are there other distributor roads within the area that may be more appropriate for a 40 km/h speed limit?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

Ellesmere Street is a Local Distributor road. This road will be included in other Local Distributor roads which will be applied to Main Roads WA to be slowed to 40km/h. Currently, Main Roads WA criteria for reducing speeds on the Local Distributor roads is for the City to demonstrate there is community support and that Council support the reduced speed on these roads.

At 7:20 pm, Cr Suzanne Worner left the meeting.

7.4 EVENT SPONSORSHIP 2025/26

- Attachments:**
1. **Event Sponsorship Guidelines 2025-26**
 2. **Event Sponsorship Applications Overview**
 3. **Revelation Perth International Film Festival - Confidential**
 4. **Super Market - Confidential**
 5. **Take 5 and Wind it on Exhibition Launch - Confidential**
 6. **Reclink Cup - Confidential**
 7. **Fairytales in the Park - Confidential**
 8. **Dogtober-fest - Confidential**
 9. **Leedy Artfest - Confidential**
 10. **The Provedores Market - Confidential**
 11. **Jazz Picnic in the Park - Confidential**
 12. **Mo-Town - Movember Fundraiser - Confidential**
 13. **Beaufort Street Christmas Festival - Confidential**
 14. **Casa Musica - Confidential**
 15. **Hyde Park Festival - Confidential**
 16. **Neon Picnic - Confidential**
 17. **St Patricks Festival WA - Confidential**
 18. **Perth Vegan Expo - Confidential**
 19. **Leederville Connect - Events Calendar - Confidential**
 20. **East Perth Football Club - NAIDOC - Confidential**
 21. **Street Art Film Festival & Live Mural Battle - Confidential**
 22. **Rewilding & Reconnecting Initiative Verge Launch - Confidential**
 23. **Miles Garner Starlight Spooktakular for Little Horrors - Confidential**
 24. **The Silver Web, A Halloween Adventure - Confidential**
 25. **Birdwood Family Festival - Confidential**
 26. **Little People's Festival - Confidential**
 27. **Boorloo Contemporary - Confidential**
 28. **Perth Festival - Main Stage EPPS - Confidential**
 29. **TV World - Confidential**

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY an amount of \$232,000 for 2025/26 Event Sponsorship as follows:

Event	Amount
Revelation Perth International Film Festival Inc. Revelation Perth International Film Festival	\$20,000
Maya Kuszewski Super Market	In-Kind Support
Northbridge Common Take 5 and Wind it on Exhibition Launch	\$6,500
Reclink Australia Reclink Perth Community Cup	\$10,000
Elenna Stacey Fairytales in the Park	\$7,000
Beaufort Street Network Dogtober-Fest	\$4,500
The Leederville Precinct Leedy Artfest	\$10,000
Pisconeri Wholesalers – James De Leo The Provedores Market	\$20,000
Perth International Jazz Festival Jazz Picnic in the Park	\$15,000
The Leederville Precinct Mo-Town Fundraiser	\$6,000
Beaufort Street Network Beaufort Street Christmas Festival	\$8,000
Perth Festival	\$40,000

Casa Musica	
Rotary Club of North Perth Hyde Park Festival	\$20,000
RTFRFM 92.1 Neon Picnic	\$10,000
St Patrick's Day WA Inc St Patricks Festival WA	\$20,000
Liberation Cooperative Perth Vegan Expo	\$20,000
Leederville Connect Events Calendar	\$15,000
East Perth Football Club NAIDOC	\$0
Blank Walls International Pty Street Art Film Festival & Live Mural Battle	\$0
Northbridge Common Rewilding & Reconnecting Verge Launch	\$0
Realmark Miles Garners Starlight Spooktakular for Little Horrors	\$0
Remida WA The Silver Web, A Halloween Adventure	\$0
Ricochet Circus Birdwood Family Festival	\$0
Charlesworth Ballet Institute Little People's Festival	\$0
Perth Festival Boorloo Contemporary	\$0
Perth Festival Main Stage	\$0
Rose Kingdom-Barron TV World	\$0
TOTAL EVENT SPONSORSHIP	\$232,000

2. That Council APPROVES \$40,000 to be expended on infrastructure improvements at East Perth Power Station in the City's leased area.
3. That Council APPROVES \$45,000 for the City to run Rainbow Family Picnic and Festival of Culture.
4. NOTES the allocation of 2025/26 Event Sponsorship remains subject to the recipient signing a Sponsorship Agreement with the City of Vincent identifying all related expectations and obligations.

CR CASTLE:

Given the funding recommendation for the Provedores Market, if they were not to deliver four events as proposed this year, would funding be proportionally reduced? How do you reassess community benefit when there are fewer bigger events rather than four smaller events?

EXECUTIVE MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT:

If the Provedores Market advise they can no longer deliver the four events they applied for, the funding would be reduced proportionally (by 25% per event).

Administration works closely with each event applicant to ensure they can deliver a successful event but it is understood that circumstances can change after funding has been approved.

Should a change of format be proposed for any event, Administration would work with the event organiser on a new and mutually agreeable proposal and budget. The new event would still be required to demonstrate community benefit.

Community benefit is assessed on the description the event organiser provides in their application against the criteria detailed in the application form based on the event offering – for example free activities, entertainment, community participation through local business/community groups, marketing strategies, smart-travel methods, and inclusivity.

For larger events, it is expected that organisers demonstrate a thorough understanding of the event approval process and work with Administration to ensure the event has a positive effect not just for attendees, but also local residents and businesses.

In-kind support is additional to event funding and is also assessed as part of the funding approval process.

CR WOOLF:

With regards to the Miles Garner's Starlight Spooktakular and the comment that the event lacked broader community appeal, how did this event differ to other family events like Fairytales in the Park that was recommended for approval for example?

EXECUTIVE MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT:

Administration assesses each application based on the detail contained in the submission.

The application for Starlight Spooktakular lacked the required level of detail specifically around the event itself and what it would comprise. When assessing community appeal, Administration look at the range of activities proposed for an event and the appeal of these to the potential audience.

Despite the above, Administration acknowledges the local community appeal of the Spooktakular event and as such, recommends they apply for a Waiver of Hire Fees for the park rather than providing cash funding.

Fairy Tales in the Park presented a detailed proposal and they have proven experience in delivering large scale community events. Their proposed event features a range of activities including live musical performances, kids' activities and food vendors demonstrating a broader community appeal.

Administration also identified potential for further community collaboration with local service providers and the City of Vincent Library to further extend the event offering.

At 7:24 pm, Cr Suzanne Worner returned to the meeting.

7.5 DIFFERENTIAL RATING STRATEGY 2025/26

- Attachments:
1. Statement of Financial Activity FY2025/26 (Draft)
 2. Statement of Objects and Reasons for the Proposed Differential Rates and Minimum Payments for 2025/26

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ADVERTISES** by local public notice for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Section 6.36(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, its intention to levy the following differential rates and minimum rates in 2025/2026 as set out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons for the Proposed Differential Rates and Minimum Payments for 2025/2026, at Attachment 2;
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to invite submissions from electors and ratepayers on the proposed differential rates and minimum payments for 2025/2026:

Rating Category	2025/2026	
	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate
Residential	0.0817795	\$1,516.54
Vacant-Residential	0.0920752	\$1,420.00
Vacant-Commercial	0.1485536	\$1,853.07
Other	0.0770538	\$1,463.62

MAYOR XAMON:

Can Administration provide details on the potential impact of increasing the residential vacant property rates by 25% instead of the proposed 9%? I would like to foreshadow a possible amendment to this effect.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

The table shows the changes to the Vacant Residential Rate in the Dollar and Minimum Rate with an increase of 25% instead of the proposed 9%.

This equates to an increase of \$6.28 per week or \$326.80 per year for the medial vacant residential ratepayer.

Rating Category	2025/2026	
	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate
Residential	0.0817795	\$1,516.54
Vacant-Residential	0.0920752 0.1055909	\$1,420.00 \$1615.00
Vacant-Commercial	0.1485536	\$1,853.07
Other	0.0770538	\$1,463.62

8.3 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. **Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Special Council Meeting held on 26 March 2025**
 2. **Unconfirmed Minutes of the Catalina Regional Council Meeting held on 17 April 2025**
 3. **Minutes Arts Advisory Group 19 February 2025**
 4. **Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of April 2025 - to follow due to end of month**
 5. **Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential**
 6. **Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at**
 7. **Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current**
 8. **Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current**
 9. **Register of Petitions - Progress Report May 2025**
 10. **Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - May 2025**
 11. **Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - May 2025**
 12. **Council Workshop Items since 9 April 2025**
 13. **Council Briefing Notes - 1 April 2025**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the Information Bulletin dated May 2025.

CR WALLACE:

Could Administration include a report on Snap Send Solve in the Infobulletin?

EXECUTIVE MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT:

A summary of the Snaps received via Snap Send Solve for the past 12 months has been added to the Info bulletin. These figures will be reported via the Infobulletin on a quarterly basis moving forward.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**A/MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

Statistics for Development Applications as at the end of April 2025 have now been included.

The Development Assessment Panel Register has been updated for current applications at No. 192 Stirling Street, Perth, No. 129 Loftus Street, Leederville and No. 177 Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn.

The SAT Register has been updated for the appeal at No. 235 Brisbane Street, Perth.

REPORTS WITH NO DISCUSSION**6.5 RFT IE384-2025 HVAC CHILLER REPLACEMENT - 246 VINCENT STREET LEEDERVILLE**

Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE384-2025 - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for IE384/2025 HVAC Chiller Replacement - 246 Vincent Street Leederville; and**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Australian HVAC Services Pty Ltd ATF Skenpost Trust t/a Australian HVAC Services for Tender IE384/2025 HVAC Chiller Replacement - 246 Vincent Street Leederville.**

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

7.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 MARCH 2025

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 31 March 2025

RECOMMENDATION:

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

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

7.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 MARCH 2025 TO 31 MARCH 2025

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

Recommendation:

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

EFT payments, including payroll	\$12,455,718.84
Cheques	\$1,692.40
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$234,426.87
Total payments for March 2025	\$12,691,838.11

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

7.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 MARCH 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 31 March 25

RECOMMENDATION:

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

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

7.6 ADOPTION OF THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2025/26 - 2034/35

Attachments: 1. Long Term Financial Plan 2026 - 2035

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. ADOPTS the Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 to 2034/35; and**
- 2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to forward the City of Vincent Long Term Financial Plan in Attachment 1 above to the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries.**

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

8.1 ANNUAL REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS

Attachments: 1. Register of Council Delegations - Marked up for 2025 Review

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

8.2 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED POLICY - ATTENDANCE AT EVENTS POLICY

Attachments: 1. Attendance at Events Policy - marked up

RECOMMENDATION

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

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

9 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

10 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

11 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil

12 CLOSURE

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.28pm.