



**CITY OF VINCENT**

# **AGENDA**

## **Ordinary Council Meeting**

**17 June 2025**

**Time: 6:00 PM**  
**Location: E-Meeting and at the Administration  
and Civic Centre,  
244 Vincent Street, Leederville**

**David MacLennan**  
**Chief Executive Officer**



**DISCLAIMER**

No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the City of Vincent (City) for any act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during Council Briefings or Council Meetings. The City disclaims any liability for any loss however caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during Council Briefings or Council Meetings. Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a Council Briefing or Council Meeting does so at their own risk.

In particular and without derogating in any way from the broad disclaimer above, in any discussion regarding any planning or development application or application for a licence, any statement or intimation of approval made by an Elected Member or Employee of the City during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not to be taken as notice of approval from the City. The City advises that anyone who has any application lodged with the City must obtain and should only rely on WRITTEN CONFIRMATION of the outcome of the application, and any conditions attaching to the decision made by the Council in respect of the application.

**Copyright**

Any plans or documents contained within this Agenda may be subject to copyright law provisions (Copyright Act 1968, as amended) and that the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction. It should be noted that Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against any persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may represent a copyright infringement.

**PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The City's Council Briefings, Ordinary Council Meetings, Special Council Meetings and Committee Meetings are held in the Council Chamber located upstairs in the City of Vincent Administration and Civic Centre. Meetings are also held electronically (as eMeetings), and live streamed so you can continue to watch our meetings and briefings online at <https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/council-meetings/livestream>

Public Questions will be strictly limited to three (3) minutes per person.

The following conditions apply to public questions and statements:

1. Members of the public present at Council Briefings will have an opportunity to ask questions or make statements during public question time. Questions and statements at Council Briefings must relate to a report contained in the agenda.
2. Members of the public present at Council Meetings, Special Council Meeting or Committee Meeting have an opportunity to ask questions or make statements during public question time in accordance with section 2.19(4) of the City's [Meeting Procedures Local Law](#).
3. Questions asked at an Ordinary Council Meeting must relate to a matter that affects the City of Vincent.
4. Questions asked at a Special Council Meeting or Committee Meeting must relate to the purpose for which the meeting has been called.
5. Written statements will be circulated to Elected Members and will not be read out unless specifically requested by the Presiding Member prior to the commencement of the meeting.
6. Where in-person meetings are not permitted due to a direction issued under the *Public Health Act 2016* or the *Emergency Management Act 2005* questions and/or statements may be submitted in writing and emailed to [governance@vincent.wa.gov.au](mailto:governance@vincent.wa.gov.au) by 3pm on the day of the Council proceeding. Please include your full name and suburb in your email.
7. Shortly after the commencement of the meeting, the Presiding Member will ask members of the public to come forward to address the Council and to give their name and the suburb in which they reside or, where a member of the public is representing the interests of a business, the suburb in which that business is located and Agenda Item number (if known).
8. Questions/statements are to be made politely in good faith and are not to be framed in such a way as to reflect adversely or be defamatory on an Elected Member or City Employee.
9. Where practicable, responses to questions will be provided at the meeting. Where the information is not available or the question cannot be answered, it will be "*taken on notice*" and a written response will be sent by the Chief Executive Officer to the person asking the question. A copy of the reply will be included in the Agenda of the next Ordinary meeting of the Council.
10. It is not intended that public speaking time should be used as a means to obtain information that would not be made available if it was sought from the City's records under Section 5.94 of the *Local Government Act 1995* or the *Freedom of Information Act 1992* (FOI Act). The CEO will advise the member of the public that the information may be sought in accordance with the FOI Act.

For further information, please view the [Council Proceedings Guidelines](#).

**RECORDING AND WEBSTREAMING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS**


- All Council proceedings are recorded and livestreamed in accordance with the [Council Proceedings - Recording and Web Streaming Policy](#).
- All recordings are retained as part of the City's records in accordance with the State Records Act 2000.
- All livestreams can be accessed at <https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/council-meetings/livestream>
- All live stream recordings can be accessed on demand at <https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/council-meetings>
- Images of the public gallery are not included in the webcast, however the voices of people in attendance may be captured and streamed.
- If you have any issues or concerns with the live streaming of meetings, please contact the City's Governance Team on 08 9273 6500.

## Order Of Business


1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country .....	9
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence .....	9
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements .....	9
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice .....	9
4	Applications for Leave of Absence .....	19
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations .....	19
6	Confirmation of Minutes .....	19
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) .....	19
8	Declarations of Interest .....	19
9	Strategy & Development .....	20
9.1	Advertising of Amended Planning and Building Policy Manual Appendix 20 - Refunding and Waiving Planning and Building Fees .....	20
9.2	State Administrative Tribunal - Section 31 Reconsideration - No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley - Reconsideration of Heritage Conservation Notice .....	27
9.3	Health Services - Historical Sundry Debtors 2018/19 - 2022/23 - Debt Write Off [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	38
10	Infrastructure & Environment .....	42
10.1	Lifovac Device Installation at Community Facilities .....	42
10.2	RFT IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator .....	46
11	Community & Business Services .....	51
11.1	Financial Statements as at 30 April 2025 .....	51
11.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 April 2025 to 30 April 2025 .....	55
11.3	Investment Report as at 30 April 2025 .....	58
11.4	Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	61
12	Chief Executive Officer .....	80
12.1	Adoption of Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 - 2028/2029 and the Four Year Capital Works Program 2025/26 – 2028/29 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	80
12.2	Reappointment of Chairperson and Deputy Chair Audit and Risk Committee [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	85
12.3	Information Bulletin .....	88
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given .....	89
	Nil	
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion) .....	89
	Nil	
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies .....	89
16	Urgent Business .....	89
	Nil	
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which The Meeting May Be Closed .....	89
	Nil	
18	Closure .....	89



# CITY OF VINCENT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK 2020 OVERVIEW









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

"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 a Council, the City of Vincent has a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people."

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

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

### **(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

#### **Laurie Vosnakos of North Perth – Item 10.3**

As you are aware the Leake Alma Reserve has been identified as a park within the Eco- zoning Parks and Reserves Implementation Plan 2011- 2025, for the potential conversion of turf to native garden areas.

The key aspect of this plan is the conversion of unused portions of turf into native gardens.

A requirement of this plan is that the concept plan for each specific park/reserve be reported to the Council for approval, prior to implementation.

I am very supportive of the conversion of under used turf areas into native gardens, such as the road reserve opposite HBF main entrance; and disappointed that applications for Adopt a Verge at the earliest will not be considered till 2027.

However, I have a few concerns regarding the approach and the intended actions in modifying the Leake Alma Reserve further into a native garden.

#### **Some Background:**

The park can be considered as 4 separate areas, each with an area of approximately 600m<sup>2</sup>, for total area of 2,400m<sup>2</sup>. Each area is approximately 15m wide and 40m long.

One entire area has already been eco-zoned into a native garden. It is in poor condition, with weeds, dead plants, dirt and generally aesthetically unpleasant.

The second area has a children's playground area, that has not had any equipment upgrade for over 15 years. Until the last several weeks, the surface of the playground area was a trip hazard, that has been temporary patched to remove the most severe trip hazards.

The second area also has some native plants along the eastern and southern border. A bench faces away from the playground area and the city skyline. The rest of the area is turf, which would equate to roughly 300m<sup>2</sup>.

The third area is all turf, that provides excellent shade over excellent grass (best in the park), that is adjacent to the footpath/road. There is no actual verge.

The fourth area, has a pair of swings, a sandpit and a bench under a mature tree, that provides food and shelter for red tailed cockatoos and other bird species.

The turf area of this area would approximate 200-300m<sup>2</sup>. This area had been identified for the location of Western Power infrastructure, which will further reduce the amount of turf area.

The park is considered a local public open space. Both a recreation space - that allows for informal play, physical activity, relaxation and social interaction; and a nature space to enjoy nature, biodiversity and natural area values.

#### **Concerns**

#### **Community Engagement**

There appears to be poor engagement with the community involving the proposed design and implementation for the further eco – zoning of the park.

There has not been any detailed plan of the proposed eco-zoning for the park provided to the community.

The initial awareness of any eco- zoning to be occurring was a sign stating that “Eco –zoning is on the way”, and a small typed line at the bottom stating for more information visit the ‘Imagine’ website.

No where was it clear that comments could be made.

Many residents were under the impression it was a given, just information and they could not provide any input or participate in any manner, or provide feedback.

There was no local letter drop.

**I believe a proper detailed design of the proposed change to the park should be provided to the community to allow appropriate feedback before any changes are made to the park.**

**And perform a letter drop.**

**Administration Response in italics:**

*Following feedback received through community consultation and a site visit with interested Council Members, an amended sketch plan with additional detail was developed and provided as an attachment to the Council report.*

*In addition, Administration met with Laurie and another resident on site to provide further detail on the design and to try and address any concerns there were with the proposal.*

**Council Approval**

The raising of a petition regarding changes to the park appears to be the reason a “plan” has been provided to the Council for approval prior to implementation rather than a given as required under the Eco- zoning Parks and Reserves Implementation Plan 2011- 2025.

It is proposed that Western Power equipment will be placed in the park that will affect the turf area and perhaps the adjacent swings, and therefore the design of any further native planting.

**I suggest that the eco-zone design for the entire park, after the Western Power equipment is placed should be provided to the Council for approval prior to implementation. For both cost and logistics benefits.**

**Administration Response in italics:**

*This suggestion is not supported by Administration as it will result in significant delays to the project.*

**Comments Input/Feedback**

Some community members became aware that comments could be provided; and provided comments on a very rough map and unclear changes that were made available.

Administration provided comments to the feedback from the community, and many of the Administration comments, were misleading, incorrect and dismissive of the community comments.

As examples of this misleading, incorrect and dismissive responses made by Administration, consider the following:

1. Design does not take away the useability of the open turf area (verge only to be eco-zoned)

There is no actual verge (a typical verge is less than 2m) and the latest plan, as part of the 13 May 2025 Council Meeting agenda shows up to 7.5m of turf area, half the width (15m) of the park in parts being mulched.

There are areas identified to be mulched under the Jacaranda trees which has the best grass and where people sit, on the grass, whether it being parents with babies, or a group of high school students, and do not want to sit on a bench.


This will take away from the useability of the park. It is a small park to begin with and the majority of the remaining turf is well used.

This comment by Administration is erroneous.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*Although it is not clearly delineated, Leake/Alma Street Reserve has a 5m wide verge (shown below).*

*The area to be mulched under the Jacaranda extends only as far as the existing tree well. Eco-zoning to the south of the Jacaranda has also been reduced to retain additional shaded grass.*



2. Several other parks are within 500m of Leake Alma Reserve including Hyde Park and Beatty Park.

This is not true, Hyde Park and Beatty Park are more than 750m away, and require the crossing of major busy roads. Travel to these parks creates a safety concern and inconvenience.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*Hyde Park, Beatty Park and Multicultural Federation Gardens are all within a 500m radius of Leake/Alma Street Reserve, albeit in some cases via controlled pedestrian crossings and refuge islands.*

3. Personal preference on park aesthetics

This comment from Administration is very dismissal and is in response to comments that the remaining turf be kept. Made by some local residents who do not have turf or/and have native gardens and a front verge native garden, and rely on the turfed area of the park to meet health and social needs.

Local preferences should not be taken lightly. Local parks are for local people.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*Administration has endeavoured to find a balance between community preferences and park usage, which has been achieved through the amended eco-zoning plan.*

**Benefits**

I do not believe proper consideration of the current design of the park has been taken into account, compared to the proposed changes.

Eco-zoning has already been applied to more than 25% of the park. This offers biodiversity and a local habitat environment, and all the benefits a native garden provides to the community.

This also contributes to water savings and the park currently utilises less than 20% of the allocation amount of water of 1,600Kl. The existing turf could survive with less than the planned 10% reduction allocation in 2028, if no further eco-zoning was undertaken.

The park also has a small turfed area, that provides for activities such as sitting or lying on the grass under the shade of a tree, socialising under a tree, informal play and physical activity on grass. Activities that cannot be performed on mulch as per the proposed rough design that would further reduce the limited turf area.

Affecting the amount of turf area will take away important health contributions, both mental and physical; and social interactions that lead to a happy, healthy, connected and supported community.

It must be remembered that some turf area will be removed as a result of the placement of Western Power equipment in the park.

#### **In summary**

I believe a detailed design needs to be provided to the community, so accurate feedback can be provided.

I believe better engagement and feedback is required to address the comments that have been raised, and not dismissed.

The placement of Western Power equipment in the park will have an impact whether or not there is any further eco-zoning.

All current benefits and future benefits should be analysed.

I hope the above will be considered and addressed, regarding any approval of proposed further eco-zoning of the Leaks Alma Reserve.

Remember: Eco-Zoning is the conversion of under used turf areas into native gardens.

#### **Christina Hoang of Mount Lawley – Item 9.1**

I am a resident living adjacent to the short-stay accommodation operated by my neighbours at [Property Address or Area]. I am writing to express my full support for the continued use of this property as a short-stay accommodation.

Since its operation, I have experienced no disruption or noise. The owners manage the property professionally and are frequently in the area. I have had positive interactions with the guests, who have all been respectful and friendly. The owners are community-oriented, and I feel confident in my ability to reach out to them if any concerns arise, knowing they will be addressed promptly.

Having managed rental properties myself, I can say that the level of upkeep and care taken with this property is exceptional, far exceeding the standards I have seen in long-term rentals. Additionally, this arrangement has provided a much more positive experience than dealing with a long-term tenant, who could cause disruptions that might be more difficult to resolve.

I also reviewed the briefing notes regarding potential noise and amenity impacts due to the use of the backyard by guests. I disagree with the officer's comments, as I have not experienced any disturbance from this use. It does not impact my enjoyment of my own backyard.

I strongly support this proposal and believe it is in the best interest of both the property owners and the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to seeing this proposal move forward.

#### **Administration Response in italics:**

*These comments of support along with all other submissions received during the consultation period were considered as part of Council's decision-making on Item 9.1.*

*Following consideration, Council resolved to refuse the development application at its Ordinary Meeting on 13 May 2025.*

### **Marie Slyth of West Perth – Item 9.5**

#### **My Statement/request**

I wish to state that I agree with recommendation that the Methodist Manse be permanently included in the Local Heritage List.

I nominated this 1898 special pre Federation building (it was built as a home residence for the Wesleyan ministers of that era. It has 5 chimneys with Crosses on each) I originally nominated the Methodist Manse for inclusion in a Heritage List in Vincent Council but unfortunately no action was taken then. I request that it now be included in **the local Heritage List**.

Part of the history and photo are included in Cleaver Precinct book titled A Heritage Walk Cleaver Precinct which book is in the Vincent Library.

My statement/request in effort to protect my house:

**(1)** wish to make the following statements regarding ongoing requests which have been made to council over the past 8 + years. On the verge in front of my house at 89 Carr Street, NO pruning has been carried out on this jacaranda tree which continues to grow higher and higher. Multiple requests have been made for action to be taken to prune this tree.

The reason why I myself and next door neighbour are so concerned especially myself) is that now because of it height I am dreading the next large storm which who knows when we will get such a storm but when a very powerful north-west wind blows the middle branches of this tree touch the power lines which go across my front lawn - one has to be standing at my gate to see this happen (the only way to take a photograph as proof is to stand in heavy rain and battle the powerful wind.)

The height of this tree now is highly likely to crash onto my front verandah and even hit the roof over the room where I have my computer.

I have rung Western Power when such an event occurs but they said it is the responsibility of Council to attend to its tree lopping.

I will add – I happen to love trees but not when such a tree can cause multiple damages AND (over a year ago I had a council employee come to look at the paving on footpath outside my fence and then there was only a tiny bulge on the path where this particular tree route goes under. Now it has risen to over **an inch** high I nearly tripped the other day even though I was pushing my walker – the walker made a thump. This super fast growing root goes under my front fence and lawn towards front of my house.

Please get action taken to prevent injury to the large number of pedestrians who now use this footpath on a daily basis.

#### **Administration Response in italics:**

*The Methodist Manse is recommended for inclusion on the City's Local Heritage Survey (LHS)*

*The LHS was approved for the purposes of advertising at Council's Ordinary Meeting on 13 May 2025.*

*Following advertising, Council would consider any submissions and whether to approve the LHS.*

*The LHS forms Stage 1 of the City's broader heritage review. Should the Methodist Manse be approved on the LHS, it would then be considered for inclusion on the City's Heritage List as part of Stage 2. The Heritage List review is scheduled to commence in 2025/26.*

#### **Administration Response in italics:**

*In line with the Street Tree Policy, the City carries out a scheduled street tree pruning program where trees are pruned to ensure appropriate clearances from powerlines and under pruned (if required) to ensure they are*

*not obstructing the footpath. Trees not located under powerlines are not reduced in height and allowed to grow to maximise canopy cover.*

*The verge tree located in front of 89 Carr Street is deemed to be in good health and structurally sound, consequentially a reduction in height is not necessary.*

*Administration will lodge a customer request to schedule any necessary repairs to the footpath.*

## **(2) Taxi situation in Carr Street**

As I no longer have a car, and because I no longer walk very well, I must get taxis to multiple places in and outside City of Vincent to reach necessary destinations – medical appointment, physio, dentist and other.

Because the increase in vehicle traffic continues to increase as do the speeds of the vehicles it has already reached a point now where taxis picking me up from my house at 89 Carr Street, sometimes are forced to double park on the road (most days cars of residents and others parking for the day block taxis from pulling into the kerb. I a driver has to get to put my walker in car boot – impatient car drivers several times have chosen to go to opposite side of road which is very dangerous both to taxi driver and oncoming vehicles (the same applies when taxi brings me home and I have to alight.

The speed limit in Carr Street is 40 kph but very few vehicles travel along Carr Street and some surrounding streets at more like 70 kph.

They do the same speeding down Strathcona Street speed humps and all (and Florence Street) so far no one has been hit (lots of close shaves) but how soon?

As I live close to the corner of Strathcona Street (only few yards for me to talk) I believe there is a solution to this problem.

A recommendation I believe that could solve this difficulty and that is that the open paved footpath ( if is not actually a footpath but rather a paved open space which could allow a taxi to slowly drive onto to pick up a passenger (put a walker in boot of taxi) without interfering with other traffic or pedestrians (who can see what is taking place and then drive safely back onto the road (there is no curbing to drive over) . A sign could be erected stating **TAXI PICK UP AND PUT DOWN ONLY**).

Taxi drivers would welcome this situation and as time goes on and more vehicles cram the roads around here highly likely to prevent accidents.

### **Administration Response in italics:**

*The City has recently developed Parking Precinct Management Plans to guide how parking is managed throughout the City. A component of these plans is for car parking occupancy surveys to be conducted at regular intervals to see if the appropriate parking restrictions are in place or if some restrictions need to be reviewed/amended, including the demand for short-term (5 minute) bays or taxi rank/ride-share parking. In the meantime, Rangers will increase their parking patrols of Carr St and the surrounding streets.*

## **(3) AGED & DISABLED COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SERVICE for Aged & Disabled COV residents.**

I was told earlier this year that Council was considering bringing in

A service (which apparently certain other council already have to assist disabled & older folk living within their Councils, and that is to save them having to continually struggle to get taxis ( which service continues to get slower ) to pick up passengers needy ) as well as those who are still just able to use public transport) and so make their lives a little easier to get around safely.

This to apply to the elderly and disabled who must get medical appointment, certain hospital appointment etc.

I believe Vincent Council does care for its residents in lots of ways but this way when you think about it, really is one of great importance.

I just hope there is time to get this into the budget as a late arrival.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The City of Vincent understands how important accessible, safe and affordable transport options are, particularly for residents who experience mobility challenges. We recognise the challenges that can come with using taxis or public transport, and we appreciate the intent behind the suggestion for a community transport service.*

*While the City is not in a position to establish or operate such a service - due to both the significant cost and logistical challenges involved in coordinating transport for individuals across a wide area to appointments in different locations - we are committed to supporting residents in other ways.*

*Currently, the City provides **Transport Assistance Vouchers** to eligible residents and people with disability. These vouchers help cover the cost of taxi fares for essential trips such as medical appointments, offering a flexible and more individualised form of support than a community bus could provide.*

*We remain committed to promoting the wellbeing, inclusion and independence of our older residents and people with disability, and we are always open to exploring practical ways to improve access and support.*

*The City continues to monitor local needs and advocate for improved transport options through relevant forums and partnerships with other levels of government*

**Matthew Selby of Mt Lawley – Item 9.1**

This is a brief email to let you know that I remain strongly opposed to 20 Grosvenor Rd, being turned into a permanent short stay airBNB commercial operation as per my earlier correspondence.

The negative experiences since this property commenced operating as such has only confirmed my concerns and reinforced my conviction that this proposal should be utterly rejected to protect the interest of local residents and wider community.

Hope you understand and do reject this proposal.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*These comments of objection along with all other submissions received during the consultation period were considered as part of Council's decision-making on Item 9.1.*

*Following consideration, Council resolved to refuse the development application at its Ordinary Meeting on 13 May 2025.*

**Dudley Maier of Highgate****Administration Response in italics:****1. Waste****1.1. What was the total cost of the recent e-waste collection day?**

*Circa \$22,240, including staff wages.*

**1.2. Did the City receive any grants from external bodies to fund the day?**

*No.*

**1.3. How much e-waste was collected?**

*2,632kg recovered through Total Green. Good Sammys have yet to provide recovery data.*

**1.4. What is the total FTE for employees in the waste management section who work in an administrative role, and those employed 'in the field'?**

*Waste & Recycling – six administrative staff, 15 operational staff.*

**2. Monthly expenditure for March shows a payment of \$5,000 to Rxxx Rxxx for "Smarty Grants Heritage assistance Fund 5".**



2.1. What works were undertaken?

*The works associated with the grant funding included tuckpoint of external walls.*

2.2. What was the total cost of those works?

*The total cost of the works was \$10,430 excluding GST.*

2.3. Why is it described as “Smarty Grants”?

*Smarty Grants refers to the software used by Administration to administer grants, including through the Heritage Assistance Fund.*

3. The City’s Greentrack Program

The Greentrack press release published on 12 March 2025 stated that applications with Life Cycle Assessments are assed within 10 working days. It then goes on to say that 100% of the 21 GreenTrack applications were processed with an average processing time of 55 days. How can 100% of the applications be processed within the 10 working day promise, when the average processing time was actually 55 days?

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The figures refer to two different metrics that reflect distinct stages of the application process, specifically the initial assessment and overall determination.*

*In summary:*

- The 10 working days refers to the time within which the first assessment is undertaken by a planning officer. This includes a technical assessment of the submitted documentation and deciding whether to progress the application to community consultation or request further information.*
- The 55-day figure refers to the total time taken (on-average) to determine the application, from lodgement through to the final decision.*

*Both metrics are important as they demonstrate efficiency at different points in the assessment process.*

4. Underground Power

The report on the Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) (Item 11.6 – 13 May 2025) states that 4-year fixed interest loans will be used fund 50% of each project, then says that the Underground Power Reserve and Catalina Land Sales Reserve will be used to fund the 4-year instalment for up to 70% of ratepayers and deal with timing issues.

- 4.1. Given that Western Power has identified a payment schedule, and given that when required to indicate their intentions, only 29.9% of owners for Area 1 indicated that they wish to pay over a 4-year period (i.e. 70% have chosen to, or have defaulted to pay up front), and given that the first cash call is due on 30 September 2025; when will the City take out the loan (estimated to be in the order of \$2.5 million) – for the first cash call, the second cash call etc?

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The City has estimated a loan of \$2.5million to be included in the Annual Budget 2025/26 with the actual loan amount to be confirmed based on the final numbers of ratepayers electing for the 4 Year Payback option.*

*The City will commence the loan application process after the adoption of the Annual 2025/26 Budget, and once approved by the WA Treasury Corporation, a settlement date will be confirmed which is anticipated to be around September 2025.*

- 4.2. The assumptions in the LTFP state that they were adopted nearly two years ago (June 2023) and included that up to 70% of property owners will choose to pay over a 4-year period. The need to cater for such a high level of time-payments was used as a reason for spacing out projects in order to reduce the ‘lumpiness’ and magnitude of borrowed funds. The administration has also confirmed that it has twice asked Western Power to delay projects to fit in with the financial model as it stood at that

time. Given that the actual initial response from the community indicated that only 30% (not the 70% that was provided for) chose to pay over-time, will the City be reviewing the financial model to determine if future projects (which have previously been delayed) can be brought forward? If not, why not?

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The Underground Power Financial Model was developed to offer the 4 Year Payback period to up to 70% of ratepayers if required. The actual proportion of ratepayers opting to pay over 4 years in the first project area is still to be finalised with current responses sitting at approximately 30%.*

*The City will update the model after the updated E30 estimates are received from Western Power, who is still finalising these for the remaining project areas. It is important to note that Western Power's project scheduling commitments may limit the City's ability to bring forward previously delayed projects, regardless of improved cashflow.*

- 4.3. Given that the assumptions in the initial financial model do not match the actual response from the community in terms of payment preferences does the Administration anticipate revising the financial model in the short term, or polling owners in future areas (e.g. Areas 2 and 3) to determine what their indicative preferences for payment are, in order to develop a more realistic model (i.e. one that matches likely responses rather than a worst case scenario)?

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The City will continue to update the financial model and Long Term Financial Plan as new information becomes available. While it is the City's intention to survey property owners in future project areas to better understand their payment preferences, this can only occur once the E10 estimates are received for each area. Until then, the City must take a conservative approach and review the financial model based on the available E30 estimates to ensure responsible financial planning.*

5. Drainage Truck

**Administration Response in italics:**

Council recently approved placing \$665,000 on the Capital Budget for the acquisition of a Drainage Truck.

- 5.1. Do any other local governments have such a truck?

*Yes, other local governments have a drainage truck.*

- 5.2. Was a full business case developed and presented to Council to justify such a large expenditure?

*A Business case was developed to show the benefits of insourcing drainage maintenance tasks using a drainage truck.*

*As part of addressing the premise that the existing drainage system will be capacity challenged based on climate change and density infill, the City is Implementing a drainage maintenance regime that ensures the system (pits, pipes, gullies etc) is serviced at a near to optimum level – hence the new drainage truck and crew.*

*This was also based on a recent data pick-up of drainage assets that identified a significant disparity of drainage pits on record (being serviced) and pits not recorded and therefore not receiving appropriate levels of service.*

- 5.3. What is the expected level of utilisation for such a truck – will it be used seasonally or year-round?

*The drainage truck will be used all year round.*

- 5.4. Was the option of hiring such a device when required considered?

*Yes, this was included within the business case, including the availability of contracted resources at key times of the year.*

## 6. FOGO

The report on the Sustainable Vincent Framework states that the introduction of FOGO in 2021 has resulted in a 42% reduction of waste going to landfill.

The Mindarie Regional Council 2020-2021 Annual Report indicates that the City delivered 11,545 tonnes of waste to the MRC of which 10,040 tonnes were processed by the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) and 1,505 tonnes went straight to landfill. The report also indicates that approximately 45.5% of material processed by the RRF was removed from the waste stream as it was organic matter. This meant that approximately 4,573 tonnes of organics were removed with the result that 6,972 tonnes went to landfill in 2020-21.

The 2023-24 MRC Annual Report shows that last year the City sent 5,661 tonnes to landfill. This represents a 19% reduction of waste going to landfill since the 2020-21 year.

6.1. Why is the administration claiming that FOGO has resulted in a 42% reduction of waste going to landfill when the figures clearly demonstrate that it is only approximately 19%?

6.2. Have the administration simply assumed that all 'waste' going to the MRC prior to the introduction of FOGO was sent to landfill rather than accepting that a significant proportion of material was already being diverted from landfill?

### **Administration Response in italics:**

*The 42% reduction in FOGO was based on a comparison between the City's 2023/24 landfill waste total with the 2017/18 baseline data:*

- *2017/18 Baseline – 9,530 tonnes.*
- *2023/24 Data – 5,563 tonnes.*
- *Reduction – 3,967 tonnes.*

*This is equivalent to a 41.63% reduction.*

*FOGO was introduced in October 2021 and while it played a role in this reduction, there are other relevant factors that also contributed. This includes changes in community behaviour towards waste as well as reduced consumption during the COVID-19 pandemic.*

*These figures did not include the amount of waste that was diverted away from landfill. The amount of waste diverted from landfill would be in addition to the above figures.*

## **FROM MEETING**

### **3.4 Linda Harris of Leederville**

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

A dog was bitten by a snake in Britannia Reserve and died.

Could the Council look at the area and thin out the undergrowth, particularly the under branches of the woollybutt trees which are so close to the houses?

### **Administration Response in italics:**

*Parks Staff have inspected this area and will be thinning out some of the vegetation within the next month.*

### **3.12 Stephen Beaumont of Highgate**

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

Proposal to reallocate funds currently allocated to the Noongar Patrol to CCTV cameras for individual business, which is able to be accessed by other businesses in the area.

**Administration Response in italics:**

*The City has been in partnership with Nyoongar Outreach Services (NOS) for a number of years and provides an annual budget of \$50k. This partnership is valuable as it allows the City and NOS to work together to address shared issues, particularly in relation to outreach services for Aboriginal people experiencing homelessness and assisting vulnerable Aboriginal people within public spaces, that leads to a collaboration of support services for and engagement with clients, and the broader Vincent community. Further information about the programs that Nyoongar Outreach Services support, and their funding sources, is available at [Publications, Pamphlets and Links — Nyoongar Outreach Services](#).*

*Currently all business owners can, and are encouraged to register their existing CCTV systems on the WA Police Cam-Map WA database through [Register for Cam-Map WA](#). This provides an accurate location of CCTV systems which benefit WA Police when investigating reports of anti-social/criminal activity and promptly act on such reports. There are opportunities for business owners to communicate with each other via various other platforms, such as being involved with other community groups and Town Teams such as Beaufort Street Network etc, and the City also provides regular updates through our [Business E-News - Newsletter for Local Businesses](#).*

*The City is continuously looking for grant funding opportunities which will allow the City's CCTV network to expand, with grant funding to be able to be applied for from time to time but have certain criteria that needs to be met to be successful. State and Federal funding for CCTV is currently very limited, however the City does apply for such funding when we are eligible and meet the required criteria. The City has previously been successful in obtaining grants for the Leederville and Beaufort St Town Centres CCTV networks.*

**4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

**5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS****6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**




Ordinary Meeting - 13 May 2025

**7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)****8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 8.1 Cr Suzanne Worner declared a financial interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is that her son is an employee of the North Perth Bowling Club. She is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in chambers to vote on the matter.
- 8.2 Cr Nicole Woolf declared an impartiality interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is she is a social member of the North Perth Bowling Club and a regular attendee of the Mount Hawthorn Playgroup.
- 8.3 Mayor Alison Xamon declared an impartiality interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is she is a member of the East Perth Football Club.

## 9 STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT

### 9.1 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED PLANNING AND BUILDING POLICY MANUAL APPENDIX 20 - REFUNDING AND WAIVING PLANNING AND BUILDING FEES

- Attachments:
1. Draft Development Fee Reductions and Refunds Policy 
  2. City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual - Appendix 20: Refunding and Waiving of Planning and Building Fees 
  3. Schedule of Modifications 

#### RECOMMENDATION

##### That Council:

1. PREPARES a notice of proposed revocation of City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual: Appendix 20 – Refunding and Waiving of Planning and Building Fees, included in Attachment 2, for the purpose of community consultation pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 3, Clause 6(b)(i) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
2. AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to carry out community consultation on:
  - 2.1 The proposed revocation in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 3, Clause 6(b)(ii) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
  - 2.2 The proposed Development Fee Reductions and Refunds Policy, at Attachment 1, which is proposed to replace the City of Vincent Planning and Building Policy Manual: Appendix 20 – Refunding and Waiving of Planning and Building Fees, at Attachment 2; and
3. NOTES that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To consider amendments to Planning and Building Policy Manual: Appendix 20 – Refunding and Waiving of Planning and Building Fees (Appendix 20) for the purposes of public advertising. This includes renaming of the policy to Development Fee Reductions and Refunds Policy (Draft Policy).

The Draft Policy is included in **Attachment 1**.

#### DELEGATION:

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995* sets out the Role of Council as being to ‘determine the local government’s policies’. There is no delegation to Administration to make, review or revoke policies.

In accordance with Clause 5.7 of the City’s Corporate Document Development Policy, Council approval is required for a complex amendment to a policy or revocation of a policy.

The proposed amendments to Appendix 20 are a complex amendment under the Corporate Document Development Policy. This is because the amendments propose substantial changes to the policy, including its objectives and the head of power under which the policy is prepared.

#### BACKGROUND:

[Appendix 20](#) was adopted by Council at its [Ordinary Meeting](#) on 27 September 2011 and has not been reviewed since. A copy of Appendix 20 is included as **Attachment 2**.

The purpose of Appendix 20 was to give fair and consistent guidance on when planning and building fees may be waived or refunded.

The legislative framework under which Appendix 20 was adopted has since been replaced. As a result, the document contains outdated references to superseded legislation and regulations. It also includes ambiguous provisions that have led to inconsistent application.

#### DETAILS:

The proposed amendments to Appendix 20 aim to establish clear standards for determining eligibility and the value of application fee reductions.

They also seek to promote consistency in decision-making by outlining clear criteria to guide the assessment of discretionary fee reduction or refund requests, as well as to support the City's strategic initiatives such as heritage protection, tree retention, and sustainable design.

A detailed review of Appendix 20, along with the proposed amendments, is provided in a Schedule of Modifications included as **Attachment 3**.

A summary of the key changes to the Draft Policy is outlined below.


Appendix 20	Change in Draft Policy
<b>Policy Scope</b>	
Provides guidance on when the City may reduce planning and/or building application fees.	<p>The Draft Policy is now split into two operative parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Non-Discretionary:</b> This section outlines a clear framework for the automatic reduction or refunding of application fees, which applies to cases that meet predefined criteria. No discretionary judgement is required, ensuring consistency and efficiency in the process.</li> <li><b>Discretionary:</b> This section allows for fee reductions or refunds to be considered on a case-by-case basis based on factors. It ensures a transparent and consistent approach, considering the specific circumstances of each request.</li> </ol>
<b>Extent of Fee Reductions</b>	
Provides for a variety of scenarios in which 'up to 100 percent' of fees to be reduced, with scenarios provided where requests for fee reductions would ordinarily be supported.	<p>The Draft Policy outlines a clear schedule of non-discretionary fee reductions, specifying the extent of each reduction.</p> <p>These fee reductions apply to developments that align with the City's strategic objectives and would incentivise or offset the associated financial costs.</p> <p>This includes proposals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Align with the City's environmentally sustainable design standards.</li> <li>Involve heritage conservation or improvement works.</li> <li>Retain significant existing trees.</li> </ul> <p>The non-discretionary section applies to proposals that meet the deemed-to-comply standards of the planning framework and are therefore exempt from requiring development approval. It also covers situations where an application is withdrawn by the applicant before a determination is made.</p>
<b>Criteria for Fee Reductions</b>	
Provides the [Executive Director Strategy and Development] with the ability to waive up to 100 percent of application fees in 'extraordinary circumstances'.	<p>The Draft Policy establishes clear criteria for assessing discretionary requests to reduce development and building application fees, outlining the key factors that must be considered.</p> <p>Key considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the City has not met its service standards in a way that has unreasonably impacted the processing of the application.</li> <li>The extent of assessment work already completed prior to the request.</li> </ul> <p>By clearly defining these considerations, the Policy provides transparent and consistent guidance for both the City and the community. This would support a fair and accountable approach to discretionary fee reduction requests.</p>

Appendix 20	Change in Draft Policy
A Responsive Policy	
Inclusion of new incentive programs would require the review of the entire policy.	<p>A separate schedule to the Draft Policy contains details of application types and fee reductions that are eligible for refunds.</p> <p>This schedule can be updated to reflect Council decisions supporting new fee reduction initiatives in a centralised and consistent way.</p>

The Draft Policy is included in **Attachment 2**.

Further supporting information including process flow-charts and customer facing information sheets would be prepared to provide further details for the matters contained in the Draft Policy.

#### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:



#### Organisation Implementation

Engagement is used to both inform the community about the proposed policy, project or propositions, and to provide some input to the shape or execution of the policy, project or proposition.

**Tension:** People feel forced leading to an unresponsive process.

**Mitigation:** Increasing the level of influence, and implementing a transparent, robust process.

The engagement leader/host is responsible for decision-making and implementation

#### **A robust process to engage with the community and stakeholders**

Consultation on the proposed amendments to Appendix 20, including the revocation of the policy under the *Planning and Development Act 2005* and adoption under the *Local Government Act 1995*, would be undertaken for a period of 21 days.

The consultation would be in accordance with the City's [Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy](#) and the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (the Planning Regulations), by way of notices:

- Published on the City's website.
- Posted to the City's social media.
- Published in the local newspapers.
- Posted on the notice board at the City's Administration and Library and Local History Centre.



- Notice provided to regular applicants and relevant industry representatives, including local developers, builders, planning consultants, architects, and peak industry bodies such as the Urban Development Institute of Australia WA, Housing Industry Association, and Planning Institute of Australia.

Any submissions received would be presented back to Council for its consideration.

#### LEGAL/POLICY:

- *Building Act 2011*;
- *Building Regulations 2012*;
- *Local Government Act 1995*;
- *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
- *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
- City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2;
- Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy; and
- Corporate Document Development Policy.

#### Planning Regulations

Appendix 20 was adopted as a local planning policy under Clause 47(5)(b) of Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS1). TPS1 was replaced by the Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2) in May 2018.

In accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 85A of LPS2, a local planning policy adopted under TPS1 continues to have effect as if it were a local planning policy adopted under LPS2.

The *Planning and Development Act 2005* and the Planning Regulations provides the criteria for the creation, amendment and revocation of local planning policies. Schedule 2, Part 3, Clause 6 of the Planning Regulations provides the procedure for the revocation of a local planning policy.

The purpose of the Draft Policy is to establish a clear and consistent framework for managing development and building application fee reductions and refunds, in alignment with the City of Vincent's strategic objectives.

It is proposed that the Draft Policy be adopted under the *Local Government Act 1995* rather than the *Planning and Development Act 2005*. This approach is recommended as both Appendix 20 and the Draft Policy relate to applications made under the *Planning and Development Act 2005* and the *Building Act 2011* and serves as an administrative function rather than a statutory planning function.


#### Local Government Act 1995 and Corporate Document Development Policy

Section 2.7(2)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995* provides Council with the power to determine policies.

The Corporate Document Development Policy sets out the process for the development and review of the City's policy documents.

In accordance with section 2.3 of the Corporate Document Development Policy:

*"The purpose of a policy is to provide a general rule or principle to guide Administration and the community on the City's decision making and advocacy."*



There is no statutory requirement for Vincent to have a policy in relation to development fee reductions or refunds.

The purpose of the proposed policy is to provide a clear framework for when the City may reduce or refund development application and building permit fees.

### RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Low: There is a low risk associated with undertaking community consultation on the proposed amendments to Appendix 20. The Draft Policy introduces a clear and consistent framework for assessing fee reductions and refunds, supporting transparency in decision-making.

Low: There is a low risk in consulting on the revocation of a local planning policy that is no longer fit for purpose, particularly where its preparation is not a statutory requirement.

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

#### Enhanced Environment

*Our urban forest/canopy is maintained and increased.*

#### Sensitive Design

*Our built form character and heritage is protected and enhanced.*

#### Innovative and Accountable

*Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.*

### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with supporting the following key sustainability outcomes of the City's *Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024*.

- Sustainable Energy Use/Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction
- Water Use Reduction/Water Quality Improvement
- Urban Greening and Biodiversity

**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any public health outcomes in the *City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025*.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

The advertising of the amendments to the Policy will be met through the City's operating budget. The budget impact of the proposed policy is outlined below.

Income

The table below outlines the income sources for the Development and Design and Building Services business units.

For the 2024/25 financial year to 29 May 2025 (YTD):

- 164.6 percent of its budgeted income has been received by Building Services.
- 99.3 percent of its budgeted income has been received by Development and Design.

	Development Applications	Building Applications
2024/25 Budget	\$500,000	\$350,000
2024/25 Actuals* (at 29 May 2025)	\$454,601	\$500,610
2023/24 Actuals*	\$436,589	\$314,700

\*This amount includes all refunds issued throughout the financial year.

Fee reductions and refunds would reduce income received from these sources, depending on the type of application. The potential loss of revenue from fee reductions and refunds is outlined in more detail below.

Expenditure*Past and Current Expenditure*

In the financial years 2023/24 and 2024/25 to date, the following refunds have been issued for development applications:

- 2023/24: \$10,056 (2.3 percent of the development application fee income).
- 2024/25: \$10,423 (2.3 percent of the development application fee income YTD).

Less than half of the number of eligible refunds were processed. This is primarily because the City has not received banking details from applicants to allow for the processing of refunds. The figures above reflect the value of refunds paid to applicants.

*Impact of Draft Policy on Planning Fees*

The Draft Policy introduces additional or modified fee reductions and refunds currently offered under Appendix 20, as outlined in **Attachment 3**. The Draft Policy is expected to result in approximately \$2,163 per year in fee reductions and refunds, based on the average of eligible applications from the 2023/24 financial year and 2024/25 YTD figures, as shown in the table below.

Development Application Type	Budget Impact (\$ per year)
Exempt Applications (Works)	-225
Exempt Applications (Land Use)	-371
Greentrack – Multiple Dwellings	-200
Not For Profit Organisation	-482
Re-lodged DAP applications	-885
<b>Total</b>	<b>-2,163</b>

This represents an estimated additional revenue reduction of approximately 0.5 percent, based on the 2024/25 development application fee income YTD. Given the overall volume of application revenue, this modest shortfall can be absorbed within existing income levels and is not expected to impact the City's broader financial position or service delivery.

*Impact of Draft Policy on Building Fees*

The Draft Policy would continue to apply to building applications. The *Building Act 2011* sets requirements for fees to be refunded in prescribed circumstances. This includes when an application is not determined within the statutory timeframe. The Draft Policy does not impact these requirements.

It is not anticipated that there would be any budgetary impact from the Draft Policy.

In the past two years the City has not granted any discretionary reductions or refunds for building applications.

One non-discretionary fee reduction for building applications is provided for in the Draft Policy for Business Enhancement Grant proposals. Any fee reduction for a building application would form part of the budget for that grant.

The inclusion of building applications in the Draft Policy allows Council to consider future programs which provide building application fee reductions. It also continues to allow for the consideration of discretionary refunds by the City.

**COMMENTS:**

Administration's comments on the Draft Policy changes are as follows:

- Non-discretionary fee reductions and refunds: The Draft Policy establishes clear standards to determine both the eligibility and value of fee reductions or refunds. This would better support applicants and community by making the process more predictable and easier to understand. It would also streamline processing by the City's Administration, as no discretion would need to be exercised for these items.
  - Complex applications, including DAP applications and proposals involving a change of use to an unlisted use, are not eligible for non-discretionary fee reductions. It does not apply to fees collected on behalf of external agencies, such as the Development Assessment Panel (DAP) fees and Building Services Levy.
- Discretionary fee reductions and refunds: The Draft Policy outlines a set of criteria to be considered when assessing requests for the reduction or refund of development or building application fees. This would improve transparency and consistency in how decisions are made. These criteria in a policy would ensure applicants can address the relevant matters when submitting a request.
  - Complex applications may be considered under the discretionary fee reduction or refund pathway. This approach ensures flexibility in applying the Policy, particularly in the event of unforeseen circumstances or changes to the definition of a 'Complex Application' under the Planning Regulations or a Local Planning Policy.
- Targeted incentives: The non-discretionary fee reduction schedule directly supports the City's strategic objectives by offering automatic financial incentives that have been Council-supported. This includes proposals that retain mature trees, improve or conserve heritage properties, and environmentally sustainable design outcomes.
- Responsive policy structure: A new schedule attached to the policy sets out which types of applications are eligible for fee reductions. This schedule can be updated over time and makes it easier for new Council-supported initiatives to be incorporated without needing to review the entire policy.
- Supporting Information: Supporting Information Sheets would be provided for customer use, and the City's Development Application form and accompanying checklists would be updated to include prompts for applicants to nominate a fee reduction for which they may be eligible, such as whether the applicant is a not-for-profit organisation. These would be available on the City's website so that they are publicly available and can be continually reviewed and updated to ensure they remain relevant.

**9.2 STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL - SECTION 31 RECONSIDERATION - NO. 40 GUILDFORD ROAD, MOUNT LAWLEY - RECONSIDERATION OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION NOTICE**

- Attachments:
1. Heritage Assessment 
  2. Conservation Management Strategy 
  3. Heritage Conservation Notice 
  4. Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Additional Information 

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

1. In accordance with Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*, AFFIRMS its decision dated 23 April 2024 to issue a Heritage Conservation Notice for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley;
2. Notwithstanding (1), RESOLVES to direct the Chief Executive Officer to withdraw the Heritage Conservation Notice for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley subject to:
  - 2.1 Development approval being granted for the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline Program by the Western Australian Planning Commission under the provisions of the Metropolitan Region Scheme; and
  - 2.2 The substantial commencement of the development approval referred to in 2.1 or the demolition of the dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley (whichever occurs first); and
3. REQUESTS that the Chief Executive Officer write to all relevant parties involved in the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment advising that:
  - It does not support the demolition of the dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley;
  - In any future determination of the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment the Commission is required to have due regard to the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 in accordance with Section 6(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
  - The dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley, is listed on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as Category B – Conservation Recommended;
  - The Statement of Significance for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley is:  
*The house at No. 40 Guildford Road is a rare example of a Federation era Arts and Crafts style bungalow residence along Guildford Road, Mount Lawley. The building demonstrates the original intentions and aspirations behind the early development of the Mount Lawley Area. It is an increasingly rare example of the Federation period development in the area that emerged from the population boom following the discovery of Gold in Western Australia and the development of the railroad eastward;* and
  - The dwelling should be retained, restored and integrated within the planned social housing development given this significance; and
4. NOTES that:
  - The City would enforce the Heritage Conservation Notice within six (6) months of the date of this Council resolution if:
    - No development application for the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment has been lodged with, or approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission; or
    - The Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment has been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission but has not substantially commenced or the dwelling has not been demolished; and
  - Enforcement could not be pursued if approval is granted and works commence, as the Notice could no longer serve its intended purpose.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this report is for Council to reconsider its decision from its Ordinary Meeting on [23 April 2024](#) to issue a Heritage Conservation Notice (HCN) for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley (subject site). This is at the invitation of the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT).

The existing dwelling on the subject site is listed on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI).

The subject site forms part of the State Government's broader landholding of nine properties that have been identified for redevelopment to provide social housing under its Housing Diversity Pipeline (HDP) Program. The HDP Program was first announced in early 2023.

In April 2024, Council refused a request that was submitted on behalf of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), as the landowner, to remove the subject site from the MHI. This request sought to prepare the subject site for redevelopment under the HDP Program and to facilitate widening of Guildford Road.

At this time Council also requested that a Heritage Conservation Notice (HCN) be issued to the WAPC. The HCN requires works to be undertaken to restore the heritage elements of the existing dwelling.

The HCN was issued to the WAPC in November 2024 and the WAPC lodged an application with the SAT for a review of this decision in December 2024.

SAT has invited Council to reconsider its decision to issue the HCN. Council is not being asked to remove the subject site from the MHI.

Matters particularly relevant for Council to consider in whether to revoke or maintain the HCN relate to:

1. The purpose and intent of the HCN.
2. The 'public works' approval pathway for the HDP Program.

The *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (Regulations) allows for a HCN to be issued where a property is not being 'properly maintained'. This is to ensure that heritage places maintain structural integrity and elements of heritage significance.

After the HCN was issued, a structural report confirmed that the dwelling is unlikely to deteriorate significantly over the next three years. While the works in the HCN are needed to restore its heritage value, they can be carried out in stages over three years without the condition becoming irreparable.

The HDP Program has progressed since Council's decision in April 2024. This included an announcement in January 2025 that Bethanie Housing was the preferred proponent for a three storey redevelopment with 90 apartments for over-55's.

While no development application has been lodged at the time of preparing this report, the project would qualify as 'public works' under relevant legislation. This means the WAPC would be the decision maker, and the City's role would be limited to providing comments.

Given the WAPC could approve the HDP Program redevelopment and demolition of the existing dwelling irrespective of the HCN, the HCN would be legally ineffective and unenforceable. This is because it could not interfere with or prevent the public works from occurring.

Administration recommends that the HCN be retained until development approval has been granted and the works have commenced.

This would ensure that the HCN would only be revoked when the HDP Program redevelopment is certain. At this point in time the HCN would no longer be able to achieve its purpose.

**DELEGATION:**

This matter is being referred to Council for determination in accordance with the City's Register of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments.



This is because it is seeking a reconsideration of a previous Council decision to issue a HCN which requires works to be undertaken to the existing heritage listed dwelling on the subject site.

## BACKGROUND:

### Site Context

The subject site is zoned Residential R100 under LPS2 and is within the Transit Corridor Built Form Area with a height standard of three storeys under Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form (Built Form Policy).

The subject site abuts Guildford Road, which is reserved as a Primary Regional Road (PRR) under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. This road is managed by Main Roads WA (MRWA).

MRWA has additional land requirements beyond the existing PRR reserve which would affect the subject site. This is discussed in greater detail in Administration's previous reports to Council on [17 October 2023](#) and [23 April 2024](#).

The subject site contains a single-storey brick and corrugated zincalume residence designed in the Federation Queen Anne style and was constructed circa 1904.

The subject site was added to the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) in 2000 and is currently listed as a Management Category B – Conservation Recommended.

At its Ordinary Meeting on [13 May 2025](#) Council approved an amended Heritage List for the purposes of advertising. The subject site has been recategorised as Management Category 3 – Some/Moderate Significance on the amended Heritage List.

### Housing Diversity Pipeline Project

The subject site forms part of a wider State Government landholding comprising of nine lots (formerly 34 lots prior to amalgamation) situated along Guildford Road and East Parade as shown below.

These lots have been identified for the delivery of social housing as part of its [HDP Program](#).





Below is a summary of the key milestones relevant to the subject site and the HDP Program:

- Early 2023 – An Expression of Interest released for diversified housing proposals on the subject site.
- July 2023 – A request was submitted to the City to remove the subject site from the MHI. This would enable the demolition of the existing dwelling as part of planned widening works to Guildford Road and to facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the Mount Lawley HDP Program site.
- October 2023 – Council deferred its consideration of the request to allow additional information to be provided from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH).
- April 2024 – Following additional information being provided the request was refused by Council.
- July 2024 – A development application for public works was referred to the City for comment on proposed decontamination and remediation works at the subject site, which included the removal of 10 mature trees due to asbestos contamination. The City supported the remediation works but did not support the removal of the mature trees.
- August 2024 – The WAPC approved the amalgamation of the 34 lots that comprise the broader HDP Program landholding to enable the future redevelopment and road widening.
- October 2024 – The application for decontamination and remediation was approved by the WAPC. Works began in November 2024 and were completed in February 2025.
- January 2025 – Bethanie Housing was [announced](#) as the preferred proponent to develop and operate a new three storey development on the subject site. The development would include 90 apartments with a mix of one and two-bedroom apartments built to silver Liveable Homes standards to accommodate over-55's. Since then, Administration has been liaising with Bethanie Housing and the State Government as they have progressed their planning for the site.
- April 2025 - Preliminary redevelopment plans were presented to the State Design Review Panel as part of the pre-lodgement process for a future development application.

#### Request to Remove Subject Site from MHI

At its Ordinary Meeting on [17 October 2023](#) Council resolved to defer its consideration of the initial request to remove the subject site from the MHI.

This was to allow for further justification to be provided on the need for road widening supported by traffic studies and detailed design to demonstrate the need for the existing dwelling to be demolished.

Additional justification was provided by the DPLH on 3 April 2024 which included a traffic report.

Council's decision from [23 April 2024](#) was that it:

1. *RESOLVES that that the dwelling at No. 40 (Lots 254 and 403) Guildford Road, Mount Lawley is retained on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI). The removal of the property from the MHI would be inconsistent with the City's Policy No. 7.6.5 – Heritage Management – Amendments to the Municipal Heritage Inventory. This is because it has not been adequately demonstrated that the dwelling could not be practically retained as part of providing for upgrades to Guildford Road to improve traffic flow and safety; and*
2. *REQUESTS that the Chief Executive Officer issues a Heritage Conservation Notice to the landowner of No. 40 (Lots 254 and 403) Guildford Road, Mount Lawley, in accordance with Schedule 2 Part 3 Clause 13(2) of the Deemed Provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.*

#### Heritage Conservation Notice

Urbis was engaged by Administration in May 2024 to prepare a Heritage Assessment (**Attachment 1**) and Conservation Management Strategy (CMS, **Attachment 2**). These would inform the preparation of the HCN.

The assessment undertaken by Urbis found that the dwelling still had heritage significance and that it had not been 'properly maintained' due to long term vacancy, vandalism and squatting.

The CMS concludes that despite the dwelling not being 'properly maintained' and in a poor condition, there remains a substantial amount of fabric extent which contributes to its heritage significance. The proposed conservation works would aid in avoiding the accelerated deterioration of its heritage significance and to address the effects of vandalism.

The HCN (**Attachment 3**) was issued to the WAPC as the landowner of the subject site on 15 November 2024.

This required the dwelling to be repaired and conserved in accordance with the CMS. Under the HCN these works are to be completed in stages up to 180 days after it was issued.

#### State Administrative Tribunal

The WAPC lodged an application with the SAT on 13 December 2024 seeking a review of the decision to issue the HCN. The matter progressed to mediation on 13 March 2025.

SAT has invited Council to reconsider its decision pursuant to Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004* (SAT Act). The orders are summarised below.

1. Additional information is to be provided to the City by 5 May 2025.
2. Council is invited to reconsider its decision on or before 24 June 2025.
3. The matter is listed for a direction's hearing on 4 July 2025.

Council is not being asked to consider removing the heritage listing of the subject site as part of the SAT's invitation to reconsider its decision.

#### **DETAILS:**

##### Heritage Conservation Notice

The Regulations allows for a HCN to be issued to an owner where a heritage place is not being 'properly maintained'. Under the Regulations 'properly maintained' means:

*that there is no actual or imminent loss or deterioration of:*

- a. *the structural integrity of the heritage place; or*
- b. *an element of the heritage place that is integral to —*
  - i. *the reason set out in the heritage list for the entry of the place in the heritage list; or*
  - ii. *the heritage significance of the area in which it is located, as set out in a statement in the local planning policy for the area adopted in accordance with clause 9(2).*

The HCN noted that the heritage property had deteriorated significantly due to ongoing vandalism, squatting, and lack of maintenance.

The HCN is informed by the Heritage Assessment and the CMS and specifies the works that are to be undertaken:

- Within 60 days of the HCN – The removal of construction waste and hazardous materials, installation of security measures and temporary propping measures to structural elements at risk of collapse or further deterioration.
- Within 120 days of the HCN – Commencement of urgent conservation and remediation works as identified by the CMS to ensure that the property is safe to access. This includes structural conservation works.
- Within 180 days of the HCN – Commencement of medium-term conservation works including the restoration of external masonry and works to the verandah.

The HCN is currently on hold as part of the SAT appeal process.

##### DPLH Justification

The position of the DPLH is that:

- A number of the works in the HCN are not considered to be relevant for the purposes of the dwelling being 'properly maintained'. These include the removal of waste and hazardous material and installation of CCTV.

- The HCN would interfere with the undertaking of public works to redevelop the site as part of the HDP Program. These works would involve demolition of the existing dwelling and development of the subject and broader sites for social housing.

The DPLH has provided additional information in support of its request for the HCN to be revoked (**Attachment 4**). This relates to:

- How the planned redevelopment qualifies as public works. Public works are exempt from requiring development approval under LPS2.
- Timing and certainty of the redevelopment occurring.
- Why the heritage dwelling cannot be retained and integrated into the wider redevelopment.

Administration's responses to DPLH's comments are included in the Comments section below.

#### **CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:**

The previous request to remove the subject site from the MHI was initially advertised between 28 July and 18 August 2023. Seven submissions were received, with three in support and four objecting to the removal.

Additional information from DPLH as part of this reconsideration was not readvertised to the community. This is because it relates to Council's decision to issue an HCN, rather than removing the subject site from the MHI.

Administration has notified previous submitters of the additional information and directed them towards a [dedicated page](#) on the City's website with updates, and includes all relevant information about the subject site and the broader redevelopment.

#### **LEGAL/POLICY:**

##### *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*

Schedule 2, Part 3, Clause 13 of the Regulations applies to HCN's:

- Council's resolution from 23 April 2024 set out for a HCN to be issued in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 3, Clause 13(2) of the Regulations. This is because Council was of the view that the property was not being 'properly maintained'.
- Clause 13(6)(a) allows for a landowner to seek a review of the decision to issue a HCN.
- Clause 13(5)(b) allows the local government to revoke a HCN. This is the outcome that is sought by the WAPC through the SAT proceedings.

##### *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*

In accordance with Section 31 of the SAT Act, Council has been invited to reconsider its decision to issue the HCN.

Section 31(1) of the SAT Act sets out that in reconsidering its decision, Council may:

- *Affirm the previous decision,*
- *Vary the decision, or*
- *Set aside the decision and substitute a new decision.*

The matter has been listed for a directions hearing on 4 July 2025 following Council's reconsideration. The purpose of this is to program how the matter would proceed.

If the WAPC is satisfied with Council's decision then it may withdraw its application from the SAT and the matter would be finalised.

If it is not satisfied, then the matter may be listed for a full hearing where SAT would determine whether the HCN is to be maintained or be revoked.

Planning and Development Act 2005 (PD Act) and Public Works Act 1902 (PW Act)

In accordance with Section 4(1) of the PD Act and Schedule 1 of the PW Act, the proposed HDP Program redevelopment would be defined as a 'public work'. This is because it relates to public and social housing.

The demolition of the existing dwelling could form part of this redevelopment project.

Public works do not require development approval from the City.

Section 6(1) of the PD Act outlines that nothing interferes with the right of a public authority to undertake, construct or provide the public work.

Section 6(2) of the PD Act outlines that due regard is to be given to the following when public works applications are assessed and determined by the WAPC:

- *The purpose and intent of any planning scheme that has effect in the locality where, and at the time when, the right is exercised; and*
- *The orderly and proper planning, and the preservation of the amenity, of that locality at that time; and*
- *Any advice provided by the responsible authority in the course of the consultation required under subsection (3) in respect of the exercise of the right.*

**RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:**

Should Council resolve to revoke the HCN:

- Reputational Risk – A perception of inconsistency with the City's Strategic Community Plan which seeks to maintain Vincent's built form heritage and character, and potential precedent for demolition by neglect.
- Risk the Project Does Not Progress – If redevelopment does not proceed, the dwelling may further deteriorate. This risk could be mitigated by not supporting the HCN being revoked until development approval has been granted and works commence.

Should Council resolve to maintain the HCN:

- Reputational Risk – Perception of delaying the HDP Program during a housing shortage.
- Financial Risk – Legal and consultant costs if the matter progresses to a full SAT hearing. This is estimated to be upward of \$40,000.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

Sensitive Design

*Our built form character and heritage is protected and enhanced.*

*Our planning framework supports quality design, sustainable urban built form and is responsive to our community and local context.*

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no budget implications in revoking the HCN.

To date, the preparation of the HCN and legal fees associated with the SAT review have cost approximately \$20,000. This has been met through the existing operational budget.

Should the matter progress to a full SAT hearing, this would have additional resourcing and financial implications. Legal and consultant costs are estimated between \$40,000 and \$60,000.

**COMMENTS:**

Council is being asked to reconsider its decision to require a HCN to be issued for the subject site.

Council is not being asked to remove the subject site from the MHI or to provide comments on any future redevelopment proposal.

Matters particularly relevant for Council to consider in whether to revoke or maintain the HCN relate to:

1. The purpose and intent of the HCN.
2. The 'public works' approval pathway for the HDP Program.

These are detailed below, along with responses to DPLH's justification.

### **1. Purpose & Intent of HCN**

The HCN serves an important planning function. The HCN addresses the current condition of the dwelling and provides a mechanism to prevent further deterioration.

Council's decision from April 2024 to issue the HCN was based on the dwelling not being 'properly maintained' in line with Clause 13(2) of the Regulations.

Under these Regulations, a heritage place is not 'properly maintained' if there is actual or imminent loss or deterioration of its structural integrity, or heritage elements integral to the significance of the place.


- Structural Integrity – The CMS prepared by Urbis observed that the structural integrity of the heritage property had deteriorated significantly due to ongoing vandalism, squatting, and lack of maintenance. The CMS recommended temporary propping within 12 months to secure the eastern and western walls and ceiling to ensure that further deterioration does not occur.

In response, the DPLH provided a report from a structural engineer in February 2025 which concluded that the walls were in a reasonable condition and did not require any propping. While the ceiling was noted as being in a poor condition, there was no imminent danger of collapse. Overall, the dwelling was assessed to be structurally adequate for the next three to five years. The City reviewed this report and accepted these findings.

- Heritage Significance – The heritage assessment noted the loss of some significant fabric from damage to the verandah fretwork, exterior doors, exterior walls and roofing, interior flooring, ceilings (including ceiling roses) and fireplace mantles. The external elements and the fireplace mantles were of primary significance in the heritage assessment (**Attachment 1**) and are shown below.

Works to the verandah were recommended to be undertaken within the first 12 months, with the remaining works recommended to be staged over two to three years.

While deterioration has occurred, the dwelling retains heritage value and structural integrity. Its condition is unlikely to worsen beyond repair within the next three to five years and while the HDP Program progresses through the approval processes.



## 2. *Redevelopment of the Site as Public Works*

The DPLH's justification is summarised as:

- The HDP Program to redevelop the subject site and wider landholdings for public and community housing would be carried out as public works. The demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site would be incidental to this.
- Under the relevant legislation nothing can interfere with public works being carried out. The HCN is considered to interfere with the broader redevelopment.
- Formal consultation was undertaken with the City between January and March 2025, with further consultation relating to the future redevelopment application ongoing.

Administration's comments are as follows:

- Public Works – At the time that Council resolved to issue the HCN in April 2024, the HDP Program had not progressed beyond the initial expressions of interest.

Since then, Bethanie Housing was announced in January 2025 as the successful proponent to deliver the redevelopment to provide for over 55's social housing on the site.

This progress confirms that the broader redevelopment and any associated demolition of the existing dwelling would be classified as 'public works'. This is because social housing is defined as a 'public work' by the PW Act.

As a 'public work', the proposal would not require development approval from the City but would require development approval from the WAPC.

While the City is not the decision maker, it would provide comments to the WAPC for its consideration.

In considering an application for public works, the WAPC is required under the PD Act to have due regard to the City's advice, the provisions of LPS2, orderly and proper planning, and the preservation of the amenity of the locality.

- HCN Interference – Within the context of the public works approval process, the HCN would not interfere with the State Government progressing the broader redevelopment works. This is because the relevant planning and public works legislation provides a clear pathway for these works to be approved.

The WAPC as the decision maker on the future redevelopment application would need to satisfy itself that the demolition of the heritage-listed dwelling would be consistent with LPS2 and orderly and proper planning and consider the HCN. If it is satisfied, it could approve the application and the works could be carried out consistent with this once the necessary building permits have been obtained.

Should the WAPC approve such an application, the HCN would become ineffective and unenforceable. This is because the redevelopment could lawfully proceed under the PD Act and PW Act.

- Consultation – Administration has received updates from the DPLH on the status of the project and the expected timeframe of an application being lodged.

Administration has been consistent in recommending that any redevelopment should include the retention of the existing dwelling.

The City would have a further opportunity to comment when the development application is formally lodged.

### **3. *Timing of the Redevelopment Proposal***

The DPLH's justification on the expected timing of the HDP Program redevelopment is summarised as:

- Lodgement of a public works development application in late May or early June 2025 for determination by the WAPC
- Within three months of development approval being obtained, demolition of the dwelling would be carried out.
- Construction would be expected to start in early 2026.

Administration's comments are as follows:

- Approval Process – The expected timeframes would be subject to obtaining development approval from the WAPC as well as any other necessary approvals before works could start. This would include a building permit for the demolition of the existing dwelling.

Having indicative timeframes and even obtaining development approvals and any other relevant approvals does not necessarily mean that the redevelopment would proceed within this expected timeframe or even at all.

Certainty would only exist once these approvals have been obtained, and works have begun on the site. Until then, there remains a risk that the redevelopment will not proceed, and the dwelling could continue to deteriorate.

### **4. *Inability to Retain the Existing Dwelling in Wider Redevelopment***

The DPLH's justification is summarised as:

- Several design options were considered, but retention of the dwelling is not preferred as it would result in a significantly smaller dwelling yield.
- The final design includes the demolition of the existing development to provide for a clean development site that optimises social housing on a strategic landholding.

Administration's comments are as follows:

- Retention & Integration – The HDP Program site is approximately 1.4 hectares in area. This would be large enough to accommodate the intended yield of 90 apartments, while retaining and adaptively reusing the 204 square metre existing dwelling in a manner that does not adversely impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential properties.



The City has seen examples of successful restoration of heritage buildings and adaptive reuse in recent years. This includes No. 67 Cleaver Street, West Perth, as part of the Rosewood Aged Care redevelopment, and No's 28-40 and 48 Cowle Street, West Perth, as part of two apartment developments.

### **Recommended Approach**

- Retention of Heritage-Listed Dwelling – Administration does not support the demolition of the dwelling on the site. This is because it has not been shown why it could not be restored and integrated into the broader social housing redevelopment as an example of adaptive reuse.

Conservation and celebration of the City's built form heritage is an important element of the City's Strategic Community Plan and local planning framework.

- Revocation of HCN Subject to Milestones – The progression of the redevelopment and related demolition as public works means that the WAPC is the decision maker on the application, and not the City.

In the scenario where approval is granted for redevelopment and for the dwelling to be demolished, the HCN would become redundant and would not be able to be enforced because the dwelling would have been lawfully demolished.

The revocation of the HCN should only be supported where development approval has been granted by the WAPC for the demolition and redevelopment and works have commenced.

This would provide the necessary certainty that the redevelopment is proceeding, and that the HCN could no longer achieve its purpose.

At present, no development application has been lodged with or approved by the WAPC.

- Heritage Listing – Should an application be approved by the WAPC, this would not have any immediate effect on the heritage listing of the dwelling. This would be considered in the as part of a broader review of all places that are on the City's Heritage List which is currently underway.

**9.3 HEALTH SERVICES - HISTORICAL SUNDRY DEBTORS 2018/19 - 2022/23 - DEBT WRITE OFF**

**Attachments:** 1. Health Sundry Debtors - 2018-2023 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY writing off a total debt of \$138,319.74 attributed to historical health services sundry debtors, accrued between 2018/19 and 2022/2023 financial years, in accordance with clause 6.21(1)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval to write off a total debt of \$138,319.74 attributed to historical health services sundry debtors, accrued between 2018/19 and 2022/23 financial years.

**DELEGATION:**

This debt write off is being referred to Council for a decision in accordance with the City's Register of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments.

A local government may write off any amount of money which is owed to the local government under Section 6.12(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) has delegation under the City's Register of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments to write off debts up to \$5,000. Council approval is required to write off the debt of \$138,319.74 attributed to historical health services invoices, as the debt exceeds this amount.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City's Health Services team provides a suite of services to the business community. This includes the registration, assessment, and monitoring of regulated businesses including but not limited to food premises, lodging houses, public buildings and temporary food stall holder/vendors. These services attract fees in accordance with the City's annually adopted Fees and Charges schedule.

Many of these services are conducted on a routine but unannounced basis to ensure their effectiveness and uphold the intent of relevant public health standards. Issuing invoices beforehand could compromise the integrity of these assessments by signalling inspections in advance, which may influence the results.

Where a service is proposed or requested, an invoice is issued. The process to recover the outstanding debt is as follows:

- An initial invoice is issued, with 30 days to pay.
- If unpaid, a final notice is issued with a \$60 late fee and another 30-day payment period.
- Debts that remain unpaid are referred to the City's debt collection agency via Finance.

The recommendation to write off unpaid debts forms part of a broader effort to improve the accuracy of the City's debtor records. These debts relate to services provided over multiple financial years and have been assessed as irrecoverable after exhausting all reasonable recovery efforts, including though reminders/final notices, payment arrangements, and referrals to debt recovery agencies cases where businesses have closed.

Administration is actively progressing debt recovery efforts for the 2023/24 and 2024/25 financial years, pursuing all reasonable avenues to ensure compliance.

**DETAILS:**

The City has been unsuccessful in recovering the outstanding sundry debts for the years 2018/19 – 2023/24 from the debtors.

The table below shows past debts where all reasonable efforts have been made to recover the debt, but it remains unpaid.

Year	Invoices raised	Total value
2019	38	\$17,901.32
2020	118	\$31,048.65
2021	150	\$44,695.62
2022	68	\$22,724.16
2023	120	\$21,949.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>\$138,319.74</b>

A full list of debtors is at **Attachment 1**.

#### DETAILS:

The City has been unsuccessful in recovering the outstanding sundry debts for the years 2018/19 – 2022/23 from the debtors.

#### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

There is no community consultation associated with the consideration of writing off debt.

#### LEGAL/POLICY:

- *Local Government Act 1995.*
- *Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911.*
- *Food Act 2008.*
- Recovery of Debts, Rates and Service Charges Policy (Recovery of Debts Policy).

Under Section 6.12(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, Council has the discretion to write off debts.

#### RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Medium: It is medium risk for Council to write off the \$138,319.74 debt. The risk of writing off the debt is medium for the following reasons:

- Historical process gaps: The debts accumulated over several years due to inconsistent review practices, resource constraints, and a focus on pursuing active debt recovery. While this does not set a precedent, it highlights the need for improved service and process maturity.
- Cost-benefit of continued recovery: The cost to pursue these debts further would exceed the amounts to be recovered.
- Resource impact: Continuing to pursue these debts would require significant staff time, which could be directed toward current debt recovery and service delivery priorities.
- Low likelihood of recovery: Debts relating to businesses that have closed or changed operators are unable to be recovered, despite recovery efforts to date.
- Perception and transparency risk: There is a potential reputational risk if stakeholders perceive the write-off as lenient or poorly explained. However, this risk is mitigated through transparent reporting and a commitment to improved financial management practices going forward.

#### STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

##### Connected and Healthy Community

*We have enhanced opportunities for our community to build relationships and connections with each other and the City.*

Thriving Places

*We are recognised as a City that supports local and small business.*

Innovative and Accountable

*Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any environmental sustainability outcomes. This action/activity is environmentally neutral.

**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any public health outcomes in the *City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025*.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

The total debt of \$138,319.74 was originally expected as revenue across the financial years of 2018/19 – 2022/23. The write-off means the City will no longer receive revenue that was expected to support its service provision.

A breakdown of the total value of unpaid invoices as compared to total value of revenue received for each financial year is provided below.

Year	Total no. invoices unpaid	Total value unpaid	Total revenue (actuals) 'Health Administration and Inspection Revenue'	% total unpaid
2018/2019	38	\$17,901.32	\$365,706	4.86%
2019/2020	118	\$31,048.65	\$343,200	9.05%
2020/2021	150	\$44,695.62	\$327,063	13.66%
2021/2022	68	\$22,724.16	\$354,584	6.41%
2022/2023	120	\$21,949.99	\$304,000	7.22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>\$138,319.74</b>	<b>\$1,694,553</b>	<b>Average – 8.24%</b>

**COMMENTS:**

The City's Recovery of Debts Policy outlines that all appropriate and reasonable steps be taken to recover outstanding debts.

If the debt remains unpaid, the Recovery of Debts Policy provides for a review of the circumstances to ensure that the next actions are appropriate and giving due consideration to all issues which have led to the debt being overdue and unpaid.

The debts presented for write off relate to historic health service charges that have remained outstanding despite repeated and reasonable efforts to recover them.

Administration recognises that debt write offs require careful consideration. In this case, the recommendation follows a review of the situation.

Administration recommends writing off the historic debts for the following reasons:

- Recovery not financially viable: The cost of further pursuing these debts would exceed the potential recovery amount.
- Final reminder/notice: Administration issued final notices to most of the debtors, without response.
- Referral to debt collectors: Most of the outstanding invoices were sent to the City's debt collection agency, without success.

- Exhaustive recovery efforts: All reasonable and proportionate steps have been taken to recover these debts, including a combination of reminders, final notices, external collections, and due diligence in tracing debtors. All of which have been unsuccessful.
- Cessation of business or change in operator: The businesses associated with the outstanding debts have ceased trading or the business operator has changed. The City is unable to pursue the new business and/or operator for the debt.
- COVID-19 constraints: Active debt recovery efforts were paused during the COVID-19 pandemic, in accordance with State Government emergency provisions and in an attempt to support small business. The *Local Government (COVID-19 Response) Amendment Order 2022* extended measures to assist those experiencing financial difficulty due to the ongoing effects of the pandemic and restricted certain recovery mechanisms for local governments.
- Age of debts: A substantial amount of time has passed since the invoices were originally issued, further reducing the likelihood of recovery.

Historically, debt write-offs have not occurred on a regular annual basis due to resource constraints, prioritisation of active debt recovery, and inconsistent review practices. To improve this, the Finance and Health Services teams are introducing a more structured process and proactive debt management approach. This includes regular reviews and annual reporting to better manage and address uncollectable debts going forward.

Administration's recommendation seeks to finalise long-outstanding debts, while separately Administration will focus on strengthening our processes moving forward.

## 10 INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT

### 10.1 LIFEVAC DEVICE INSTALLATION AT COMMUNITY FACILITIES

**Attachments:** 1. Notice of Motion - LifeVac CoV Community Facilities 

#### RECOMMENDATION:

**That Council**

1. **APPROVES LifeVac® devices to be installed at Community Facilities;**
2. **NOTES that \$9,000 be included in the 2025/2026 budget to purchase, install and maintain LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities; and**
3. **NOTES the implementation and evaluation of the LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities to occur throughout financial year 2025/2026.**

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To seek Council endorsement to install LifeVac® devices at City of Vincent Community Facilities.

#### DELEGATION:

Not applicable. Council resolution required a report for Council determination on this matter.

#### BACKGROUND:

In January 2025, Councillor Nicole Woolf and Councillor Suzanne Worner received email correspondence from Mr Brian Bwoga of Beldon, Western Australia with a notice of motion to consider installation of LifeVac® devices in City managed facilities. Tragically, Mr Bwoga's son, ZaZa, lost his life on 15 January 2024 after choking on a grape at Burns Beach. Despite Mr Bwoga's attempts to apply CPR, and paramedics rushing to the scene, ZaZa passed away within five minutes. He is currently advocating for implementation of Lifevac® devices throughout local councils.

In May 2025, the Administration provided Council a comprehensive evaluation of the LifeVac® device with additional considerations and relevant costs related to its installation at City of Vincent Community Facilities  
**ATTACHMENT 1.** Council subsequently resolved the following –

*That Council REQUESTS that:*

1. *the CEO prepares a report outlining the costs, benefits and risks of installing LifeVac® airway clearance devices in City of Vincent Community Facilities, such as those where Automated External Defibrillators are installed; and*
2. *the report is provided to Council for consideration by August 2025, including a recommendation on whether to proceed with the installation of LifeVac devices at City of Vincent Community Facilities.*

#### DETAILS:

LifeVac® is a non-powered upper airway clearing device. It is listed for sale in Australia as a Class 1 Medical Device on the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods (ARTG) and has been validated through post market and clinical review audits. The LifeVac® Airway clearance device has been documented in multiple peer reviewed medical publications and has undergone independent testing on safety, effectiveness, and ease of use. LifeVac® uses a patented one-way valve system that creates a powerful suction to remove blockages from the airway without pushing the object further down. It is intended to be used in an emergency when the standard current choking protocol has been followed without success and recommended for use on persons over 12 months of age.


Administration's assessment concludes that LifeVac® devices do not replace first line treatment for choking, however, could act as an additional tool should first line treatment be unsuccessful. These devices could dually support anyone administering first aid in an emergency.

It is recommended these devices be installed at Community Facilities where Automated External Defibrillators (AEDs) are located to ensure additional first aid equipment is available in emergency situations.

It is noted the availability of accessing the LifeVac® devices is limited, and several reviews of the product suggest there has been wait times up to 5 months for the product to arrive. It is therefore recommended the City acquire a surplus supply of the devices should any devices be damaged; these can then be easily replaced.

Whilst the devices are considered easy to use it is recommended that City staff at operated facilities be trained to use the device in emergency situations – for example Beatty Park Leisure Centre, Loftus Community Centre, Loftus Recreation Centre and Vincent Library and additional educational signage be investigated for inclusion at other sites.

### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:



### Community Advocacy

To achieve the desired action requires the response of a focal organisation because the community cannot achieve the desired result alone and, therefore, advocates to motivate the organisation to act.

**Tension:** Gap between what's wanted and what you can do or influence.

**Mitigation:** Showing you're willing to be their decision-makers' advocate.

Advocates have a transparent and genuine process to represent the needs and interests drawn from a diverse range of community members

*Proactively communicate with advocates to understand their positions and processes*

### LEGAL/POLICY:

Nil

### RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Low: It is low risk for Council to approve LifeVac® devices to be installed at City of Vincent Community Facilities.



Risk Category	Risk Appetite / Tolerance Statement	Descriptor / clarification
<i>Sustainable future for our community</i>	The City supports investments, activities and developments that result in a sustainable future for our community while meeting the current needs of our residents.  It recognises that this may at times involve accepting some degree of risk and is comfortable with this, subject to always ensuring that potential benefits and risks are fully understood before planning is approved and that appropriate measures to mitigate risk are established.	There is often a payoff. Proposals need to consider the risks and rewards based on the promises made to the community. This has been envisaged with the City's Project Management Framework implementation and future actions.
<i>Activities against ratepayer values &amp; ethics</i>	The City has a <b>very low risk appetite</b> for investments and activities that do not align with the City's values.	The City has set its vision, purpose and guiding values based on the interpretation of those of the community it serves. When entering into new projects, investments and proposals, these values must be considered as one of the key consideration sets.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

Enhanced Environment

*Our parks and reserves are maintained, enhanced and are accessible for all members of the community.*

Connected and Healthy Community

*We have enhanced opportunities for our community to build relationships and connections with each other and the City.*

*Our community facilities and spaces are well known and well used.*

*We are an inclusive, accessible and equitable City for all.*

*We protect, improve and promote public health and wellbeing within Vincent.*

Thriving Places

*Our town centres and gathering spaces are safe, easy to use and attractive places where pedestrians have priority.*

*We encourage innovation in business, social enterprise and imaginative uses of space, both public and private.*

Innovative and Accountable

*We embrace good ideas or innovative approaches to our work to get better outcomes for Vincent and our community.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any specific sustainability outcomes of the *City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024*, however will play a significant role in supporting the City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025 outcomes.

**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the following priority health outcomes of the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*:

*Reduced injuries and a safer community*

*Mitigate the impact of public health emergencies*

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

The City currently has 14 AEDs located across 10 sites. The supply of Lifevac® devices at each of these sites would result in a total cost of approximately \$2,270.00. Suitable housing for the 6 devices located in outdoor public spaces would incur an additional cost. The projected annual operating cost is \$750.00 based on an assumption that 33% of the units (or components) may need to be replaced annually due to damage, deterioration or loss.

Component	Cost	Notes
10x LifeVac® Devices	\$2,270	approx. maintenance cost \$750.00 per year
3x replacement LifeVac®	\$681	
Storage Cabinets	\$2,000 - \$5,000	Price dependent on facility (indoor/outdoor) and integration with AED storage.
Training	\$500 - \$1,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,451 - \$8,951</b>	

**COMMENTS:**

The installation of LifeVac® devices at City of Vincent Community Facilities represents a proactive and responsible measure to enhance emergency preparedness and community safety. While not a substitute for standard first aid protocols, LifeVac offers an additional, evidence-supported intervention in situations where conventional methods to relieve airway obstructions are unsuccessful.

Importantly, this initiative aligns with recent actions taken by neighbouring local governments, including the Cities of Joondalup, Wanneroo, and Swan, who have already approved the installation of LifeVac® devices within their community facilities. Their adoption of this device reflects a growing recognition across the sector of its potential to save lives and improve public health outcomes.

With modest upfront and ongoing costs, strong community advocacy, and clear alignment with the City's strategic objectives around safety, inclusion, and wellbeing, the implementation of LifeVac® devices demonstrates the City of Vincent's continued leadership and commitment to delivering responsive, community-focused services.

**10.2 RFT IE426/2025 HIRE OF SKID STEER LOADER ASSOCIATED PLANT (TRUCK) & OPERATOR**

**Attachments:** 1. **Confidential Attachment 1 - Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE426-2025 - Confidential**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator; and**
2. **ACCEPTS the tender submission of The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust for Tender IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator.**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

For Council to consider and determine the outcome of Tender IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator.

**DELEGATION:**

The decision to accept or reject tenders with a value exceeding \$250,000 requires a decision of Council in accordance with Council's adopted register of delegations, authorisations, and appointments.

**BACKGROUND:**

The hire of a skid steer loader associated plant (truck), and operator is required to support the delivery of the City's Parks programs, including the Adopt a Verge and Eco-Zoning initiatives, as well as general landscaping and maintenance works. There is currently no contract in place for this service. A procurement plan to undertake a public Request for Tender was approved on 21 March 2025.

**DETAILS:****Tender Submissions**

There was a total of six (6) submissions received from six (6) respondents. All respondents submitted conforming responses.

**Evaluation Panel**

The Evaluation Panel comprised of four members, being:

- three with the appropriate operational expertise and involvement in supervising the contract (voting); and
- one with tender preparation skills and probity advice provided by a Procurement and Contracts Officer (non-voting).

**Compliance Assessment**

Compliance assessment was carried out on all submissions. All six (6) submissions were assessed as fully compliant and progressed to the qualitative assessment stage.

**Evaluation Method and Weighting**

The qualitative weighting method of tender evaluation was selected to evaluate the offer. The qualitative criteria and weighting used in evaluating the submission received were as follows:

Qualitative Criteria		Weighting
1	Demonstrated Understanding	35%
2	Capacity, Skills and Experience	35%
3	Safety	20%
4	Environmental Sustainability	10%

### Qualitative Assessment

Each submission was evaluated against the qualitative criteria outlined in the Request for Tender, which included demonstrated experience, capacity to deliver the services, understanding of the requirements, and commitment to environmental and social objectives. The results of the qualitative assessment are summarised below:

Respondent #	Weighted Percentage Score	Qualitative Ranking
Respondent 1	66%	4
Respondent 2	77%	1
Respondent 3	68%	3
Respondent 4	73%	2
Respondent 5	62%	5
Respondent 6	49%	6

Refer to **Confidential Attachment 1** for further details.

The Evaluation Panel shortlisted Respondent 1, Respondent 2, Respondent 3, Respondent 4 and Respondent 5 to progress to the price assessment stage. The remaining Respondent did not progress due to the low qualitative score and significant risk associated with the responses to the qualitative criteria.

### Price Assessment

The Evaluation Panel assessed the pricing submitted by each shortlisted Respondent based on the proposed hourly rates for the provision of a truck, skid steer loader, and operator. To ensure a consistent and comparable evaluation, pricing was calculated based on an assumed utilisation of 8 hours per day, 5 days per week, over a 52-week period. The hourly rate and corresponding annual total for each Respondent are presented in the table below.

The total price breakdown is included in **Confidential Attachment 1**.

Respondent #	Hourly Rate	Price over 52 weeks (excl GST)	Rank
Respondent 1 (minimum charge of 10 hours per day)	\$180	\$468,000	3
Respondent 2 (no minimum charge)	\$90	\$187,200	1
Respondent 3 (no minimum charge)	\$255	\$530,400	4
Respondent 4 (no minimum charge)	\$140	\$291,200	2
Respondent 5 (no minimum charge)	\$225	\$468,000	3

Refer to **Confidential Attachment 1** for further detail.

### Risk Assessment

The evaluation panel conducted a comprehensive risk assessment of each submission, considering compliance with specifications, potential service delivery risks, and contractual risk exposure.

Respondent #	Compliance with RFT	Operational/Service Delivery Risk	Contractual Risk	Risk Rank
Respondent 1	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	<b>Medium</b> – Strong submission but issues with daily minimum charges and accreditations.	Low – No departures from contract terms. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation	4
Respondent 2	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	<b>Low</b> – Submission demonstrates excellent understanding of service requirements and sound risk mitigation strategies.	Low – No departures from contract terms. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation	2
Respondent 3	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	<b>Medium</b> – Strong alignment with City values; limited detail on past performance and qualifications.	Low – No departures from contract terms. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation	3

Respondent #	Compliance with RFT	Operational/Service Delivery Risk	Contractual Risk	Risk Rank
Respondent 4	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	<b>Low</b> – Well-structured proposal with minor documentation gaps; low delivery risk.	Low – Minor contractual departures; all reasonable and aligned with industry norms.	1
Respondent 5	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	<b>Medium</b> – Limited submission with vague risk strategies and contract management gaps.	Low – No departures from contract terms. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation	5

### Value for Money Assessment

The Evaluation Panel undertook a comprehensive value for money assessment, considering the combined outcomes of the qualitative evaluation, pricing analysis, and risk assessment. This holistic approach ensured that the recommended submission offers the optimal balance of quality, cost-effectiveness, and low delivery and contractual risk to the City.

Respondent #	Qualitative Rank	Price Rank	Risk Rank	Value for Money Rank	Comment
Respondent 1	4	4	4	3	Moderate qualitative score and high price. While showing good capability, operational inflexibility and medium risk reduce value for money, requiring careful contract oversight
Respondent 2	1	1	2	1	Highest qualitative score and lowest price, combined with a moderate but manageable risk profile. As the incumbent, this respondent demonstrates strong operational readiness, delivering the best overall value for money.
Respondent 3	3	5	3	4	Moderate qualitative score but highest price and moderate risk due to some management and transparency gaps. Despite good social/environmental credentials, high cost reduces overall value.
Respondent 4	2	2	1	2	Good qualitative score and second-lowest price with a low-risk rating. Offers strong value, especially where risk mitigation and compliance are priorities, though at a higher cost than Respondent 2
Respondent 5	5	3	5	5	Lowest qualitative score and mid-range price with medium risk due to lack of detail and oversight. Limited value for money without increased contract management.

### Evaluation Summary

Following a detailed assessment of all submissions, the evaluation panel recommends the tender from The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust for Request for Tender IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator, as offering the best overall value for money to the City.

This recommendation is based on the following key considerations:

- The submission met all mandatory compliance requirements in full;
- The Respondent achieved the highest ranking in the qualitative assessment;
- The pricing proposal was the most competitive, ranked 1st overall;
- The submission was assessed as presenting the second-lowest overall risk;
- When considered holistically, the pricing represents excellent value for money, offering the best balance between cost, quality, and risk.

Based on this assessment, it is recommended that Council accepts the tender submitted by The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust for this contract.

#### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

This matter is subject to a statutory advertising requirement.

The Request for Tender IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator advertised in the West Australian on Saturday 5 April 2025 and on both the City's website and Vendor Panel between 5 April 2025 and 30 April 2025.

#### LEGAL/POLICY:

The Request for Tender was prepared and advertised in accordance with:

- Section 3.57 of the *Local Government Act 1995*;
- Part 4 of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*; and
- City of Vincent Purchasing Policy.

#### RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Low: It is low risk for Council to accept the preferred Respondent.

In accordance with the City of Vincent's adopted Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statements, the recommendation to award the contract to The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust presents a low risk to the City and is consistent with the organisation's risk position for the following reasons:

- **Third-Party Risk:** The City has a low appetite for contractor failure, including delays, breaches, or underperformance. The recommended Respondent demonstrated a strong and well-evidenced understanding of the service requirements, supported by relevant qualifications, appropriate plant and equipment, and sound safety and risk management systems. While the Respondent is a sole operator, potential vulnerabilities were acknowledged in the assessment and deemed minor due to their proactive risk mitigation strategies, established service continuity arrangements, and strong operational preparedness. These factors provide confidence in the Respondent's ability to meet contract requirements, minimise delivery risk, and uphold the City's service standards.
- **Procurement Risk – Value for Money:** The City also maintains a low-risk appetite for procurement outcomes that result in poor value for money, substandard service, or financial loss. The Respondent ranked first in both the qualitative and price assessments, offering the most competitive pricing combined with a high-quality and compliant submission. This outcome reflects a sound procurement process and aligns with the City's obligation to ensure that contracts deliver value, quality, and reliability.
- **Procurement Risk – Health and Safety:** The City has zero tolerance for procurement decisions that could result in harm to staff or the community. The recommended Respondent has demonstrated clear adherence to safety standards, risk mitigation procedures, and regulatory compliance. While some reliance on a sole operator was noted, no concerns were identified that would compromise the safety of the City's workforce or community members.

In summary, the recommended contract award is considered low risk, aligns with the City's risk appetite, and reflects a balanced decision that supports safe, reliable, and cost-effective service delivery.

#### STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

##### Enhanced Environment

*We have minimised our impact on the environment.*

Connected and Healthy Community

*Our community facilities and spaces are well known and well used.*

Thriving Places

*Efficiently managed and maintained City assets in the public realm.*

Innovative and Accountable

*Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any specific sustainability outcomes of the *City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024*; however, the sustainability and environmental management practices of Respondents was a weighted qualitative criterion of this request, and the preferred Respondent provided some evidence of sustainability practices.

**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any public health outcomes in the *City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025*. However, public health considerations are indirectly supported through the contractor's compliance with workplace health and safety standards, the use of well-maintained equipment, and adherence to environmental management practices. These measures help ensure that works undertaken in the community are delivered safely and responsibly, minimising risk to both the public and City staff.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

An annual budget of approximately \$222,000 has been identified and approved through the City's 2024/25 Operating and Capital Budget and associated Procurement Plan, resulting in a total allocation of \$665,000 over the initial three-year contract term.

The recommended Respondent submitted a total annual price of \$187,200, equating to \$561,600 over three years. This pricing is well within the approved budget, providing a cost-effective solution for the City.

The submission represents a financially sound outcome that supports the City's value for money objectives and remains fully aligned with established budgetary parameters.

**COMMENTS:**

The tender submission from The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust complies with all tender requirements and was presented to a high standard. The submission demonstrated a strong understanding of the service requirements and responded to the specifications in a clear, thorough, and professional manner.


The Evaluation Panel considered the response to be well-structured, credible, and closely aligned with the City's expectations in terms of capability, capacity, and relevant experience. The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust achieved the highest rankings across all evaluation criteria, including qualitative assessment, pricing, and risk.

Notably, the submission presented a low level of contractual and operational risk, consistent with the City's low risk appetite for both third-party failure and procurement failure. The competitive annual pricing of \$187,200 represents excellent value for money when balanced against the quality of the submission and the assessed risk.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Panel recommends the award of Request for Tender IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator f, Associated Plant (Truck), to The Trustee for Bladerunner Trust.

## 11 COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES

### 11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 30 APRIL 2025

- Attachments:**
1. Financial Statements as at 30 April 2025 
  2. Statement of Financial Activity 30 June 2025 - Budget Amendment 
  3. Cash Backed Reserve 30 June 2025 - Budget Amendment 

#### RECOMMENDATION:

- That Council **RECEIVES** the Financial Statements for the month ended 30 April 2025 as shown in Attachment 1; and
- 
- **BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY APPROVES** the increase in interest revenue and changes to cash back reserve balances as detailed in the Statement of Financial Activity (Attachment 2) and Cash Backed Reserves Statement (Attachment 3) showing a 30 June 2025 closing balance of \$29,101,798.

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To present the statement of financial activity for the period ended 30 April 2025.

#### DELEGATION:

*Regulation 34 (4) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires the local government to prepare a statement of financial activity each month, which is to be presented to Council within 2 months after the end of the relevant month.

#### BACKGROUND:

Regulation 34 (1) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires a local government to prepare each month a statement of financial activity including the sources and applications of funds, as compared to the budget.

#### DETAILS:

The following documents, included as **Attachment 1**, comprise the statement of financial activity for the period ended **30 April 2025**:

Note	Description	Page
1.	Statement of Financial Activity by Nature or Type Report	1
2.	Net Current Funding Position	2
3.	Statement of Financial Position	3
4.	Summary of Income and Expenditure by Service Areas	4-6
5.	Capital Expenditure including Funding graph and Capital Works Schedule	7-12
6.	Cash Backed Reserves	13
7.	Receivables: Rates and Other Debtors	14
8.	Beatty Park Leisure Centre Financial Activity	15

#### Explanation of Material Variances

The materiality thresholds used for reporting variances are 10% and \$20,000, respectively. This means that variances will be analysed and separately reported when they are more than 10% (+/-) of the year-to-date budget and where that variance exceeds \$20,000 (+/-). This threshold was adopted by Council as part of the budget adoption for 2024/2025 and is used in the preparation of the statements of financial activity when highlighting material variance in accordance with *Financial Management Regulation 34(1) (d)*.

In accordance with the above, all material variances as at 30 April 2025 have been detailed in the variance comments report in **Attachment 1**.



**Revenue by Nature or Type** (on page 1) is tracking higher than the YTD budgeted revenue by \$1,528,594 (2.1%). The following items materially contributed to this position:

- A favourable variance of \$1,050,644 in Fees and Charges mainly due to:
  - \$470,916 favourable Ranger Services fees and charges,
  - \$295,095 favourable Building Licences,
  - \$58,992 favourable Beatty Park membership fees,
  - \$35,333 favourable development application fees, and
  - \$35,864 favourable Waste Management fees,
- A favourable variance of \$659,660 in Other Revenue mainly due to:
  - \$364,067 reimbursements for Catalina Regional Council and Insurance claims.
  - \$114,531 timing variance for Perth Inner City Group reimbursements and variable outgoing recoups.
- A favourable variance in Interest earnings of \$293,382 mostly due to higher cash balances.
- An unfavourable timing variance in Operating grants, subsidies, and contributions of \$321,242.
- An unfavourable variance of \$101,001 in rates mainly due to lower interim rates.

**Expenditure by Nature or Type** (on page 1) is unfavourable, attributed by an over-spend of \$676,324 (1.1%). The following items materially contributed to this position:

- \$577,030 unfavourable other expenditure.
- \$390,296 unfavourable depreciation expense due to higher asset values.
- \$222,214 favourable materials and contracts mainly due to timing variances.
- \$122,540 unfavourable utility costs.
- \$186,292 favourable employee costs due to timing variances.

### Surplus Position

The opening surplus position brought forward to 2024/25 is \$6,962,305. The closing surplus is \$2,858,861 favourable against budget as at April 2025.

### Content of Statement of Financial Activity

An explanation of each report in the Statement of Financial Activity (**Attachment 1**), along with some commentary, is below:

1. Statement of Financial Activity by Nature or Type Report (Note 1 Page 1)

This statement of financial activity shows revenue and expenditure classified by Nature or Type.

2. Net Current Funding Position (Note 2 Page 2)

'Net current assets' is the difference between the current assets and current liabilities, less committed and restricted assets.

3. Statement of Financial Position (Note 3 Page 3)

This statement of financial position shows the new current position and the total equity of the City.

4. Summary of Income and Expenditure by Service Areas (Note 4 Page 4-6)

This statement shows a summary of operating revenue and expenditure by service unit including variance commentary.

5. Capital Expenditure and Funding Summary (Note 5 Page 7-12)

The full capital works program is listed in detail in Note 5 in **Attachment 1**. The attachment includes a summary of the year-to-date expenditure of each asset category and the funding source associated to the delivery of capital works.

6. Cash Backed Reserves (Note 6 Page 13)

The cash backed reserves schedule provides a detailed summary of the movements in the reserve portfolio, including transfers to and from the reserve. The balance as at 30 April 2025 is \$27,407,767.

7. Receivables: Rating Information (Note 7 Page 14)

The notices for rates and charges levied for 2024/25 were issued on 25 July 2024. *The Local Government Act 1995* provides for ratepayers to pay rates by four instalments. The due dates for each instalment are:

	Due Date
First Instalment	30 August 2024
Second Instalment	1 November 2024
Third Instalment	3 January 2025
Fourth Instalment	7 March 2025

The outstanding rates debtors balance at 30 April 2025 was \$2,353,048. The outstanding rates percentage at 30 April 2025 was 3.09% compared to 4.49% for the same period last year.

8. Receivables: Other Debtors (Note 7 Page 14)

Total trade and other receivables at 30 April 2025 were \$2,813,627. Below is a summary of the significant items with an outstanding balance over 90 days:

- \$1,120,731 relates to unpaid infringements (plus costs) over 90 days. Infringements that remain unpaid for more than two months are referred to the Fines Enforcement Registry (FER), which then collects the outstanding balance on behalf of the City for a fee.
- \$140,168 relates to cash-in-lieu car parking debtors. In accordance with the *City's Policy 7.7.1 Non-residential parking*, Administration has entered into special payment arrangements with long outstanding cash in lieu parking debtors to enable them to pay their debt over a fixed term of five years.

9. Beatty Park Leisure Centre – Financial Activity report (Note 8 Page 15)

As at 30 April 2025, the Centre reported a net operating surplus of \$29,929, which is below the year-to-date budgeted surplus of \$103,011. In addition, capital expenditure of \$1.1 million and loan repayments of \$1.8 million have contributed to a closing funds position of a \$1,432,615 deficit.

**BUDGET AMENDMENT- STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY (ATTACHMENT 2) & CASH BACKED RESERVES (ATTACHMENT 3)**

The budget amendments proposed below are to account for higher interest earnings on reserve balances and to transfer the Sullivan Logistics naming rights income to the Leederville Oval Reserve as per the report tabled at the OCM on 16 May 2023.

The cash backed reserves budget is proposed to increase by **\$100,000** due to:

- Overall increase in interest revenue and transfer to reserves of **\$100,000**, due to higher cash balances.
- Increase in transfer to reserves of **\$33,123** in the Leederville Oval Reserve for the naming rights income received for the Sullivan Logistics Oval; and
- Decrease in transfer to reserves of **\$33,123** in the Asset Sustainability Reserve.

**CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:**

Not applicable.

**LEGAL/POLICY:**

*Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act 1995* requires a local government to prepare an annual financial report for the preceding year and other financial reports as prescribed.

*Regulation 34 (1) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires the local government to prepare a statement of financial activity each month, reporting on the source and application of funds as set out in the adopted annual budget.

A statement of financial activity and any accompanying documents are to be presented at an Ordinary Meeting of the Council within two months after the end of the month to which the statement relates. *Section 6.8 of the Local Government Act 1995* specifies that a local government is not to incur expenditure from its Municipal Fund for an additional purpose except where the expenditure is authorised in advance by an absolute majority decision of Council.

**RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:**

Low: Provision of monthly financial reports to Council fulfils relevant statutory requirements and is consistent with good financial governance.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

Reporting on the City's financial position is aligned with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

Innovative and Accountable

*Our resources and assets are planned and managed in an efficient and sustainable manner.*

*Our community is aware of what we are doing and how we are meeting our goals.*

*Our community is satisfied with the service we provide.*

*We are open and accountable to an engaged community.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

Expenditure within this report facilitates various projects, programs, services and initiatives that contribute to protecting/enhancing the City's built and natural environment and to improving resource efficiency.




**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

Expenditure within this report facilitates various projects, programs and services that contribute to the priority health outcomes within the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

As contained in this report.

**11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 APRIL 2025 TO 30 APRIL 2025**

- Attachments:**
1. April 2025 - Payments by EFT and Payroll 
  2. April 2025 - Payment by Direct Debits 
  3. April 2025 - Payments by Fuel Cards 

**Recommendation:**

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 April 2025 to 30 April 2025 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$6,207,181.51
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$617,861.49
 Total payments for April 2025	 \$6,825,043.00

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

To present to Council the list of expenditure and accounts paid for the period 01 April 2025 to 30 April 2025.

**DELEGATION:**

Regulation 13(1) and (3) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires that a list of accounts A list prepared under sub regulation (1) is to be presented to Council at the next ordinary meeting of Council after the list is prepared.

**BACKGROUND:**

Council has delegated to the Chief Executive Officer (Delegation No. 2.2.18) the power to make payments from the City's Municipal and Trust funds.

In accordance with *Regulation 13(1)* of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* a list of accounts paid by the Chief Executive Officer is to be provided to Council, where such delegation is made.

The list of accounts paid must be recorded in the minutes of the Council Meeting.

**DETAILS:**

The Schedule of Accounts paid for the period 01 April 2025 to 30 April 2025, covers the following:

FUND	CHEQUE NUMBERS/ BATCH NUMBER	AMOUNT
<b>Municipal Account (Attachment 1, 2 and 3)</b>		
EFT Payments	3189-3193	\$4,492,789.95
Payroll by Direct Credit	April 2025	\$1,714,391.56
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>\$6,207,181.51</b>
<b>Direct Debits (including Credit Cards)</b>		
Lease Fees		\$42,518.78
Loan Repayments		\$540,916.88
Bank Charges – CBA		\$23,867.04
Credit Cards		\$10,558.79
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>\$617,861.49</b>
<b>Total Payments</b>		<b>\$6,825,043.00</b>

**CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:**

Not applicable.

**LEGAL/POLICY:**

Regulation 12(1) and (2) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*:

“12. *Payments from municipal fund or trust fund, restrictions on making*

- (1) *A payment may only be made from the municipal fund or the trust fund —*
  - *if the local government has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from those funds — by the CEO; or*
  - *otherwise, if the payment is authorised in advance by a resolution of Council.*
- (2) *Council must not authorise a payment from those funds until a list prepared under regulation 13(2) containing details of the accounts to be paid has been presented to Council.”*

Regulation 13(1) and (3) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*:

“13. *Lists of Accounts*

- (1) *If the local government has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the municipal fund or the trust fund, a list of accounts paid by the CEO is to be prepared each month showing for each account paid since the last such list was prepared –*
  - *the payee’s name;*
  - *the amount of the payment;*
  - *the date of the payment; and*
  - *sufficient information to identify the transaction.*
- (2) *A list prepared under sub regulation (1) is to be —*
  - *presented to Council at the next ordinary meeting of Council after the list is prepared; and*
  - *recorded in the minutes of that meeting.”*

**RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

**Low:** Management systems are in place that establish satisfactory controls, supported by the internal and external audit functions. Financial reporting to Council increases transparency and accountability.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

Innovative and Accountable

*Our resources and assets are planned and managed in an efficient and sustainable manner.*

*Our community is aware of what we are doing and how we are meeting our goals.*

*Our community is satisfied with the service we provide.*

*We are open and accountable to an engaged community.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

Expenditure covered in this report includes various projects, programs, services and initiatives that contribute to protecting/enhancing the City's built and natural environment and to improving resource efficiency.

**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

Expenditure covered in this report includes various projects, programs and services that contribute to the priority health outcomes within the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

All municipal fund expenditure included in the list of payments is in accordance with Council's annual budget.

**11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 APRIL 2025**

**Attachments:** 1. Investment Report as at 30 April 25 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **NOTES** the Investment Statistics for the month ended 30 April 2025 as detailed in Attachment 1.

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

To advise Council of the nature and value of the City's Investments as at 30 April 2025 and the interest amounts earned YTD.

**DELEGATION:**

*Regulation 34 (4) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires the local government to prepare a statement of financial activity each month, which is to be presented to Council within two months after the end of the relevant month.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City's surplus funds are invested in bank term deposits for various terms to facilitate maximum investment returns in accordance with the City's Investment Policy (No. 1.2.4).

Details of the investments are included in **Attachment 1** and outline the following information:

- Investment performance and policy compliance charts;
- Investment portfolio data;
- Investment interest earnings; and
- Current investment holdings.

**DETAILS:****Summary of Key Investment Decisions in this Reporting Period**

There were no funds invested in the month of April 2025 while \$9.6m of funds matured during the period.


**Investment Status**

The City's investment portfolio is diversified across several accredited financial institutions.

As at 30 April 2025, the total funds held in the City's operating accounts (including on call) was \$52,868,636 compared to \$45,621,474 for the period ended 30 April 2024. All funds are interest bearing as at 30 April 2025.

The total term deposit investments for the period ended 30 April 2025 were \$40,099,836 compared to \$42,296,954 for the period ended 30 April 2024.

The following chart shows funds under management from April 2024 to April 2025:



### Interest Status

Total accrued interest earned on investments as at 30 April 2025 is:

Total Accrued Interest Earned on Investment	Budget Annual	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	% of YTD Budget	FY23/24 Actual
Municipal	980,000	956,497	1,122,123	117.32%	1,385,886
Reserve	1,100,000	906,278	1,015,146	112.01%	887,673
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,080,000</b>	<b>1,862,775</b>	<b>2,137,269</b>	<b>114.74%</b>	<b>2,273,559</b>
Leederville Gardens Inc. Surplus Trust*	0	0	163,436	N/A	193,472
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,080,000</b>	<b>1,862,775</b>	<b>2,300,704</b>	<b>123.51%</b>	<b>2,467,031</b>

\*Interest estimates for Leederville Gardens Inc. Surplus Trust were not included in the 2024/25 Budget as actual interest earned is restricted.

The City has a weighted average interest rate of 4.67% for current investments compared to the Reserve Bank 90 day accepted bill rate for April 2025 of 4.02%.

### Sustainable Investments

The City's investment policy requires that in the first instance, the City considers rate of return of the fund. All things being equal, the City then prioritises funds with no current record of funding fossil fuels. The City can increase the number of non-fossil fuel investments but will potentially result in a lower rate of return.

Administration utilises a platform called 'Yield Hub' to ascertain the level of exposure banks have in fossil fuel activities and to determine daily interest rates published by banks.

The investment guidelines which is the supplementary document to the Council Investment Policy sets the maximum exposure limits to financial institutions at 90% as reflected in the below table. The majority of financial institutions lie within A-2 and A-1+ categories.

Short Term Rating (Standard & Poor's) or Equivalent	Direct Investments Maximum %with any one institution		Maximum % of Total Portfolio	
	Guideline	Current position	Guideline	Current position
A-1+	30%	37.4%	90%	56.6%
A-1	25%	0%	90%	0%
A-2	20%	16.9%	90%	43.4%



Administration will continuously explore options to ascertain if a balanced investment strategy can be developed where investments in divested banks can be increased with a minimal opportunity cost of loss in interest rate returns for instances when banks not divested in fossil fuel activities offer a higher rate of return.

**CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:**

Nil.

**LEGAL/POLICY:**

Section 19(2)(b) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* requires that a local government establish and document procedures to enable the identification of the nature and location of all investments.

**RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

**Low:** Administration has developed effective controls to ensure funds are invested in accordance with the City's Investment Policy. This report enhances transparency and accountability for the City's investments.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the City's Strategic Community Plan 2023-2032:

Innovative and Accountable

*Our resources and assets are planned and managed in an efficient and sustainable manner.*

*Our community is aware of what we are doing and how we are meeting our goals.*

*Our community is satisfied with the service we provide.*

*We are open and accountable to an engaged community.*

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any specific sustainability outcomes of the City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024, however focussing on non-fossil fuel investments contributes to a sustainable environment.








**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

This does not contribute to any public health outcomes of the City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025.

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

The financial implications of this report are as noted in the details section of the report. Administration is satisfied that appropriate and responsible measures are in place to protect the City's financial assets.

## 11.4 ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2025/26

- Attachments:
1. Statutory Budget Financial Statements 2025/26 
  2. 4 Year Capital Works Plan 2025/26 - 2028/29 
  3. Summary of Income and Expenditure by Service Area 2025/26 
  4. Proposed Fees and Charges 2025/26 
  5. Long Term Financial Plan - Community Workshop Report 
  6. Workforce Plan 2025/26 
  7. Differential Rates Submissions 2025/26 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

## 1. BUDGET:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 6.2(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Part 3 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS the City of Vincent Annual Budget as detailed in Attachment 1 for the year ended 30 June 2026, which includes:

- 1.1 Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature or Type showing a net result for that year of \$9,557,641;
- 1.2 Statement of Cash Flows showing a net cash provided by operations of \$12,371,833 and net increase in cash held of \$934,262;
- 1.3 Statement of Financial Activity showing an amount required to be raised from rates of \$46,428,195;
- 1.4 Transfers to/from Reserves as detailed on the Cash Backed Reserves Statement showing a 30 June 2026 closing balance of \$34,902,559;
- 1.5 Notes to and forming part of the Budget; and
- 1.6 (a) Capital Works Program showing a total of \$21,501,784 (including 2024/25 carry forward projects of \$3,536,717); and.
- 1.6 (b) Capital Works Program showing a total of \$357,000 (including 2024/25 carry forward projects of \$157,000) for Hyde Park Playground & Softfall East/West, Hyde Park Asphalt Pathways and North Perth Bowling Club Driveway Renewal.

## 2. CAPITAL WORKS PLAN:

- (a) ADOPTS the Capital Works Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 at Attachment 2 excluding assets listed in 1.6(b);
- (b) ADOPTS the assets listed in 1.6(b) included in the Capital Works Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 at Attachment 2;

## 3. RATES:

NOTES community submissions were received in response to the Notice published in accordance with section 6.36(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, detailed in Attachment 7.

Pursuant to Sections 6.32, 6.33 and 6.35 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, IMPOSES the following differential general rates and minimum payments on Gross Rental Values (GRV);

**3.1 General Rates:**

Differential General Rate	Cents in the dollar
Residential	8.17795
Vacant-Residential	10.5591
Vacant-Commercial	14.8554
Other (Commercial and Industrial)	7.70538

**3.2 Minimum Payments:**

Differential General Rate	Minimum Payment on GRV
Residential	\$1,516.54
Vacant-Residential	\$1,615.00
Vacant-Commercial	\$1,853.07
Other (Commercial and Industrial)	\$1,463.62

**3.3 Rate Payment Options:**

Pursuant to Section 6.45 of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 64(2) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS the following payment options and due dates for the payment of rates and service charges:

**3.3.1 Pay in full:**

Payment in full on 29 August 2025.

**3.3.2 Four Instalments:**

To qualify for the instalment option, the City must receive the exact amount of the 1<sup>st</sup> instalment in one transaction by the due date. The instalment option includes the following due dates:

Instalment	Date
First instalment	29 August 2025
Second instalment	31 October 2025
Third instalment	2 January 2026
Fourth instalment	6 March 2026

**3.3.3 Rates Smoothing:**

The rates smoothing payment option allows ratepayers to spread their payments across weekly, fortnightly, or monthly instalments. To participate in this program, ratepayers must complete a Direct Debit Request and Service Agreement form. Payment options available include:

1. Weekly – 40 payments from 29/08/2025 to 29/05/2026.
2. Fortnightly – 20 payments from 29/08/2025 to 22/05/2026.

**3. Monthly – 10 payments from 29/08/2025 to 29/05/2026.****3.4 Instalment, Rates Smoothing And Arrangements, Administration Fees And Interest Charges:**

**3.4.1** Pursuant to Section 6.45(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 67 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS an instalment administration charge of \$8.00 per instalment for payment of rates by 4 instalments, to apply to the second, third and fourth instalment; and

**3.4.2** Pursuant to Section 6.45(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 68 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS an interest rate of 5.5% where the owner has elected to pay rates through an instalment option, rates smoothing or alternative payment arrangement.

**3.5 Late Payment Interest On Overdue Rates And Amounts:**

ADOPTS an interest rate of 11% per annum, calculated daily from the due date and continuing until the date of payment:

**3.5.1** On overdue rates in accordance with Section 6.51(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 70 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, subject to Section 6.51(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and

**3.5.2** Amounts due to the City in accordance with Section 6.13 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Subject to the following exclusions - deferred rates, registered pensioner portions and current government pensioner rebate amounts.

**4. UNDERGROUND POWER SERVICE CHARGE - NORTH PERTH MOUNT HAWTHORN:**

ADOPTS the following service charges for the provision of underground electricity for the North Perth Mount Hawthorn Project as included in the Schedule of Fees and Charges;

- A residential network charge of \$2,078.
- A commercial network charge of \$305 per KVA.
- A connection charge of \$0-\$3,457, depending on the current connection arrangements.

**4.1 SERVICE CHARGE INSTALMENT:**

That Council NOTES that owners of properties in the North Perth Mount Hawthorn Project are given upfront payment or annual instalments over a period of 4 years.

- The annual instalment is subject to an interest charge determined by the City's borrowing rate with the Western Australia Treasury Corporation.
- The payment choice was to be made via responses to the City's survey sent to impacted property owners which was concluded in December 2024.
- The amount shown on the current year's rates notice reflects the election made by each property owner.
- For properties where no survey response was received, the default option of upfront payment will be applied.

**5. REPORTING OF BUDGET VARIANCES:**

Pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS the monthly reporting variance for the 2023/2024 financial year of 10% or more, where that variance is also more than \$20,000;

**6. FEES AND CHARGES:**

PURSUANT to Section 6.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, ADOPTS the Schedule of Fees and Charges in Attachment 4;

**7. RATES WAIVER:**

7.1(a) Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2025/26 local government rates for the following groups:

Azzurri Bocce Club	Dorrien Gardens	\$4,758.84
Earlybirds Playgroup	87 The Boulevard	\$1,463.62
East Perth Football Club	Leederville Oval	\$14,633.56
Floreat Athena Soccer Club	Litis Stadium	\$10,932.01
Forrest Park Croquet Club	Forrest Park	\$5,405.32
Gymnastics Western Australia Inc.	Loftus Centre	\$13,594.22
Highgate Forrest Park Playgroup	Forrest Park	\$2,404.85
Leederville Tennis Club	Richmond Street Leederville	\$3,154.58
Leederville Toy Library	Loftus Community Centre	\$1,463.62
Loton Park Tennis Club	Loton Park	\$3,950.16
Mount Hawthorn Playgroup	Mt Hawthorn Community Centre	\$1,463.62
Mount Hawthorn Toy Library	Mt Hawthorn Community Centre	\$1,463.62
North Perth Community Garden Inc	Woodville Reserve	\$1,463.62
North Perth Tennis Club	Woodville Reserve	\$4,171.69
Perth Junior Soccer Club Inc	Forrest Park	\$1,875.49
Perth Soccer Club	Dorrien Gardens	\$18,145.40
Pride Western Australia Incorporated	4 View Street	\$2,635.24
Subiaco Football Club	Leederville Oval	\$12,424.20
Tennis West	Robertson Park	\$9,130.88
Tools n Things	Britannia Reserve	\$1,463.62
Town Team Movement	245 Vincent Street	\$1,463.62
Vincent Men's Shed	Woodville Reserve	\$1,464.02
Volleyball WA	Royal Park	\$3,945.54
		<b>\$122,871.34</b>

7.1(b) Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2025/26 local government rates for the following groups:

North Perth Bowling Club	Woodville Reserve	\$4,274.56
--------------------------	-------------------	------------

- 7.2 Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2025/26 local government rates for the following properties reserved for future road widening:

65A Raglan Road MOUNT LAWLEY WA 6050	LOT 198 D/P 39921	\$1,615.00
385 Walcott Street COOLBINIA WA 6050	LOT 889 D/P 426986	\$1,615.00
471 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 201 D/P 422599	\$1,615.00
497 Fitzgerald Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 425918	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 301 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00
232 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6000	LOT 888 D/P 426994	\$1,615.00
71 Bondi Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 6016	LOT 1 STR 86573	\$1,615.00
383 Walcott Street, Coolbinia WA	LOT 500 D/P 424837	\$1,615.00
5 Franklin Street, LEEDERVILLE WA 6007	LOT 300 STR 87463	\$1,615.00
16 Fairfield Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 16	LOT 8800 D/P 429094	\$1,615.00
		<b>\$17,765.00</b>

8. NOTES a provision of \$50,000 within the budget that will be used to assist ratepayers in financial hardship, up to a maximum of \$500 per property;
9. Pursuant to Section 6.11(2)(a) and Section 6.11(3)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, APPROVES the change of purpose of the Underground Power Reserve to: '*For the purpose of providing ratepayers longer payback periods for Underground Power Projects.*'; and
10. That Council APPROVES a concession of \$225 for minimum rated vacant residential properties and a concession of \$250 for non-minimum rated vacant residential properties where:
  - a) The property is classified as vacant residential as at 1 July 2025; and
  - a)
  - b) At the time of rating, the property must have been classified as vacant residential for less than two continuous years.

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To consider adoption of the City's Budget for the 2025/26 financial year, including imposition of differential and minimum rates, adoption of fees and charges, and other consequential matters arising from the budget papers.

#### DELEGATION:

Section 6.2 of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires Council to adopt by Absolute Majority a budget for its municipal fund for the financial year.

#### BACKGROUND

Between 1 June and 31 August each year, local governments are required to prepare and adopt a budget for the financial year. As in past years, in preparing the budget, Administration has compiled and analysed relevant information, held a series of budget workshops with Council Members, aligned to the priorities in the City's Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 (SCP), Long Term Financial Plan and review of the Corporate Business Plan (CBP).

A key part of the budget development is identifying the 'budget deficiency' to be made up from the levying of council rates. Once an estimate of that budget deficiency was known, the City gave local public notice of its intention to levy differential rates.

The 2025/26 draft budget continues Vincent's progress toward long term financial sustainability, and a maturing approach to financial and asset management. Despite signs of easing inflation nationally, the City continues to face cost escalations across employee costs, waste services, construction costs, materials and utilities. These cost pressures, along with higher community expectations and asset renewal needs, have shaped the 2025/26 Annual Budget.

The City is proposing a 4.5% rate increase for the residential, other, and vacant-commercial categories and a 25% increase for vacant-residential category. The overall proposed rate increase of ~4.5% for the majority of ratepayers, aligns with the City's Long Term Financial Plan 2024/2025 – 2033/2034 and reflects a balanced approach to funding core services and infrastructure without overburdening ratepayers.

In preparing the Differential Rates and Minimum Rates for 2025/2026, the City has used the following methodology:

1. Increase rates yield by 4.5% for Residential, Other and Vacant-commercial category excluding rates growth and 25% for the Vacant-residential category excluding rates growth; and
2. Minimum rate increase by 4.5% for Residential, Other and Vacant-commercial category and 21.27% for the Vacant-residential category.

Minimum rates are imposed to establish the minimum amount any property must pay to contribute to the cost of services provided by a local government, regardless of the value (GRV) of their property.

The anticipated growth in rateable properties during the year has been budgeted at \$200,000 (interim rates).

Several of the City's properties are leased to various community and sporting groups and are subject to local government rates. An allocation of \$150,000 has been budgeted for the waiver of rates to support community and sporting groups. The current total of rates waivers is \$127,146, with the remaining allowance set aside to cover any changes in Gross Rental Value (GRV) and potential new community lease agreements throughout the year.

Additionally, several properties within the City are currently zoned as vacant land but are designated for road reserve purposes. These properties are privately owned and are not available for development or private use due to their designation as future road reserves. Despite their restricted use, these properties remain subject to local government rates with differential minimum payment applying to all of these properties.

A \$30,000 budget has been included for the waiving these rates. The current total of rates waivers in this category is \$17,765, with the remaining allowance reserved for any additional properties identified during the year.

As Vincent is one of Perth's lower rating Councils, the proposed rates increase equates to \$1.41 per week, or \$73 per year for the median residential household.

Other residential property examples include an increase of \$1.67 per week or \$86.98 per year for a 3x1 house in Mt Lawley with a GRV of 24,700 and \$2.32 per week or \$120.86 per year for a 4x2 house in Mt Hawthorn with a GRV of 34,320.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 13 May 2025, Council considered a report (Item 11.5) dealing with a proposal to introduce Differential and Minimum Rates in order to fund the estimated budgeted.

As a result, the following resolution was adopted:

*'That Council:*

1. *ADVERTISES by local public notice, in accordance with Section 6.36(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 for a period of 21 days its intention to levy the following differential rates and minimum rates in 2025/26 and invites submissions on the proposal from electors and ratepayers:*

Rating Category	2025/2026	
	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate

Residential	0.0817795	\$1,516.54
Vacant-Residential	0.1055909	\$1,615.00
Vacant-Commercial	0.1485536	\$1,853.07
Other – Commercial/Industrial	0.0770538	\$1,463.62

**DETAILS:**

The 2025/26 Draft Budget (**Attachment 1**) as presented includes the following components:

- Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature or Type – this statement details the operating income and expenditure categorised by the nature of the income or expenditure, together with capital grants and profit/loss on asset disposal.
- b)
- Statement of Financial Activity – identifies the amount of rates that need to be levied to allow the City to undertake all annual activities, once all income is recognised, non-cash items are adjusted back, Reserve transfers are incorporated and opening and closing balances are factored in.
- Statement of Cash Flows – this statement reflects how cash and cash equivalents have been generated and used over the reporting period
- Explanatory notes to the Statements.
- Cash backed reserves 2025/26 (**Attachment 1 – Note 9, pages 20 and 21**)
- 4 Year Capital Works Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 (**Attachment 2**).
- Summary of Income and Expenditure by Service Area (**Attachment 3**).
- Fees and Charges Schedule (**Attachment 4**).

**FINANCIAL HARDSHIP SUPPORT**

The City's financial hardship measures will still be applicable in the 2025/26 financial year.

These measures include:

- **Deferment of payments for up to 6 months** – ratepayers may request to defer the payment of rates for 6 months;
- **Waiver of penalty interest and charges on payment arrangements** – ratepayers entering into a payment arrangement will have interest and fees waived; and
- **Suspension of debt recovery** – debt recovery will cease once a payment arrangement is in place.

**Rates concession for Vacant Residential properties**

A higher rate in the dollar for vacant residential land will be introduced in the 2025/2026 financial year to encourage the timely development of underutilised land, foster a more vibrant community and deter land banking.

To support property owners actively progressing development, the 2025/2026 budget includes a Vacant Residential Rates Concession Scheme. A \$225 concession for minimum rated vacant residential properties and a \$250 for non-minimum rated vacant residential properties per financial year will apply for up to two rating years.

In accordance with Section 6.47 of the Local Government Act 1995, a concession will be automatically applied from 1 July 2025 to properties that have been classified as vacant residential for less than two continuous years at that date.



**OPENING BALANCE – 1 JULY 2025**

The 2024/25 budget is currently estimating an end of year closing surplus for 30 June 2025 of \$4,160,616, which is mainly attributable to:

- \$2.2m Estimated municipal funding for carry forward capital projects
- \$1.9m Estimated favourable operating result and capital savings for 2024/25

**REVENUE**

Revenue is anticipated to be increased by \$4.1m excluding Underground Power Service charges compared against the current revised budget. The assumptions resulting in revenue increasing include:

Rates:	Rates and annual charges comprise 54% of the revenue mix excluding Underground Power Service charges.
Service Charge:	Vincent will charge a service charge for the installation of Underground Power estimated to be \$7.1m for FY2025/26.
Grants/Subsidies/Contributions:	Vincent actively advocates for grant funding and third-party contributions to deliver important infrastructure and service outcomes for the community. In the Annual Budget for 2025/26 the City expects to receive \$5.8m in external funding, of which \$2.1m supports operational activities.
Fees and Charges	Fees and charges ('User Charges') increase from \$25.5m (31%) in the current revised budget to \$27.0m (32.0%) of total revenue excluding Underground Power Service charges. This comprises charges for the delivery of services and the use of community infrastructure, such as Beatty Park Leisure Centre membership fees and paid parking.
Interest Earnings	Council receives interest on funds managed as part of its investment portfolio. Investment decisions are managed in accordance with policy and are reasonably risk averse. In the proposed budget for 2025/26 interest earnings are estimated to earn approximately \$2.1m.

**FEES AND CHARGES**

The fees and charges for 2025/26 (**Attachment 4**) includes various amendments to fees and charges with the intention to primarily recover costs due to the impact of inflationary costs pressures. All new fees and charges have been highlighted in the attachment.

**OPERATING EXPENDITURE**

The City continues to face cost pressures across employee costs, waste services, construction costs, materials and utilities. Annual CPI for the 2025/26 is forecasted at 3.2 percent and in many instances actual cost increases have been higher than current inflation levels.

Operating expenditure has increased by \$5.1m excluding Underground Power Project costs compared to the current revised budget, this is mainly attributed to:

- Materials and contracts expenditure excluding Underground Power is forecasted to increase by \$1.1m mainly due to an increase in contractors (\$0.9m), software license fee (\$0.5m), GRV valuation (\$0.25m) and local government election expenses (\$0.15m). This has been partially offset by cost savings identified in discretionary spend areas of ~\$0.7m (equivalent to a ~1.5% rate increase).
- Employee costs are expected to rise by \$2.3m due to the new EBA, legislated superannuation increase from 11.5% to 12.0%, resourcing needs at Beatty Park and other high-demand areas.
- Utility charges are expected to increase by \$0.3m due to an increase in Synergy electricity prices.

### **UNDERGROUND POWER PROJECT**

Included in the Statement of Financial Activity are the following Underground Power Project revenue and expenditure items:

- Service charges \$7,114,538
- Materials and Contracts of \$5,354,876
- Interest expense \$58,625

All Underground Power costs are recovered from ratepayers in the NPMH project area and have no impact on proposed rating for 2025/26.

The estimated net cash flow position at 30 June 2026 is transferred to the Underground Power Reserve to meet payment obligations to Western Power in early 2026/27.

### **NON-OPERATING BUDGET**

As detailed in the Statement of Financial Activity, the following Non-Operating transactions are proposed for 2025/26:

- Capital Grants directly associated with the Capital Works Program (including carry forward funding) totalling **\$3,643,078**:
  - \$1.3m grant funding for various road projects;
  - \$1.1m grant funding for Litis Stadium flood lights and upgrades and;
  - \$0.6m grant funding for various other flood lighting upgrades.
- Profit on asset disposals of **\$286,408** mainly due to the disposal of light and heavy fleet.
- Loss on asset disposals of **\$41,058** mainly due to the disposal of light and heavy fleet.
- Proceeds from Disposal of Assets of **\$527,573** mainly due to the disposal of light and heavy fleet.

### **FINANCING ACTIVITIES**

The Statement of Financial Activity lists the following annual financing activities scheduled for 2025/26:

- Repayment of long-term borrowings – loan principal repayments of **\$1,776,541** have increased due to the Underground Power project.
- Transfers to Reserves of **\$8,906,702** includes the following key movements:
  - Anticipated proceeds of \$5.8m transferred to the Catalina Land Sales Reserve due to increased land sales.
  - Transfer of \$1.0m to Underground Power Reserve due to anticipated cash flow timing of funds to be paid to Western Power in early 2026/27.
  - Transfer of \$1.0m to the Asset Sustainability reserve.
  - Interest earnings of \$0.8m.
- Transfer from Reserves of **\$4,255,795**, includes the following key movements:
  - Asset sustainability reserve transfers to fund Heavy fleet equipment \$0.6m, Drainage improvements \$0.4m, Light fleet equipment \$0.35m, Beatty Park infrastructure renewal \$0.25m, Belgravia toilet facilities renewal \$0.25m, Birdwood Square floodlight \$0.2m and Weld Square new in-ground irrigation \$0.2m.
  - Cash in lieu for parking reserve to fund a temporary at-grade car park \$0.4m and the Accessible City Strategy Implementation \$0.1m.
  - Office building reserve of \$0.2m for DLGSC HVAC renewals.
  - Percent for Art Reserve to fund the COVID-19 Artwork relief project and the Artlets sculpture \$0.1m.
  - State Gymnastics Centre Reserve to fund renewal of fans and ventilation \$0.1m.

**CAPITAL BUDGET**

In 2025/26 the City of Vincent plans capital expenditure of \$21,858,784 (**Attachment 2**) including estimated carry forwards of \$3,693,717 with further details provided in the table below. The total capital expenditure includes several multi-year projects.

The capital expenditure budget includes significant funding from grants, third party contributions and reserves with the residual \$13,432,338 (carry forwards \$2,246,863) from municipal funds.

Vincent continues its focus of renewal expenditure in the 2025/26 draft budget, with 75% of new expenditure including carry forwards attributable to asset renewal.

<b>Description</b>	<b>Est. Carry Forward Budget</b>
<b>Air Conditioning &amp; HVAC Renewal</b>	
Air Conditioning & HVAC Renewal - Admin	284,266
Leederville Oval - HVAC Renewal - East Perth Function Room	127,417
<b>BPLC - Construction of Indoor Changerooms</b>	
BPLC – Construct & Fit Out Indoor Pool Changerooms	33,367
<b>Litis Stadium changeroom redevelopment</b>	
Infrastructure Works - Litis Stadium	275,984
Floreat Athena Clubroom Refurbishment - Litis Stadium	129,917
<b>Beatty Park Leisure Centre - Facilities Infrastructure</b>	
BPLC - Repair and Maintain Heritage Grandstand	954,277
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	
Temporary at-grade car park	400,000
<b>Road Maintenance Programs – Local Road Program</b>	
Annual Local Roads Program - budget to be split	100,000
<b>Parks Greening Plan Program</b>	
Greening plan	60,000
Post PSHB Restoration Works	80,000
<b>Road Maintenance Programs – Roads to Recovery</b>	
Annual Roads to Recovery Program - budget to be split	123,769
<b>Parks Eco-Zoning Program</b>	
Monmouth Street	8,136
<b>Bus Shelter Replacement and Renewal Program</b>	
Bus Shelters - replace & upgrade	26,977
<b>Parks Playground / Exercise Equipment Upgrade</b>	
Edinboro St Res - replace playground equipment and softfall	161,542
Hyde Park - renew playground and softfall (east)	157,000
Beatty Park Reserve - renew playground equipment and softfall	179,880
<b>Rights of Way Rehabilitation Program</b>	
Rights of Way Rehab Program	56,933
<b>Sullivan Logistics Stadium Turf &amp; Lighting Upgrade</b>	
Sullivan Logistics Stadium Turf Upgrade	122,107
Sullivan Logistics Stadium Lighting Upgrade	412,145
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,693,717</b>

**BORROWINGS**

The City estimates new borrowings of \$2.5m next year to fund longer payback periods for ratepayers in the North Perth Mount Hawthorn (NPMH) Underground Power project area.

**CASH BACKED RESERVES**Underground Power Reserve

This Underground Power Reserve definition doesn't reflect the current intention of the reserve as included in the City's Underground Power Financial Model. It is proposed the reserve definition is changed to: *'For the purpose of providing ratepayers longer payback periods for Underground Power Projects.'*

**RATES SETTING CONTEXT**

The following table details how the rate in the dollar and waste collection charges (where they are applied separately) levied in 2024/25 impact on the rate levied on an individual residential property at each of the local governments, based on a nominated Gross Rental Value (GRV) of \$20,800, being the City of Vincent Residential category median value.

In a residential rating context, this table demonstrates that in 2024/25, when the waste collection charge is factored in the City had:

1. the eighth lowest minimum rate in the metropolitan area; and
2. the eighth lowest combined rates/waste charge of the 29 local governments listed for a residential property with a GRV of \$20,800.

2024/25 Residential Rating Comparison table

Council	Rate in \$	Minimum Rates	Waste Charge	Security	Total		Ranking of lowest to highest ranks of Residential Rates Levy based on a GRV of \$20,800	
					Total Minimum Payable	Residential Rates Levy based on a GRV of \$20,800	Minimum	\$20,800
East Fremantle	0.0718600	1,296.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,296.00	\$ 1,494.69	4	1
Claremont	0.0614860	1,499.16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,499.16	\$ 1,499.16	13	2
Joondalup	0.0547810	899.00	\$ 375.00	\$ -	\$ 1,274.00	\$ 1,514.44	3	3
Stirling	0.0528490	948.00	\$ 395.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 1,388.00	\$ 1,539.26	7	4
Melville	0.0732513	1,434.42	\$ -	\$ 62.00	\$ 1,496.42	\$ 1,585.63	12	5
Peppermint Grove	0.0774400	1,530.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,530.00	\$ 1,610.75	14	6
Perth	0.0607405	785.00	\$ 357.40	\$ -	\$ 1,142.40	\$ 1,620.80	1	7
Vincent	0.0782600	1,451.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,451.23	\$ 1,627.81	8	8
Belmont	0.0631710	880.00	\$ 337.00	\$ -	\$ 1,217.00	\$ 1,650.96	2	9
Canning	0.0573100	1,062.00	\$ 424.00	\$ 72.00	\$ 1,558.00	\$ 1,688.05	17	10
Fremantle	0.0834890	1,738.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,738.00	\$ 1,738.00	25	11
Cockburn	0.0810300	1,537.00	\$ -	\$ 72.57	\$ 1,609.57	\$ 1,757.99	20	12
Cambridge	0.0561820	1,022.00	\$ 600.00	\$ -	\$ 1,622.00	\$ 1,768.59	23	13
Subiaco	0.0695990	1,190.00	\$ 391.00	\$ -	\$ 1,581.00	\$ 1,838.66	15	14
Wanneroo	0.0688370	1,105.00	\$ 425.00	\$ -	\$ 1,530.00	\$ 1,856.81	14	15
Gosnells	0.0705500	1,086.00	\$ 395.00	\$ -	\$ 1,481.00	\$ 1,862.44	11	16
Victoria Park	0.0905800	1,357.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,357.00	\$ 1,884.06	5	17
Mosman Park	0.0737840	979.72	\$ 399.00	\$ -	\$ 1,378.72	\$ 1,933.71	6	18
Bayswater	0.0746740	1,143.40	\$ 411.00	\$ -	\$ 1,554.40	\$ 1,964.22	16	19
South Perth	0.0755510	1,210.00	\$ 395.00	\$ -	\$ 1,605.00	\$ 1,966.46	19	20
Cottesloe	0.0559400	1,383.00	\$ 585.00	\$ -	\$ 1,968.00	\$ 1,968.00	28	21
Nedlands	0.0605500	1,576.00	\$ 408.00	\$ -	\$ 1,984.00	\$ 1,984.00	29	22
Kalamunda	0.0667853	1,020.00	\$ 659.15	\$ -	\$ 1,679.15	\$ 2,048.28	24	23
Swan	0.0773970	970.00	\$ 491.00	\$ -	\$ 1,461.00	\$ 2,100.86	9	24
Bassendean	0.0817600	1,183.00	\$ 432.00	\$ -	\$ 1,615.00	\$ 2,132.61	21	25
Rockingham	0.0828400	1,377.00	\$ 443.00	\$ -	\$ 1,820.00	\$ 2,166.07	26	26
Kwinana	0.0884600	1,222.00	\$ 393.00	\$ -	\$ 1,615.00	\$ 2,232.97	21	27
Mundaring	0.0888900	985.00	\$ 495.00	\$ -	\$ 1,480.00	\$ 2,343.91	10	28
Armadale	0.0977080	1,409.00	\$ 433.50	\$ -	\$ 1,842.50	\$ 2,465.83	27	29

**Rates Growth and Waivers and Concession**

Rates revenue in the Statutory Budget Financial Statement 2025/26 (**Attachment 1**) has also provided for the following assumptions:

- An increase of approximately \$200,000 due to organic growth in rates revenue arising from property development or improvement (i.e interim rates); and
- A decrease of approximately \$180,000 as a waiver of rates for community and sporting groups and properties designated for future road reserves.
- A decrease of approximately \$40,000 as a concession that will reduce the rates payable for vacant residential properties that have been vacant for less than 2 years.

The City's level of growth in the number of rateable properties has plateaued slightly to an average of 0.59% between 2019 to 2025.

Year (30 June)	RATABLE PROPERTIES	Increase	
		Number	%
<b>2025</b>	<b>19554</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>0.31%</b>
2024	19493	138	0.71%
2023	19355	58	0.30%
2022	19297	59	0.31%
2021	19238	197	1.02%
2020	19041	163	0.86%
2019	18878	126	0.67%

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROPERTIES – RATES WAIVER**

In recent years, Council has waived the rate on a range of City properties leased to various community and sporting groups. If a waiver is to be considered, it is necessary for it to be considered at the time of the adoption of the budget. Accordingly, Administration has proposed a recommendation to give Council the opportunity to expressly waive the rates for individual leased local government properties that do not meet any of the defined exemption criteria under section 6.26(2) of the Act.

The total value of the rates waiver for community and sporting groups of **\$127,145.90** has been included in the Rates modelling, and is as follows:

Azzurri Bocce Club	Dorrien Gardens	\$4,758.84
Earlybirds Playgroup	87 The Boulevarde	\$1,463.62
East Perth Football Club	Leederville Oval	\$14,633.56
Floreat Athena Soccer Club	Litis Stadium	\$10,932.01
Forrest Park Croquet Club	Forrest Park	\$5,405.32
Gymnastics Western Australia Inc.	Loftus Centre	\$13,594.22
Highgate Forrest Park Playgroup	Forrest Park	\$2,404.85
Leederville Tennis Club	Richmond Street Leederville	\$3,154.58
Leederville Toy Library	Loftus Community Centre	\$1,463.62
Loton Park Tennis Club	Loton Park	\$3,950.16
Mount Hawthorn Playgroup	Mt Hawthorn Community Centre	\$1,463.62
Mount Hawthorn Toy Library	Mt Hawthorn Community Centre	\$1,463.62
North Perth Bowling Club	Woodville Reserve	\$4,274.56
North Perth Community Garden Inc	Woodville Reserve	\$1,463.62
North Perth Tennis Club	Woodville Reserve	\$4,171.69
Perth Junior Soccer Club Inc	Forrest Park	\$1,875.49
Perth Soccer Club	Dorrien Gardens	\$18,145.40

Pride Western Australia Incorporated	4 View Street	\$2,635.24
Subiaco Football Club	Leederville Oval	\$12,424.20
Tennis West	Robertson Park	\$9,130.88
Tools n Things	Britannia Reserve	\$1,463.62
Town Team Movement	245 Vincent Street	\$1,463.62
Vincent Men's Shed	Woodville Reserve	\$1,464.02
Volleyball WA	Royal Park	\$3,945.54
		<b>\$127,145.90</b>

Additionally, several properties within the City are currently zoned as vacant land but are designated for road reserve purposes. These properties are privately owned and are not available for development or private use due to their designation as future road reserves. Despite their restricted use, these properties remain subject to local government rates with differential minimum payment applying to all of these properties.

If a waiver is to be considered, it is necessary for it to be considered at the time of the adoption of the budget. Accordingly, Administration has proposed a recommendation to give Council the opportunity to expressly waive the rates for these properties.

Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995* provides discretionary power for the Council to waive, grant concessions, or write off rates and charges under circumstances deemed appropriate.

The total value of rates waivers in this category is **\$17,765** has been included in the Rates modelling, and is as follows:

65A Raglan Road MOUNT LAWLEY WA 6050	LOT 198 D/P 39921	\$1,615.00
385 Walcott Street COOLBINIA WA 6050	LOT 889 D/P 426986	\$1,615.00
471 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 201 D/P 422599	\$1,615.00
497 Fitzgerald Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 425918	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 301 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00
232 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6000	LOT 888 D/P 426994	\$1,615.00
71 Bondi Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 6016	LOT 1 STR 86573	\$1,615.00
383 Walcott Street, Coolbinia WA	LOT 500 D/P 424837	\$1,615.00
5 Franklin Street, LEEDERVILLE WA 6007	LOT 300 STR 87463	\$1,615.00
16 Fairfield Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 16	LOT 8800 D/P 429094	\$1,615.00
		<b>\$17,765.00</b>

### **DIFFERENTIAL RATES AND MINIMUM RATES IN 2025/26**

In preparing the Differential Rates and Minimum Rates for 2025/26, the City has used the following assumptions:

#### **Residential Category:**

The *Residential* rate imposes a differential rate on land primarily used for residential purposes.

The rate in the dollar has been set at or about the general rate, on the basis that residential properties represent 73% of the total gross rental value of all Vincent properties and therefore they will make a reasonable contribution to the cost of local government services and facilities.

#### **Vacant - Residential Category:**

The *Vacant-Residential* rate is imposed on vacant, uninhabitable or undeveloped residential properties that are zoned Residential.

The higher rate in the dollar encourages the development of vacant properties, improving the City's streetscape and stimulates growth and development in the community.

**Vacant - Commercial:**

The *Vacant-Commercial* rate is imposed on vacant or undeveloped non-residential properties that are zoned Mixed Use, Local Centre, District/Regional Centre, Special Use and Commercial.

The rate in the dollar has been set at or about 177% of the general rate. A higher vacant commercial rate encourages the development of vacant properties, improving the City's streetscape and builds business infrastructure that contributes to the local economy.

**Other – Commercial/Industrial:**

The *Other – Commercial/Industrial* rate is imposed on non-residential properties that are used for commercial or industrial purposes.

Examples of properties that fall within this category are retail shops, storerooms, car bays, advertisements, wholesalers, warehouses, offices, service stations, hotels, taverns and properties generally used for business purposes.

The rate in the dollar has been set at or about 92% of the general rate. A lower rate has been designed to support and attract businesses to the City thereby stimulating growth and development in the community.

**The objective for minimum rating:**

A minimum rate is applied to all differential rate categories within the City of Vincent.

The setting of the minimum rate recognises that every property within the City receives a minimum level of benefit from works and services provided throughout the City. By adopting a minimum rate, Council takes this benefit into consideration.

**LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - CONSULTATION**

On Thursday 6 March, the City hosted a focus group to gauge whether its Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP) aligns with community expectations and to identify key concerns and priorities. 20 residents and ratepayers from diverse backgrounds were recruited by market research agency Thinkfield, and the session was facilitated by engagement strategist Viv Warren in line with IAP2 principles.

Participants were provided with a high-level overview of the LTFP focusing on major projects, financial priorities and service delivery. While the format allowed limited time for detailed discussion or clarification, the session served as a useful temperature check on community sentiment. A copy of the report is included in **Attachment 5**.

Key themes:

- General support for the City's financial direction and balance between investment and responsibility
- Strong interest in increased investment in sustainability, urban greening and infrastructure maintenance (footpaths, drainage, bike paths)
- Support for improved accessibility and community programs
- Mixed views on the Underground Power project's scale and funding
- Desire for a careful approach to rate increases amid cost-of-living pressures.

Participants welcomed the opportunity to engage with the City's financial planning and encouraged continued transparency and consultation.

**WORKFORCE PLAN 2025/26**


Workforce planning is a process of analysing the current workforce, determining future workforce needs, identifying the gap within the workforce and implementing solutions to ensure that our strategic and operational plans/objectives are achieved. The workforce plan is informed by the Strategic Community Plan, Corporate Services Plan and Annual Budget and is reviewed annually and updated as these plans are revised.

The City's Workforce Plan 2025/2026 (**Attachment 6**) provides a workforce profile snapshot, workforce challenges and meeting future workforce needs to deliver on programs, projects and services to support our Vincent community.

To ensure the workforce plan is a living document that remains relevant and appropriate to guide planning and decision making, the following activities will be used to monitor and manage the ongoing workforce planning progress towards objectives:

- Review of HR data and trends (quarterly);
- Review Services on a Page (annually);
- Review of workforce implications being considered in Council decision making and project planning (bi-monthly);
- Review of staff annual Individual Action Plans (annually);
- Meetings with Executive Directors and their management groups on workforce planning within their areas to capture and action (quarterly);
- Review of HR risks and the effectiveness of their treatments (annually).

#### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:



Developed by Anne Pattillo, Amanda Newbery, and Michelle Feenan (2014) for IAP2 Australasia

#### Organisation Implementation

Organisations lead engagement and seek input, shape the policies, projects and services for which they are responsible. This is a familiar and traditional approach to policy development, project management and service delivery.

**Tension:** People feel forced leading to an unresponsive process.

**Mitigation:** Increasing the level of influence, and implementing a transparent, robust process.

#### Required under regulations/legislation

A robust process to engage with the community and stakeholders



**Consultation – Intention to Implement Differential and Minimum Rates - Section 6.36(1) of the Act**

Notices which included relevant details of Council's intention to impose Differential and Minimum Rates and an invitation for submissions from electors and ratepayers in respect to the proposed differential rates were published on the City of Vincent's website, e-news, social media, newspapers and noticeboards.

Advertising for the City's intention to levy and the objects and reasons for the 2025/2026 differential rates opened on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2025 for 21 days and closed at **5pm Wednesday, 4 June 2025**.

The estimated reach of the consultation is approximately 8,483 based on all forms of media used.

Details of submissions received have been included in **Attachment 7**. A direct response will be provided by Administration to the submitters on the specific questions and issues raised.

**LEGAL/POLICY:**

The following clauses from the *Local Government Act 1995* are relevant to the preparation of the Annual Budget.

**6.2. Local government to prepare annual budget**

- (1) *During the period from 1 June in a financial year to 31 August in the next financial year, or such extended time as the Minister allows, each local government is to prepare and adopt\*, in the form and manner prescribed, a budget for its municipal fund for the financial year ending on the 30 June next following that 31 August.*

*\* Absolute majority required.*

- (2) *In the preparation of the annual budget the local government is to have regard to the contents of the plan for the future of the district made in accordance with section 5.56 and to prepare a detailed estimate for the current year of —*

- (a) the expenditure by the local government; and*
- (b) the revenue and income, independent of general rates, of the local government; and*
- (c) the amount required to make up the deficiency, if any, shown by comparing the estimated expenditure with the estimated revenue and income.*

- (3) *For the purposes of subsections (2)(a) and (b) all expenditure, revenue and income of the local government is to be taken into account unless otherwise prescribed.*

- (4) *The annual budget is to incorporate —*

- (a) particulars of the estimated expenditure proposed to be incurred by the local government; and*
- (b) detailed information relating to the rates and service charges which will apply to land within the district including —*

- (i) the amount it is estimated will be yielded by the general rate; and*
- (ii) the rate of interest (if any) to be charged by the local government on unpaid rates and service charges;*

*and*

- (c) the fees and charges proposed to be imposed by the local government; and*
- (d) the particulars of borrowings and other financial accommodation proposed to be entered into by the local government; and*
- (e) details of the amounts to be set aside in, or used from, reserve accounts and of the purpose for which they are to be set aside or used; and*
- (f) particulars of proposed land transactions and trading undertakings (as those terms are defined in and for the purpose of section 3.59) of the local government; and*
- (g) such other matters as are prescribed.*

(5) *Regulations may provide for —*

- (a) *the form of the annual budget; and*
- (b) *the contents of the annual budget; and*
- (c) *the information to be contained in or to accompany the annual budget.*

6.36. *Local government to give notice of certain rates*

- (1) *Before imposing any differential general rates or a minimum payment applying to a differential rate category under section 6.35(6)(c) a local government is to give local public notice of its intention to do so.*
- (2) *A local government is required to ensure that a notice referred to in subsection (1) is published in sufficient time to allow compliance with the requirements specified in this section and section 6.2(1).*
- (3) *A notice referred to in subsection (1) –*
  - (a) *may be published within the period of 2 months preceding the commencement of the financial year to which the proposed rates are to apply on the basis of the local government's estimate of the budget deficiency; and*
  - (b) *is to contain –*
    - (i) *details of each rate or minimum payment the local government intends to impose; and*
    - (ii) *an invitation for submissions to be made by an elector or a ratepayer in respect of the proposed rate or minimum payment and any related matters within 21 days (or such longer period as is specified in the notice) of the notice; and*
    - (iii) *any further information in relation to the matters specified in subparagraphs (i) and (ii) which may be prescribed; and*
  - (c) *is to advise electors and ratepayers of the time and place where a document describing the objects of, and reasons for, each proposed rate and minimum payment may be inspected.*
- (4) *The local government is required to consider any submissions received before imposing the proposed rate or minimum payment with or without modification.*
- (5) *Where a local government —*
  - (a) *in an emergency, proposes to impose a supplementary general rate or specified area rate under section 6.32(3)(a); or*
  - (b) *proposes to modify the proposed rates or minimum payments after considering any submissions under subsection (4),**it is not required to give local public notice of that proposed supplementary general rate, specified area rate, modified rate or minimum payment.*

6.26. *Rateable land*

- (1) *Except as provided in this section all land within a district is rateable land.”*

*Subsection (2) then goes on to specify the nature of properties that are exempt, which in essence includes:*

- (a) *Crown Land being used for a public purpose or is unoccupied;*
- (b) *Local government land used for a local government purpose;*
- (c) *Regional local government land used for that Regional Local Government's purposes;*
- (d) *Land used exclusively for a religious body as a place of worship, residence of a minister, a convent, nunnery or monastery or occupied exclusively by a religious brotherhood or sisterhood;*
- (e) *Land used exclusively by a religious body as a school;*
- (f) *Land used exclusively as a non-government school;*
- (g) *Land used exclusively for charitable purposes;*
- (h) *Land vested in trustees for agricultural and horticultural show purposes;*

- (i) Land owned by Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited;
- (j) Land exempt from rates under any other written law;
- (k) Land which is declared by the Minister to be exempt from rates.

#### 6.47. Concessions

*Subject to the Rates and Charges (Rebates and Deferments) Act 1992, a local government may at the time of imposing a rate or service charge or at a later date resolve to waive\* a rate or service charge or resolve to grant other concessions in relation to a rate or service charge.*

*\* Absolute majority required."*

#### Fees and Charges

The fees and charges schedule has been reviewed in conjunction with the Budget development. The following provisions are relevant to the implementation of fees and charges.

#### **6.16. Imposition of fees and charges**

- (1) *A local government may impose\* and recover a fee or charge for any goods or service it provides or proposes to provide, other than a service for which a service charge is imposed.*

*\* Absolute majority required.*

- (3) *Fees and charges are to be imposed when adopting the annual budget but may be —*

- (a) *imposed\* during a financial year; and*
- (b) *amended\* from time to time during a financial year.*

*\* Absolute majority required.*

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:**

Moderate: The 2025/26 Budget is based on the best information available and considered to be a reasonable and prudent representation of the financial performance for the year ahead.

#### **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

- d) This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

e)

#### Innovative and Accountable

*Our resources and assets are planned and managed in an efficient and sustainable manner.*

*Our community is aware of what we are doing and how we are meeting our goals*

*We are open and accountable to an engaged community*

#### **SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

The Annual Budget, Capital Works Program and Long Term Financial Plan provide resources to support the City of Vincent's Sustainability Programs.

#### **PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

The Annual Budget, Capital Works Program and Long Term Financial Plan provide resources to support the City of Vincent's Public Health Programs.

#### **FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

Subject to Adoption of the Budget on 17 June 2025, the Rates notices will be distributed from 25 July 2025.

Fees and Charges will be updated following the Budget adoption, unless otherwise set by a statutory authority to commence on any other date.

The opening surplus for 2025/26 has been decreased from \$6,962,305 in the prior year to \$4,160,616.

The closing surplus for 2024/25 is an estimate, as is the forecast for carry forward projects. Each of these will be submitted to Council for review following the annual audit of the 2024/25 Financial Statements. In the interim, the estimates are considered reasonable for calculation of the 2025/26 opening surplus.

**12 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER****12.1 ADOPTION OF CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2025/26 - 2028/2029 AND THE FOUR YEAR CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM 2025/26 - 2028/29**

**Attachments:** 1. Draft Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 - 2028/2029 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the City of Vincent Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 at Attachment 1, including the Four Year Capital Works Program 2025/26 – 2028/29; and
2. **NOTES that:**
  - 2.1 **Financials in the Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 are subject to change based on the figures adopted in the City’s Annual Budget 2025/26 and Long Term Financial Plan; and**
  - 2.2 **The Four Year Capital Works Program 2025/26 – 2028/29 will be included in the Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 after adoption in the City’s Annual Budget 2025/26 and Long Term Financial Plan; and**
  - 2.3 **Final editorial, design and formatting of these documents will be determined by the Chief Executive Officer prior to publication.**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

In accordance with section 5.56 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) and Regulation 19DA of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* the City is required to plan for the future and have a four year Corporate Business Plan (CBP).

**DELEGATION:**

Regulation 19DA(6) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* requires an Absolute Majority decision to consider whether or not to adopt the corporate business plan.

**BACKGROUND:**

Council at its meeting 18 June 2024 adopted the Corporate Business Plan 2024/25 – 2027/28. As part of the annual budget process, Administration has undertaken an annual review of all the City’s projects, programs and services to inform the CBP review in 2025.

**DETAILS:****Annual Service Area Review**

Section 3.18 of the *Local Government Act 1995* provides the Functions of local governments and includes:

**3.18. Performing executive functions**

- (2) *In performing its executive functions, a local government may provide services and facilities.*
- (3) *A local government is to satisfy itself that services and facilities that it provides —*
  - (a) *integrate and coordinate, so far as practicable, with any provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any public body; and*

- (b) *do not duplicate, to an extent that the local government considers inappropriate, services or facilities provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any other body or person, whether public or private; and*
- (c) *are managed efficiently and effectively.*

The Corporate Business Plan identifies how the City will deliver on the Strategic Community Plan through strategic projects, services and the four year capital works program. In accordance with s3.18 above Administration undertakes an annual Service Delivery Review Program to provide insights for future corporate planning.

The Service Delivery Review Program involves assessing the teams overall Strategy House which informs the priorities for the team and reviewing each sub-service area by completing a Service on a Page (SOAP). The SOAPs are a snapshot of the service functions performed by a team and should align with the key functions identified in the Corporate Business Plan.

### **Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29**

The updated Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 (CBP), at **Attachment 1**, captures the City's strategic priorities, projects and initiatives. These are aligned to meet the Strategic Community Plan (SCP) priorities, the four-year Capital Works Program (CWP) and operational area initiatives, projects and programs.

Projects and initiatives in the CBP and CWP which are scheduled for 2025/2026 are funded in the Annual Budget 2025/26. The CBP is also aligned with the City's Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP).

The Budget 2025/26 is being presented to Council for adoption at its 17 June 2025 Meeting (addressed in a separate item). Any amendments to the recommended Annual Budget 2025/26 will be made and reflected in the CBP prior to publishing.

The CBP provides a comprehensive overview of the City's commitments, resourcing and operations including all projects, programs, and operational initiatives for the next four years.

The operating initiatives listed for each of the City's service areas are programs or projects on a page that are not already captured in the capital works program or listed as a service deliverable in a service unit review (SOAP). Instead, they are initiatives that support the delivery of services and are time limited with tangible outcomes that may or may not require additional budget.

The key elements of the CBP are as follows:

- Strategic projects for 2025/26;
- SCP community priorities implemented through the CBP;
- Profile of each service area, including their objective, key functions and operational initiatives;
- Resources required to deliver these priorities, projects, and initiatives. This includes employee costs, financial statements and organisational structures;
- Update on the City's Risk Management Framework;
- Overview of the Vincent Underground Power Project, and other major projects; and
- Alignment with CEO KPIs.


### **Four Year Capital Works Program 2025/26 – 2028/29**

The Four Year Capital Works Program (CWP) is an Annexure to the CBP and includes both a summary and detailed version of the capital works program for the next four years with a significant focus on planning for renewal of existing assets over building new infrastructure. This was reviewed as part of the development of the Long Term Financial Plan which will require adjustments to current planned capital expenditure in 2026/27 & 2027/28 to manage the City's cash flow requirements.

All projects detailed in the consecutive years 2026/27 to 2028/29 will depend on Council's approval in the relevant Annual Budget process informed by the 10 Year Long Term Financial Plan.

The Capital Works Program has been developed to meet anticipated community infrastructure needs and the future development of the City with the strategic direction for the Program provided by the Strategic Community Plan and Long Term Financial Plan.

### CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:



The CBP will be promoted through the City's website after adoption and publication.

Items listed in the Capital Works Program may be subject to community consultation as required by the City's [Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy](#).

As each works item progresses the requirement for community engagement will be considered against the Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy consistent with the City's Project Management Framework.

#### **Organisation Implementation**

Organisations lead engagement and seek input, shape the policies, projects and services for which they are responsible. This is a familiar and traditional approach to policy development, project management and service delivery.

**Tension:** People feel forced leading to an unresponsive process.

**Mitigation:** Increasing the level of influence, and implementing a transparent, robust process.

Required under regulations/legislation

A robust process to engage with the community and stakeholders

### LEGAL/POLICY:

Local governments must prepare a plan for the future in accordance with section 5.56 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

The development of a CBP covering a minimum four financial years is a requirement of regulation 19DA(1) and 19DA(2) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*.

Regulation 19DA(3) also requires a CBP to:

- a) *set out, consistently with any relevant priorities set out in the strategic community plan for the district, a local government's priorities for dealing with the objectives and aspirations of the community in the district;*
- b) *govern a local government's internal business planning by expressing a local government's priorities by reference to operations that are within the capacity of the local government's resources; and*
- c) *develop and integrate matters relating to resources, including asset management, workforce planning and long-term financial planning.*

## RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Risk Category	Risk Appetite and tolerance statement	description/clarifications
Governance, Due diligence, Accountability and Sustainability	The City has a low risk tolerance for less than better practice decision making for governance, due diligence, accountability, and sustainability, as measured by accepted industry standards and practices.	Adoption of the CBP ensures structured planning and alignment with the Strategic Community Plan and LTFP. It strengthens governance by clearly defining service objectives, resource requirements. Adoption of the CBP ensures structured planning and alignment with the Strategic Community Plan and LTFP. It strengthens governance by clearly defining service objectives, resource requirements.
Regulatory Compliance and Legal Obligations	The City has a very low risk appetite for breaches of legislation, professional standards or ethical requirements.	The CBP complies with section 5.56 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> and Regulation 19DA of the <i>Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996</i> , fulfilling legislative obligations for future planning and corporate business strategy.
Business Service Disruption	The City has a very low tolerance for risks that may result in disruption to the operation of the business.	The CBP consolidates strategic, financial and operational planning into one framework, reducing ad-hoc or reactionary decision-making. It enhances service delivery continuity and ensures consistent investment in infrastructure and community priorities.

Low: Adoption of the CBP 2025/26 – 2028/29 poses a low risk to the City. It complies with legislation, supports transparent and forward-looking planning, aligns with the SCP and LTFP, and reduces the likelihood of uncoordinated or inefficient service delivery.

## STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

### Innovative and Accountable

*Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.*

## SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The CBP includes initiatives that contribute to the achievement of the City's *Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024*.



**PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:**

The CBP includes initiatives that contribute to the achievement of the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*:

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

Projects and initiatives in the CBP and CWP which are scheduled for 2025/2026 are funded in the Annual Budget 2025/26 presented to Council at its 17 June 2025 Meeting. Any amendments to the recommended Annual Budget 2025/26 will be changed and reflected in the CBP and CWP prior to publishing.

Projects and initiatives in the CBP scheduled from 2026/27 onward will be approved for delivery as part of next year's Annual Budget as informed by the Long Term Financial Plan.

The CBP and CWP reflect the LTFP approved by Council at its meeting 13 May 2025. The CBP and CWP are subject to the figures which are adopted by Council in the LTFP.

**12.2 REAPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON AND DEPUTY CHAIR AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE**

**Attachments:** Nil

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council, by ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, formally reappoint:**

- 1. George Araj as Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the day of the Ordinary Council Elections in October 2025; and**
- 2. Cr Ron Alexander as Deputy Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the day of the Ordinary Council elections in October 2025.**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

To formally reappoint the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the day of the Ordinary Council elections in October 2025 to ensure continuity and legislative compliance.

**DELEGATION:**

Section 5.12(1) and (2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires that Council makes these appointments by absolute majority resolution. Delegation of this power is not permitted, as per section 5.43(a) of the Act, which prohibits delegating any power or duty that requires an absolute majority decision of Council.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Audit and Risk Committee is a formally appointed committee in accordance with Section 7.1A of the *Local Government Act 1995* (Act).

At the 21 November 2023 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council adopted the Committee's composition, which includes:

Council Members:

- Mayor Alison Xamon;
- Cr Ron Alexander;
- Cr Alex Castle; and
- Cr Jonathan Hallett.

External Independent Members:

- Mr George Araj (Chairperson);
- Mr Conley Manifis; and
- Mr Baptiste Isambert.

Committee appointments are fixed in accordance with section 5.11(1)(d) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, which provides that committee membership expires on the day of the next ordinary local government election. Accordingly, current members will remain appointed until the election scheduled for October 2025.

Previously, the Committee selected its Chair and Deputy Chair via nominations and vote at its first meeting following appointments. At the 7 December 2023 meeting, Mr George Araj was reappointed as Chairperson, and Cr Ron Alexander was appointed as Deputy Chairperson using this process.

**LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS:**

The *Local Government Amendment Act 2024* introduces a change to section 5.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. From 1 July 2025, the Act will require that Council, not the committee, must appoint the Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding Member of all committees by absolute majority.

This change removes the practice of committees electing their own leadership and reinforces the role of Council in formal appointments.

**DETAILS:**

To prepare for the upcoming legislative change and ensure compliance, Administration has contacted both the current Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson.

- Mr George Araj has confirmed his willingness to continue as Chairperson.
- Cr Ron Alexander has also confirmed his willingness to continue as Deputy Chairperson.

The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for 2 July 2025, immediately after the new legislative requirements come into effect. Two further meetings are scheduled for 3 September and 12 November 2025.

It is therefore appropriate for Council to resolve the appointments of the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson in advance of the 2 July meeting, in accordance with amended section 5.12 of the Act.

After the October 2025 election, Council will be required to reappoint the Committee membership and leadership in line with the legislative framework.

**FUTURE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES**

Section 87 of the *Local Government Amendment Act 2024* introduces a new requirement for all WA local governments to establish an Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC). These changes are not yet in effect and will commence on a date to be proclaimed. It is anticipated that they will take effect after the 2025 Local Government Election.

Once proclaimed, the following will apply:

- All local governments must establish an ARIC.
- The Presiding Member (Chairperson) must be an independent person.
- A Deputy to the Presiding Member must also be appointed and must be independent.
- A Deputy to the Deputy Presiding Member (if appointed) must also be independent.
- Local governments may share an ARIC with other councils, including a shared independent Chair, to increase efficiency and collaboration.

Although not currently required by legislation, the City has appointed an independent Chairperson since November 2019. This approach was formalised in the September 2020 review of the Committee's Terms of Reference. However, there has been no requirement for the Deputy Chairperson to be independent under current arrangements.

Following the proclamation of these changes, the City will review and update its Terms of Reference and all relevant appointments to ensure compliance with the new legislative requirements.

**CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:**

Not Applicable.

**LEGAL/POLICY:**

The Audit and Risk Committee is a formally appointed committee in accordance with section 7.1A of the *Local Government Act 1995* (Act).

The reappointment of both the Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding Member is in accordance with (sections 5.12(1) and 5.12(2)) of the *Local Government Amendment Act 2024* (Act).

**RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Risk Appetite and tolerance statement</b>	<b>description/clarifications</b>
Governance, Due diligence, Accountability and Sustainability	The City has a low risk tolerance for less than better practice decision making for governance, due diligence, accountability, and sustainability, as measured by accepted industry standards and practices.	The reappointment of the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson ensures continuity of oversight, alignment with the upcoming legislative changes under <i>the Local Government Amendment Act 2024</i> , and compliance with the Act's requirements.
Regulatory Compliance and Legal Obligations	The City has a very low risk appetite for breaches of legislation, professional standards or ethical requirements.	The recommendation ensures compliance with new legislative provisions under section 5.12 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> , which come into effect on 1 July 2025, by formalising the appointments in advance. This proactive approach minimises legal risk and reinforces adherence to best practice governance standards.
Business Service Disruption	The City has a very low tolerance for risks that may result in disruption to the operation of the business.	Reappointing the current committee leadership maintains stability and continuity in the Audit and Risk Committee's operations. This minimises risk of delay or disruption in the Committee's ability to perform its audit, risk, and oversight functions.

Low: It is low risk for Council to formally reappoint the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the October 2025 local government elections. These appointments ensure compliance with upcoming legislative changes, maintain continuity of oversight, and support effective governance of audit and risk matters at the City.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:














Innovative and Accountable

*Our resources and assets are planned and managed in an efficient and sustainable manner. We are open and accountable to an engaged community.*

**FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

Nil.

**12.3 INFORMATION BULLETIN**

- Attachments:**
1. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 24 April 2025 
  2. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 8 May 2025 
  3. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of May 2025 
  4. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
  5. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 28 May 2025 
  6. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
  7. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
  8. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - June 2025 
  9. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - June 2025 
  10. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - June 2025 
  11. Council Workshop Items since 14 May 2025 
  12. Council Briefing Notes - 6 May 2025 
  13. Unrecoverable Parking Infringements Write-Off 
  14. Quarterly Street Tree Removal Information 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated June 2025.

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

Nil

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

Nil

**15      REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES**

**16      URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil

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

Nil

**18      CLOSURE**