



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

9 September 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country	3
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence	3
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	4
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice	10
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	17
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	18
6	Confirmation of Minutes	18
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	18
7.1	Concrete Batching Plants	18
8	Declarations of Interest	18
	Reports	19
	Items Approved "En Bloc":	20
9.3	Annual Reviews 2024/25 - Accessible City Strategy, Thriving Places Strategy and Arts Plan	21
9.4	Annual Review 2024/25 - Place Plans	22
11.1	Financial Statements as at 31 July 2025	23
11.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 July 2025 to 31 July 2025	24
11.3	Investment Report as at 31 July 2025	25
	Reports with Discussion	26
9.1	No. 141 (Lot: 6; D/P: 98568) Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn - Proposed Change of Use from Hotel to Tavern	26
9.2	No. 42 (Lot: 24; D/P: 26565) Mary Street, Highgate - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship	28
12.1	Information Bulletin	29
13.1	Notice of Motion - Mayor Alison Xamon & Cr Jonathan Hallett - Plant-Based Food Systems	30
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion)	31
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	31
16	Urgent Business	31
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	31
18	Closure	31

**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AS E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE
ON TUESDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2025 AT 6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Sophie Greer	Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	Jay Naidoo Sarah Hill Lisa Williams Prue Reddingius Main Bhuiyan Karsen Reynolds Mitchell Hoad Eamonn Lourey Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard	A/Chief Executive Officer A/Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment A/Executive Director Community & Business Services A/Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Financial Services (electronically) (Left at 6.16pm after Item 11.3) Manager Development & Design Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability Coordinator Place A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support
Public:	Approximately four members of the public.	

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon declared the meeting open at 6.00pm and read the following Acknowledgement of Country statement:

“The City of Vincent would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and pay our respects to Elders past and present, acknowledging that as the City of Vincent we have a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Suzanne Worner on approved leave of absence from 25 August 2025 to 19 September 2025.
Cr Ashley Wallace on approved leave of absence from 6 September 2025 to 27 September 2025.
Cr Ashlee La Fontaine was an apology for this meeting.

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

The following questions and statements were received at the meeting. This is not a verbatim record of questions and statements made at the meeting.

3.1 Greg Johnson of Mt Hawthorn – Item 9.1

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

Questions

- Does this proposal meet the planning vision for the City?
- Does it add any amenity to the City?
- Is it part of the planning strategy to see amenity of this kind reduced?
- This is reducing opportunity, not creating it – is there an opportunity to create a better place in the City?

3.2 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

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

Questions

- Request for an update on the GHD survey data and mapping of the stormwater drainage in the City, as per the Drainage Technical Memorandum (December 2022):
 - Has the data and mapping been completed?
 - Has this been made available to residents?
 - Has the State Records Office been updated, and if so, when?
 - Have affected property owners with stormwater drains running through/under their property been advised? If so, how many and under what circumstances?
- At the April 2025 meeting a formal request was made regarding the total expenditure of the small underground stormwater storage and infiltration system installed at Menzies Park (system cost, installation, groundworks, turf replacement and associated labour). A response has not yet been provided — can this now be provided?

Further information requested regarding drainage maintenance at Menzies Park:

- What were the dates in 2025 that the Council cleaned the drains around Menzies Park?
- When was the drain on Menzies Park oval next to the playground last cleaned?
- For the 2024 calendar year, what was the total amount paid to contractors for drain cleaning works at Menzies Park?

Additional questions:

1. How many properties have been UV lined since the works carried out on her property?
2. If any such works have been undertaken, what was the total cost?

3.3 Mary Cropley of Mt Lawley – Item 9.2

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

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.08pm.

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

Administration's responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 7 October 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

Glenn Christie of Mt Lawley – Item 9.2

I respectfully request that you defer Agenda Item 9.2 regarding the proposed alterations and additions to the place of worship at 42 Mary Street, Highgate, in this evening's meeting. I believe further information from the Administration and the applicant is necessary to address some concerns I have.

Questions

Community consultation

- 1.1 Was sufficient community consultation carried out in accordance with the City's Consultation policy to facilitate informed decision making?
- 1.2 Despite being located just 45 meters from the development, I did not receive any notification. According to the Officer's report, nine letters were sent out, with three (?) of those potentially going to properties directly or indirectly owned or associated with the development site. Does the City accept this is a fair representation of consultation with local residents?
- 1.3 A notice was placed on the rear wall of the neighbouring property advising of the development. Does the City accept that this notice may have misled residents on the exact property and buildings being developed and should have been correctly located on the development site ?



Current non-compliance

- 1.4 At the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) on 20 November 2007 (Item 10.1.3), the applicant stated that the building was to be used as a temporary archive for a period of three to five years. Did the Council resolution in fact provide for a permanent change of use or just for three to five years; is the current usage as archives etc now non-complainant or compliant with the 2007 approval?
- 1.5 At the OCM on 10 March 2009 (Item 9.1.6), the City approved a temporary car park at the adjoining 197 Harold Street for a period of three years. Has the owner of this separate development site applied for an extension since this approval expired in November 2012, or therefore is the current usage as a temporary car park now non-complaint and should be rehabilitated?
- 1.6 Can the City confirm that 197 Harold Street is currently zoned residential and the owner can remove and revoke the current temporary car park bays without notifying with the City?
- 1.7 There are additional non-compliance issues with the 2009 temporary approval (see 1.9 below). The conditions imposed were for the provision of one tree per four car bays and new lawn and landscaping on the northern and eastern boundaries. Sixteen years later, these requirements have still not been met. What actions, and dates of actions, has the City undertaken since 2009 to enforce this condition and will the City act today to enforce said conditions?

The development.

- 1.8 The Officers report states the application is for quote ... *'Alterations and additions to Place of Worship'*. Does the City acknowledge that Recommendation 1, by not referencing the 2007 use ... *'Place of Public Worship Building comprising Prayer Room, Library, Museum, Office, Archival Storage, Reception, Kitchen and Toilets with Associated Additions and Alterations'*, that the 2007 approval is now no longer valid because the development is not to the Place of Worship, it's for the adjoining hall/achieves?
- 1.9 The Officer's report states that the northwestern car park will be used to facilitate parking, and the development plans also make reference to using parking bays at 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street due to no (archive staff and visitors) bays at 42 Mary Street. Was the School Hall at 40 Mary Street development application circa Jan 2011 reviewed and considered as part of this development application as there was also a shortfall of bays granted; and why has the Officers report stated that 197 Harold Street is available parking?
- 1.10 Why is the City allowing this development to proceed when there are outstanding issues relating to the 2007 and 2009 where the current usage and designated car parking are now non-complainant, yet stated as being part of this development? The City now not dismiss these as separate development site due to the Officers report connects all there 'sites'.
- 1.11 Has the City clearly articulated in the officer's report that the school (Lot 64 D/ P42775), the church and church hall (Lot 24 D/P 26565), and the residential lot (temporary car park) (Lot 5 D/P 672) are all independent freehold properties/development sites and not legally connected as a single (sic) site, 'precinct' or as stated on the map item 9.2 page 2 ' Sacred Heart Catholic Group' ?
- 1.12 In addition to 1.11 above, a condition of the application, Recommendation 4, is that the stormwater is collected on (sic) site. Can the City advise how this is currently collected and how will this be undertaken when the development is built to the lot boundary on three sides? Has the Officer incorrectly assumed that the stormwater can be disposed via the adjoining properties and without imposing any TLA easement conditions? If the stormwater is being discharged into the privately owned ROW, who is responsible for the approval, compliance and maintenance of the drains in the ROW?
- 1.13 The Officers report incorrectly states the development is quote ... *' is consistent with the established character of Harold Street'*. Did the Officer not visit Harold Street and the intersection with Vincent Street (due to the visual dominance of the hall) to appreciate the residential c1906 onwards homes that are dominate in the vicinity and not dismiss our homes and the amenity of the area as just quote ... *'garages and solid school fences'*?
- 1.14 Why is the City recommendation to support is despite the Officers later assessment in the report stating ... *'The above elements of the proposal do not meet the specified acceptable outcomes'*, allowing the building to be extended to the property boundary/footpath and not creating a passive street scape, interactive windows etc, contrary to the City's Built Form Policy and supporting the removal of four windows facing Harold Street?

In addition, I note that a response has been provided in tonight's Agenda to questions raised by Mary Cropley of Mount Lawley ... *'The matter raised relates to an adjacent development site and a separate development approval and is not relevant to the assessment of the current application'*. I disagree. This development is dependant (car parking, stormwater, access etc) and related to, as mentioned numerous times in the Officer's report (see eg 1.9 above), 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street. If you now dismiss the relevance of the sperate development sites at 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street and the interdependencies with this development, this development may fail to meet the required planning conditions and policy/s.

Summary

The hall is a very prominent and dominant feature in the landscape, with all three sides highly visible. To support an interactive streetscape, the development should not build right up to the front property line, as this would significantly increase the building's bulk and dominance. The current building boundary frontage is about four meters, but this would increase to about 16 meters, with 80% of the northern boundary adjacent to the footpath being a bulk wall with two tiny highlight windows and a small portico.

I am not opposed to the use of the hall for archive purposes, but I must highlight the lack of compliance by the City with past Council resolutions, the lack of (any) available parking on (sic) site, the bulk of the extension right on the footpath, which lacks visual appeal and; any conditions to retain the existing sculpture or future art et al. All of these issues appear to contradict the Council's planning policies. Therefore, I kindly request that the Council declines this development and ask the applicant to design a more interactive and passive building that aligns with the streetscape and addresses the parking concerns; and undertakes informed community consultation.

In addition, I invite the Councillors to meet with concerned local residents on site to assist you with your deliberations and an improved design and conditions.

Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 9.4

I wish to comment on Item 9.4 – Place Plan Reviews and, more generally, on the role of place planners in the city.

1. The city employs seven place planners - one co-ordinator and six planners.
2. The employee cost to the community of having these positions is \$869,430 this financial year. This is an average of \$124,000 per position.
3. A friend of mine attended one of the community meetings concerning the future of Leederville. Their comment was *"The place planners told us of all the wonderful things they plan to do. But they're the same things they tell us every time, but never deliver."*
4. When the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework (BSTCPF) was advertised earlier this year, I looked at the [Community Engagement Report](#) that accompanied it. One of the questions that was asked of the participants was *"What is most important to you when you describe your ideal neighbourhood?"*. The most significant response, with a score of 4.8 out of 5, was "Public Spaces". The next question was about how Beaufort Street and surrounding spaces were performing in relation to 9 specified elements. The lowest score, with 2.9 out of 5 was, you guessed it , "public spaces".

As far as I'm aware the place planners have been in place at least 10 years, and the element that is considered the most important by the community, and is the whole raison d'être for place planners, 'public spaces', is viewed by the community as being the worst provided by the City. Surely this would have rung alarm bells with anybody who read that!

5. Beaufort Street is my local 'town centre'. In the last decade or so that the town centre has been 'managed' by place planners, yet I have seen no appreciable improvement in the ambience of the strip. They did some insignificant work in 'Lois Lane' (by the way the locals, including the owner of Planet, objected to the name and instead put up their own sign calling it Dean's Lane); they gave some businesses money to fix up their frontage, repainted a laneway; and that's about it other than some of the projects that were listed in the place plans but never eventuated.
6. There was the brilliant idea to sell off the Barlee Street car park or convert it into a pocket park. It was absolutely bonkers and did not go ahead. It sounded like a bright idea somebody had, totally unaware of what really happens on the strip. The businesses hated it, the community hated it, and it should not have even seen the light of day. The fact that it was even advertised is a reflection on the council at the time.
7. Then there was the brilliant idea of blocking off Grosvenor Road. Again, an impractical proposal that the council allowed to be floated. Maybe it might have worked if the city had more creative people involved, so I won't say it could never happen. The administration came up with a face-saving response that said it would cost between \$2.7 and 3.6 million to complete. To my knowledge they never even got back to the community to explain why it was not going ahead.
8. Then there is the Norfolk Street Safe Active Street proposal. It was an absolute fiasco. This was because it had significant flaws that had cyclists shaking their heads, and was appallingly sold to the community. One proposal to block Venn Street was strongly opposed by people in the street even though it would have probably been very beneficial for them. This was probably because mis-trust of local government, seemingly forcing an idea on the community without explaining it, just encouraged people to come up with arguments against the proposal, even if they were illogical. You have people elsewhere begging to have their street blocked, yet the city could not sell this to a street subject to heavy rat-running.

By the way, Vincent had a very progressive person working on active transport, and on the Norfolk Street precinct. He came up with, what I think is, the best video Vincent has ever produced. The video demonstrated what was done in Belmont some time ago, and presented a series of tools that might be applicable in the broader area around Norfolk Street – yes, a precinct wide approach. The video just presented alternatives and did not preach. It is only 4 and a half minutes long and can be seen at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oraG2MGI4VE>

Sadly, the employee left Vincent. While I have been told why he left, it was not directly from him, so all I will say is that it was a massive lost opportunity. It seems that somebody with positive ideas was replaced with engineers and place planers without an idea.

9. At the last meeting Council approved a place plan for Beaufort Street. One of the elements of the plan was this fantastic idea of making the median strip 1.6-2.0 metres wide to make it so much better for pedestrians. Sounds great, but will it be done, or even, can it be done. It was all very vague – how do you widen the median without either losing footpath or on-road lanes? I did question this when I put in my submission on the plan, but it was not addressed, so I asked further questions at a council meeting. The planners have agreed that the kerb-line will/can't be moved. So if you don't move the kerb-line, the only way of getting a wide median is to lose a traffic lane, remembering that there is a bus-priority lane on both sides.

The upshot, is that the place planners have come up with a warm fuzzy suggestion, supported by a pretty picture that most people would support – except it is impractical. It won't happen in the five years of this plan, but everybody thinks we are making progress.

Now to the Beaufort Street Place Plan review (Item 9.4 on the agenda) and what was completed, or was supposed to be completed this year. These are the items that still needed to be completed in the 2024/25 year, or had some activity.

1. Item 1.1 is about installing a fast-charging service in the area. It was completed in 2024-25 but was supposed to be completed in 2022/23 – two years late!
2. Item 1.3 is about engaging businesses on moving to solar. The outcome is something that is supposed to happen in 2025/26 as part of the Climate Action Transition Plan which hasn't been developed yet and is due for development this financial year. So it is delayed.
3. Item 2.1 concerning the bike plan was scheduled for 2022/23. There is reference to the failed Norfolk Street plan then makes reference to investigating improvements on Beaufort Street in the next 5 years. So, let's take that as nothing done in 2024/25 other than plan to do something in the next 5 years.
4. Item 2.2 is about undertaking a streetscape audit. That was scheduled for the four year period 2021/22 to 2024/25. The actual outcome was the BSTCPF with an item to develop streetscape guidelines in the next two years. So again, nothing tangible.
5. Item 2.4 is about advocating to Main Roads for a 40kph limit on Beaufort. Unsurprisingly this item had a four-year time frame (2021/22 to 2024/25) and has not been delivered – well, they are still advocating it. So what is it, a couple of letters over a four-year period with no tangible result?
6. Item 2.5 is about streetscape improvements between Harold and Mary. It was supposed to be finished by 2023/24 but was carried over to allow negotiation with the owners of The Beaufort. It is now proposed that it be part of the BSTCPF. So again, nothing delivered.
7. Item 2.6 is about wayfinding and was supposed to be completed by 2024/25. I expect there will be a bit of a community outcry when this is finally implemented (perhaps in 2025/26) and they see where ratepayers money has been spent – watch this space.
8. Item 3.1 is about giving money to the local Town Team. So how much work was involved in dishing out \$10,000 to a local group, and did the community get anywhere near \$10,000 in value – remembering that isn't for project grants, just admin.
9. Item 4.1 is about a lighting plan that was supposed to be completed in 2023/24. Yup, it's been kicked down the road to the BSTCPF.
10. Item 5.1 was about developing a Streetscape Palette. It was supposed to be developed in 2022/23 but now will be actioned in 2025/26.
11. Item 6.1 is about working collaboratively with the City of Stirling, and the big achievement of 2024/25 was to send Stirling notice of the BSTCPF – that's it, working collaboratively is sending them a formal notice. What's worse, Stirling did not even respond!
12. Item 6.2 is about improving the median lighting. This was supposed to be completed in 2023/24 and has been kicked down the road to the BSTCPF.
13. Item 6.3 is about repairing the medians. This was supposed to be done in 2022/23 and has been put off until 2026/27 under the BSTCPF.

That's it. You have a four-year plan with very few tangible deliveries, and the bit that was delivered was mostly done before the 2024/25 year!

Looking at the next plan there are so many 'to be investigated' items. This really sounds like the main activity is to keep somebody employed rather than delivering actual changes. This is not to single-out the Beaufort place planner, I am sure the same applies elsewhere. Who can forget 'the Globe' or the Leederville artwork, both of which were botched, have run over-time and over-budget, and had/have to be installed in alternate locations?

Council should not be accepting promises of so much, with so little delivered. Council really needs to step in and ask if the community is getting anywhere near \$870,000 of benefit from having so many place planners.

Council should move to appoint external experts to review the whole concept/implementation of place planners and see if there is a better way of getting more cost effective outcomes for the community.

As an aside, the two most visible/successful elements of the placemaking activities in the city over the last few years, the development of parklets and the encouragement of public murals, were initiatives that came from the council, not the administration. In fact, the administration of the time did not support either, and council had to push for them.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Administration's responses are in italics below:

Lexi Smith of Perth

Regarding Building Works at 37–39 Stuart Street,

It appears that construction activities may have commenced on this site without the issuance of a building permit from the City of Vincent.

Could the City please provide clarification on the following points:

1. Permit Status: Did construction works at 37–39 Stuart Street begin prior to obtaining the necessary building permit. If works did commence without a permit, what actions has the City taken in response to ongoing works at this location?

Yes, works commenced before a building permit for demolition was issued. The City directed the contractor to stop all works, refused the initial demolition application, and required a new application to include the unauthorised works. A demolition permit was subsequently issued on 21 May 2025.

2. Compliance with JDAP Approval: Assuming the building work is proceeding under the Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) approval, what measures will the City implement to ensure any development complies with all JDAP conditions and that the City will verify that the builder engaged for this project holds permits and the appropriate licensing to undertake the construction.

The City checks compliance with Development Assessment Panel (DAP) approvals at several key stages. When a building permit application is lodged, the plans are reviewed to ensure they are consistent with the DAP approval and that any relevant conditions are addressed at the right time.

The City also monitors works during construction where required, checks again at the time of occupancy permit, and responds to any issues raised by the community as-needed.

As required under the Building Act 2011, a building permit must be obtained before any works commence. Through this process, the City confirms that all requirements are met, including that the builder has the necessary approvals to carry out the work.

Together, these steps ensure the development and its conditions remain consistent with the DAP approval and applicable legislation throughout the construction process.

3. Is the funding source for these works the WA Government?

The City has not been advised of the funding source for these works. Further information on project funding would need to be confirmed with the proponent of the project.

Shawn Offer of Mt Lawley

Administration's responses are in italics below:

Specific Questions for Council

1. Why was the "large development" threshold removed from this parking policy clause?

The reference to "large development" was not clearly defined and created uncertainty in how the policy should be applied. To provide greater clarity and fairness, the policy now takes a consistent approach that applies to all new grouped and multiple dwelling developments. Regardless of their size, these developments are expected to provide adequate parking on site, rather than rely on access to on-street permits. This ensures consistency, fairness and better management of the City's limited kerbside parking.

2. What demonstrable planning or traffic rationale supports applying this clause in 2025?

This clause reflects the City's long-standing position that grouped and multiple dwellings are not eligible for residential parking permits. In an inner-city area, on-street parking is a limited and shared resource. To manage this fairly, new developments are expected to provide their own parking on site or encourage residents to make use of public transport, walking and cycling.

This approach helps to keep kerbside space available for existing residents, visitors and local businesses, while also supporting more sustainable transport choices as our community continues to grow. Council has reaffirmed this position through successive policy reviews to ensure consistency and equity in how parking is managed across Vincent.

3. How many small-to-medium developments across Vincent are affected by this clause (i.e., those approved between 1 July 1994 and 30 June 2007)?

The City does not hold consolidated data on the number of developments approved within these dates. Records from this period were not collected in a way that allows us to easily identify how many are affected by this clause.

4. Why was Parry Street singled out for a blanket exemption?

Parry Street was given a specific exemption because of its unique circumstances. The street contains a number of grouped dwelling heritage homes that do not have on-site parking or only limited space for visitors.

The exemption was introduced to ensure these existing residents would continue to have sufficient on-street parking, while any new grouped or multiple dwelling developments would be required to accommodate parking within their development site and would not be entitled to residential permits.

5. Is Council willing to bring forward its next review of the Parking Permits Policy and sunset this clause given its outdated and discriminatory effect?

The next scheduled review of the Policy is programmed for early 2026, however, Administration is looking at commencing this review process in August/September 2025. Community consultation will form part of the review, and a member of the Ranger Services team will notify Shawn when the consultation period opens. Should a submission be made during that time, all respondents will be advised of the relevant Council Briefing and Meeting dates and will be welcome to address Council for up to three minutes if they choose to do so.

6. If not, will the City use its discretionary authority (under Section 4 of the policy) to permit allow affected residents to receive permits as that are not large developments?

Administration has delegated authority to issue parking permits under Section 4 of the Policy and Administration assesses the applications on a case by case basis.

Glenn Christie of Mt Lawley – Item 10.1

I request the Councillors defer accepting the tender from Linemarking WA Pty Ltd while further information is obtained and considered.

To ensure the best value and reduce the repainting cycle, I ask the City –

1. What type paint is being supplied in the tender?

There is a water borne road marking paint and a thermoplastic high performance long life product, both certified to Australian Standard 4049.

2. The anticipated life of the markings before repainting is required?

The water borne road markings can last up to 2 years, the thermoplastic can last up to 4 years before repainting is required.

3. To investigate and stipulate the use of long life thermoplastic paint and re-tender?

The City of Vincent has investigated using the typical thermoplastic high performance long life over the water borne and deemed it unsuitable due to:

- *Cost – Thermoplastic paint is approximately 5 times more expensive than water borne paint and over a 10-year period of scheduled repainting, is 3 times the cost.*
- *Application – Thermoplastic paint is designed for short longitudinal markings (comes in 1m strips) and not long longitudinal markings.*
- *Maintenance – Thermoplastic may need cleaning from dust, dirt and grime which water borne road markings would not.*

4. Any long term cost savings identified by reducing the refresh cycle when using thermoplastic paint?

Traditional thermoplastics are 3 times more expensive than water borne paints when considering rescheduled painting over a 10-year period. The recommended contractor Line marking WA has provided an alternate thermoplastic product which is a cold applied product, that is expected to have a 5 to 10 year life. The City of Vincent plan to trial this as a substitute material to use for no parking yellow line marking.

5. Provide the schedule of the current program cycle of refreshing existing markings across the city or is the painting of markings reactive based on residents' complaints?

The cycle of refreshing will be partly from planned site inspections by City of Vincent staff team and from receiving reactive community requests for repainting. The Rangers team has finalised a parking sign audit and is commencing a replacement program. A parking line marking audit is currently being prepared.

Linemarking WA is an experienced contractor, currently there are several local governments and Main Roads WA as clients. Linemarking WA are ISO accredited for AS/NZS ISO 9001: 2015 Quality and certified under the Painting Contractor Accreditation Program (PCCP). Linemarking WA have staff that are experienced and qualified, with the General Manager a member of Engineers Australia with engineering qualifications. The RFT has set Key Performance Indicators, which requires the quality of service to be periodically measured throughout the duration of the contract.

Dudley Maier of Highgate – Items 9.2 and 9.4

1. The Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework (BSTCPF) makes reference to a 'draft' Precinct Parking Management Plan on page 62, yet on page 65 it says that Vincent has developed a Precinct Parking Management Plan (i.e. no longer referred to as draft). It further states that actions will be implemented in accordance with that plan. No link was provided when the draft BSTCPF was advertised, and the city's web search facility does not easily locate the document. It is only after looking at a range of alternatives that it can be found. The document indicates that it was developed around the middle of 2023.

- 1.1. Was this document ever presented to Council for formal approval? If so, when? If not, why not?

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 18 May 2021, the Accessible City Strategy, known as the ACS was adopted. Public consultation was conducted throughout the development of the Strategy.

The objectives of the Strategy are to create a safe transport environment, ensure easy accessibility and connectivity in and around Vincent, promote environmentally friendly transport modes and initiatives to make it enjoyable to get around the local area.

As part of this Strategy, one of the action items was to prepare and deliver precinct-specific parking management plans, with priority given to precincts already at capacity and expand paid parking using the 'demand responsive pricing' methodology.

- 1.2. Given that parking is probably the single most continuously vexatious issue facing the community, and that there are many community members who are significantly impacted by parking decisions, was this plan advertised for public review and comment? If so, when? If not, why not?

The Precinct Parking Management Plans were finalised and the implementation timetable presented at the 27 August 2024 Council Workshop. Administration is currently working through the various recommendations, with priority focused on the items that are operational and listed as urgent.

Any of the recommendations contained within the plans which would result in a major change to parking restrictions etc. will require community consultation and Council approval before being implemented.

- 1.3. Are there any similar 'plans' which have not been formally adopted by council or advertised for community comment?

Administration is unable to provide a definitive response to this question. Council determines the broad strategic approach for the City, as well as the nature of community consultation required. A proposed change in direction or approach will generally be subject to Council guidance and subject to the issue, the nature of and approach for community consultation.

2. Given that the Enhanced Environment Strategy now includes the statement that "*In alignment with the principles of the Plant Based Treaty and broader circular economy strategies, the City will promote plant based diets and sustainable food choices*", will the council and administration lead by example by removing all red meat (and other products from 'industrial animal agriculture' as it is referred to in the Briefing Notes) from all post-meeting meals?

The City supports the principles of the Plant Based Treaty and is committed to encouraging more sustainable food choices. The City does provide for vegan and vegetarian options.

As part of the implementation of the Enhanced Environment Strategy, Administration would continue to review its practices to align with these principles.

For clarity: As a vegetarian for over 60 years, I am not against a plant based diet. And further, I believe that people have the right to choose how they live. What I have concerns with is people (i.e. council and local government) telling people what to do without actually doing it themselves – do as I say, not do as I do.

3. Woodville Reserve

- 3.1. Can you confirm that the 2025/26 Corporate Business Plan, which was adopted on 17 June 2025, contained an item which showed that the Woodville Reserve Masterplan will be developed in 2028/29?

Yes

- 3.2. Can you confirm that the 2024/25 Corporate Business plan indicated that the Woodville Reserve Masterplan was to be developed in 2024/25 and 2025/26?

Yes

- 3.3. Can you confirm that the mayor recently held a meeting with representatives of the community shed, the artists' studio and community garden, but not the broader community, at which it was proposed to expand the community shed, seal the car park and other initiatives? Is this replacing the proposed masterplan? Could this compromise the proposed masterplan by intensifying uses before the plan is developed?

The City is currently preparing a community facilities needs review that will support Council decision making for future infrastructure management and investment.

It is anticipated that the review will inform the need for a masterplan at Woodville Reserve. Give the status and usage of the facilities at Woodville, a masterplan is not expected to be a priority.

Noting the above and acknowledging the Community Shed's plan to expand to address current and future need, the City has approached the Community Garden and Artist's Collective to investigate low cost opportunities to share facilities and space in addressing any expansion of the Community Shed. While formalising the car park area and managing drainage has been discussed, any planned improvement would focus on retaining and enhancing green space and water sensitive urban design, including permeable surface.

For clarity: I have no issues with some of the actions proposed, and think some of them, other than the decision to seal the car park, are long overdue – the issue is about circumventing engagement of the surrounding community, not the proposed actions. It is particularly concerning that it is proposed to maintain a parking area on the reserve, let alone sealing it, as this reduces the potential to increase tree canopy and/or passive/active recreational uses.

4. The current Vincent web-site has an article, dated 5 August 2025, which celebrates the opening of new changerooms at Litis Stadium.

- 4.1. Can you confirm that seven years ago, in August 2018, former Western Australian Senator Peter Georgiou negotiated a commitment from the then Federal Government that they would provide \$3 million for the upgrade of Litis Stadium if they were re-elected?

Yes, that's correct.

- 4.2. Does the city consider taking seven years from funding being identified, to when a relatively strait forward project has been completed, is acceptable?

Although funding was committed in 2018, the agreement between the Federal Government and the City was only signed in April 2023. Prior to this, the City completed planning, design, and approvals between December 2021 and February 2023.

Following the execution of the funding agreement, the project progressed according to its terms, achieving the following milestones within the agreement's completion date of October 2025.

- Demolition of the existing grandstand was completed in June 2023.*
- The tender was advertised and evaluation completed in November 2023.*
- The contract was awarded to Schlager in December 2023.*
- Schlager received building approval from the City of Vincent in February 2024, with construction commencing immediately thereafter.*
- The project was completed in August 2025.*

Given that the timing of funding was beyond the City's control, and given the necessary planning, approvals, and procurement processes, the City considers the timeline reasonable and appropriate.

5. On page 60 of the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework there is a cross-section diagram of a potential allocation of space from lot boundary to lot boundary. This diagram shows a central median strip ranging from 1.6 metres to 2.0 metres, and a kerbside lane of 2.3 metres on one side, but 3 metres on the other side. Both sides show kerb-to-lot boundary distances of 3 metres. No explanation is given as to what is intended or how it is intended to achieve this. I raised this issue in my submission on the 'place plan' but my concerns do not seem to have been addressed.

- 5.1. The diagram shows a bus taking up a 3 metre lane on the right, but the matching lane on the left is only shown as 2.3 metres wide. Given that buses travel in both directions and that Beaufort Street has peak hour bus lanes on both sides (i.e. the bus does not travel in the middle lane), is 2.3 metres wide enough for a bus?

Figure 9 on page 60 of the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework is an indicative street section showing Vincent's aspirations to:

- Increase the width of the median to 1.6 to 2.0 metres in order to provide safe refuge for pedestrians and those on bikes, with prams or in wheelchairs and other mobility devices where possible; and*
- Increase the width of the footpath to 5.0 metres through the enforcement of a 2.0 metre setback from the lot boundary for all future developments unless the existing building façade is retained.*

All four lanes are to remain at 3.0 metres wide, including the kerbside lane on the left of the figure, so as to be wide enough for a bus.

Figure 9 does refer to the 2.3 metre wide on-street parking bays which operate within the 3.0 metre wide kerbside lane outside of peak periods. During peak periods, the kerbside lane is a 3.0 metre bus lane with clearways restricting parking in the 2.3 metre wide on-street parking bays.

- 5.2. Is the intention to move the kerb-line closer to the lot boundary on one or both sides?

There is no intention to move kerb lines on Beaufort Street.

- 5.3. Is moving the kerb-line dependent on adjacent buildings being set back 2 metres from the lot boundary?

There is no intention to move kerb lines on Beaufort Street. The intent is to increase the width of the footpath incrementally through the enforcement of a 2.0 metre setback from the lot boundary for all future developments unless the existing building façade is retained.

- 5.4. If there is no intention to move the kerb-line, how does the city propose to increase the width of the median strip?

The City will explore opportunities to increase the width of the median strip at key pedestrian crossings through intersection design improvements as part of all future Beaufort Street road safety projects.

The City has no intention to remove on-street parking, bus lanes or vehicular lanes to increase the width of the median.

- 5.5. *I have no issue with widening the median, but I do have issues with indicating potential solutions that are not feasible. Does the city believe that there is a feasible solution to widening the median? If there is, what is it, and will it involve removal of on-street parking and/or the bus lane?*

At this stage, no specific solution has been finalised. Any future opportunities to widen the median at pedestrian crossings on Beaufort Street would be investigated through detailed intersection design.

The City has no intention to remove the on-street parking, bus lanes or vehicular lanes.

6. How many Place Maker FTEs are there, including any supervisory positions, and what is the 2025-2026 'employee cost' budget for those positions? What did those employees achieve in the 2024-2025 financial year?

As per the 2025/2026 budget, the Urban Design and Strategic Projects team (including Place) employee costs are \$1,911,172 per annum. A total of 15.2 employees are within this team, comprising of six Place Planners and one Coordinator of Place.

The Place team has an FTE of 7 and the budget for 25/26 is \$869,430.

The Place Planning team delivers services, grant programs, strategies and projects across Vincent's five town centres (Leederville, Mt Hawthorn, North Perth, Beaufort Street and William Street) and two emerging precincts (North Claisebrook and Pickle District), as well as transport planning, art, economic development, place performance and urban design portfolios.

The Place Planning team develops and coordinates the implementation of the Accessible City Strategy, Thriving Places Strategy, Arts Plan and Place Plans, reporting annually to Council.

The Place Planning team provides a responsive and solutions-focused service to both internal and external stakeholders, helping them navigate approvals pathways and overcome bureaucratic barriers to deliver activations and improvements in the public realm.

The team undertakes regular public realm inspections, logging maintenance requests with the appropriate internal department or external utility providers to ensure spaces remain safe and inviting, while managing assets such as parklets, festoon lights, planter boxes and seating. The team also supports the organisation to undertake project-based community engagement across Vincent's Town Centres, ensuring stakeholders are meaningfully involved in shaping local places and projects.

Key projects and deliverables in 2024/25 by the Place Planning team included:

- Facilitated 16 co-funded business enhancements through the Business Enhancement Grant program and eight co-funded murals through the relaunched Mural Co-Funding Program.*
- Commissioned three films through the Vincent Film Project and exhibited three emerging artists in the relaunched Lightbox Laneway Gallery in Kaadadjiny Lane, Highgate.*
- Supported town teams to deliver projects and initiatives in Vincent's town centres through providing advice, establishing approvals pathways and providing grant funding through the Town Team Grant program.*

- *In partnership with the Strategic Planning team, developed the Beaufort Street Town Centre Planning Framework and William Street Planning Framework which were adopted at the August 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting; and progressing community engagement activities for the Mount Hawthorn Town Centre Planning Framework and North Perth Town Centre Planning Framework – which are scheduled to be considered by Council in 2025/26 and 2026/27.*
- *Drafted the next iteration of the Leederville Town Centre Place Plan 2025-2030 which was endorsed for advertising at the August 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.*
- *Commenced the Major Review of the Accessible City Strategy and Vibrant Public Spaces Policy – which are expected to be considered by Council in 2025/26.*
- *In partnership with the Strategic Planning team, completed the Arts Policies review and consolidated into the Arts Collection Policy.*
- *Led the North Perth Traffic Study and supported Engineering on the Mt Lawley and Highgate Traffic Studies with community engagement scheduled for 2025/26.*
- *Led the procurement phase of the Housing Supply and Infrastructure Servicing Study.*
- *Completed the installation of the Mt Hawthorn Youth Skate Space in Britannia Reserve.*
- *Finalised the design of wayfinding signage – with signs to be fabricated and installed in 2025/26.*
- *Developed Lighting Plans for the grant-funded Mt Hawthorn Town Centre Parks Lighting Upgrade project – with installation scheduled for 2025/26.*
- *Planned for the restriction of illegal parking in the Leederville Village Square with installation scheduled for 2025/26.*
- *Installed a mural at Robertson Park and the Nuanced Encounters public artwork in the Leederville Town Centre and progressed detailed design of The Globe and Pickle Poles public art projects.*
- *In partnership with Marketing & Communications, partnered with businesses to deliver three seasonal Shop Local campaigns for Christmas, Lunar New Year and a Winter Wellness campaign.*
- *Undertook maintenance on the four Vincent-owned parklets in our town centres.*
- *Commenced the audit and valuation of Vincent's fine art collection with completion of a public-facing online database planned for 2025/26.*
- *Undertook a public art audit and developed a proactive public art maintenance program with four public artworks renewed in 2024/25.*
- *Published the monthly Business eNews promoting programs, workshops and training opportunities from Vincent and our partnering organisations.*
- *Provided advice to and supported business owners and commercial property owners to activate public space including approving five new parklets/eatlets and four affixed eating area furniture applications through the Vibrant Public Spaces Policy.*
- *Facilitated the naming of Cockatoo Lane, Mt Hawthorn and dedication of four laneways*

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 12 August 2025 be confirmed.

CARRIED (6-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

7.1 CONCRETE BATCHING PLANTS

The decision to move the concrete batching plants out of North Claisebrook was made by imposing a number of time-limited approvals and requirements to give certainty to developers, the community and Council that they would ultimately leave.

Holcim and Heidelberg appealed a number of the conditions, specifically the requirement to remove all structures and to remediate the land. Heidelberg also sought to amend the orders to enable operations to commence at 3.00am.

The decision by the WAPC to support the proposed changes in relation to noise, decommissioning and remediation is incredibly disappointing. The removal of those requirements creates a serious risk that the sites will continue to be sterilised and may derail any future development. The retention of the structures means no remediation of the site will occur, and the extent of any contamination cannot be ascertained.

Heidelberg and Holcim should be held accountable for making the site safe for development following their long-awaited departure in 2027. This requires appropriate decommissioning and remediation of the site.

Vincent, the State Government and the WAPC will not be able to achieve the desired density within the North Claisebrook precinct, or ensure redevelopment in line with the planning framework, if the plants are not removed.

Fortunately, Heidelberg were unsuccessful in gaining approval to commence operations at 3.00am, although it is expected this will be appealed. I will continue to urge the State Government to pursue compulsory acquisition of the sites, as it may be the only way to ensure their removal.

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

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

REPORTS

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

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

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

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

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Cr Woolf	12.1
Cr Hallett	13.1

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon therefore requested the A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance, to advise the meeting of:

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved “En Bloc”, being:**
Items 9.3, 9.4, 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**
Nil

ITEMS APPROVED "EN BLOC":

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

COUNCIL DECISION

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

That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:
Items 9.3, 9.4, 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3

CARRIED (6-0)

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




Against: Nil

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.3 ANNUAL REVIEWS 2024/25 - ACCESSIBLE CITY STRATEGY, THRIVING PLACES STRATEGY AND ARTS PLAN

- Attachments:
1. 2024/25 Annual Review (IV) - Accessible City Strategy 
 2. 2024/25 Annual Review (II) - Thriving Places Strategy 
 3. 2024/25 Annual Review (II) - Arts Plan 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Accessible City Strategy included as Attachment 1, the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Thriving Places Strategy included as Attachment 2, and the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Arts Plan as Attachment 3.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (6-0)

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.4 ANNUAL REVIEW 2024/25 - PLACE PLANS

- Attachments:**
1. 2024/25 Annual Review (IV) - Leederville Town Centre Place Plan 
 2. 2024/25 Annual Review (IV) - Beaufort Street Town Centre Place Plan 
 3. 2024/25 Annual Review (II) - North Claisebrook Place Plan 
 4. 2024/25 Annual Review (II) - Pickle District Place Plan 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Leederville Town Centre Place Plan included as Attachment 1, the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Beaufort Street Town Centre Place Plan included as Attachment 2, the 2024/25 Annual Review of the North Claisebrook Place Plan include as Attachment 3, and the 2024/25 Annual Review of the Pickle District Place Plan included as Attachment 4.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (6-0)

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 JULY 2025

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 31 Jul 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

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

That the recommendation be adopted.




CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (6-0)

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

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

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

Recommendation:

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

EFT payments, including payroll	\$7,070,034.16
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$ 160,235.69
 Total payments for July 2025	 \$7,230,269.85

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (6-0)

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 JULY 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 31 July 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (6-0)

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)






At 6.16pm Manager Financial Services left the meeting and did not return.

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

9.1 NO. 141 (LOT: 6; D/P: 98568) SCARBOROUGH BEACH ROAD, MOUNT HAWTHORN - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM HOTEL TO TAVERN

Ward: North

Attachments:

1. Location and Consultation Plan 
2. Development Plans 
3. Applicant Cover Letter 
4. Clause 67 Assessment 
5. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, APPROVES the application for a Change of Use from Hotel to Tavern at No. 141 (Lot: 6; D/P: 98568) Scarborough Beach Road, Mount Hawthorn, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 5:

1. Development Approval

- 1.1 This approval is for a Change of Use from Hotel to Tavern as shown on the approved plans dated 27 June 2025 and 19 August 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Use of Premises

- 2.1 This approval is for a Tavern as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2. The use of the subject land for any other land use may require further approval from the City;
- 2.2 The Tavern shall be limited to a maximum capacity of 470 people on-site at any one time; and
- 2.3 The Tavern shall have the following hours of operation:
 - Monday to Saturday: 6:00am to 12:00am (midnight); and
 - Sunday and Public Holidays: 7:00am to 12:00am (midnight);

unless an Extended Trading Permit for alternative hours is issued by the Racing Gaming and Liquor Division of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries;

3. Venue Management

- 3.1 Prior to the commencement of the Tavern use, a Venue Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The Venue Management Plan shall address the following matters, to the satisfaction of the City:
 - Floor plans of the premises;
 - Noise control and management measures;
 - The number of patrons;
 - Hours of operation;
 - Management of patron behaviour, including measures to address anti-social behaviour;
 - Community relations and complaint management procedure;
 - Car parking and access arrangements;
 - Rubbish collection and disposal and litter associated with the development; and

- Deliveries.

3.2 The premises shall operate in accordance with the approved Venue Management Plan, to the satisfaction of the City;

4. Façade Design

- 4.1 Doors and windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Scarborough Beach Road and Fairfield Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with this street. Ground floor glazing and/or tinting shall have a minimum of 70 percent visible light transmission to provide unobscured visibility between the street and the interior of the tenancy. Darkened, obscured, mirrored, or tinted glass or other similar materials, as considered by the City, is prohibited;
- 4.2 Curtains, blinds and other internal treatments that obscure the view of the internal area from Oxford Street are not permitted to be used during the hours of the business operation; and
- 4.3 Internal security and privacy treatments shall be located and installed internally behind the glazing line or recessed, and shall be transparent and visually permeable to allow views inside the building and enable internal light sources to be seen from the street, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Signage

- 5.1 All signage is to be in accordance with the City's Signs and Advertising Policy, unless further development approval is obtained; and
- 5.2 All signage shall be kept in a good state of repair, safe, non-climbable, and free from graffiti for the duration of its display on-site; and

6. Car Parking

Prior to first commencement of the use, 12 car parking bays shall be provided in the locations shown on the approved plans for the exclusive use of the Tavern, to the satisfaction of the City.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (6-0)

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








Against: Nil

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.2 NO. 42 (LOT: 24; D/P: 26565) MARY STREET, HIGHGATE - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PLACE OF WORSHIP**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Heritage Impact Statement 
 4. Sacred Heart Church Conservation Plan 2004 
 5. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
 6. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
 7. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, **APPROVES** the application for Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship at No. 42 (Lot: 24; D/P: 26565) Mary Street, Highgate, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 7:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship as shown on the approved plans dated 20 May 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, satellite dishes, solar panels, external hot water heaters, air conditioners, and the like, shall not be visible from the street(s), are designed integrally with the building, and be located so as not to be visually obtrusive to the satisfaction of the City;

3. Colours and Materials

The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with the details and annotations as indicated on the approved plans which forms part of this approval. The development must be finished, and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the schedule provided to and approved by the City, prior to occupation of the development; and

4. Stormwater

Stormwater from all roofed and paved areas shall be collected and contained on site. Stormwater must not affect or be allowed to flow onto or into any other property or road reserve.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

Moved: Cr Greer, **Seconded:** Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (6-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

12.1 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. Unconfirmed Minutes for Catalina Regional Council Meeting on 21 August 2025 
 2. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of August 2025 
 3. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 4. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 21 August 2025 
 5. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 6. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 7. Snap, Send, Solve Update as at August 2025 
 8. Unrecoverable Parking Infringements Write-Off 
 9. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - September 2025 
 10. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - September 2025 
 11. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - September 2025 
 12. Council Workshop Items since 22 July 2025 
 13. Council Briefing Notes - 5 August 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated September 2025.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (6-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - MAYOR ALISON XAMON & CR JONATHAN HALLETT - PLANT-BASED FOOD SYSTEMS

That Council:

1. **RECOGNISES** the critical role of food systems and supporting initiatives such as the Plant-Based Treaty in addressing the current climate crisis;
2. **ACKNOWLEDGES** that transitioning to plant-based food systems aligns with the City's existing priority areas including climate action, biodiversity conservation, water management, and public health; and
3. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer to:
 - 3.1 Investigate opportunities to incorporate plant-based principles throughout the City's operations, strategies and plans related to sustainability, waste and community health, and improve community education to increase awareness of the benefits of a plant-forward diet; and
 - 3.2 Engage with plant-based organisations such as the Plant-Based Treaty, stakeholders and advocates to explore best practice to inform the City's policy setting and advocacy efforts.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.1

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (5-1)

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

Against: Cr Alexander

(Cr Worner was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr Wallace was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

(Cr La Fontaine was an apology for the Meeting.)

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

Nil

15 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

16 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

**17 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE
CLOSED**

Nil

18 CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 6.57pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Sophie Greer	Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	Jay Naidoo Sarah Hill Lisa Williams Prue Reddingius Karsen Reynolds Mitchell Hoad Eamonn Lourey Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard	A/Chief Executive Officer A/Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment A/Executive Director Community & Business Services A/Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Development & Design Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability Coordinator Place A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support
Public:	One member of the public.	

These Minutes were confirmed at the 7 October 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 9 September 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated