



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

21 April 2026

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.....	5
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	14
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	15
6	Confirmation of Minutes	16
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	16
	7.1 Polyphagous Shot Hole Borer.....	16
8	Declarations of Interest	17
	Reports	17
	Items Approved "En Bloc":	19
	9.1 No. 389 (Lot: 3; D/P: 1283) Bulwer Street, West Perth - Proposed Three Grouped Dwellings (Amendment to Approval)	20
	9.2 No. 6 (Lot: 72 and 77; D/P: 4576) Brookman Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to a Single House.....	21
	9.5 Advertising of Local Planning Policy: Heritage Area Guidelines, Local Planning Policy: Character Area Guidelines and Proposed Lacey Street Heritage Area	23
	11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 February 2026 to 28 February 2026	24
	11.3 Investment Report as at 28 February 2026	25
	11.4 Approval to Advertise Amended Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy	26
	12.2 Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of New Privacy and Information Breach Policy - Standard Amendment.....	27
	12.5 Governance Framework Review.....	28
	12.6 Information Bulletin	29
	Reports with Discussion.....	30
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 28 February 2026	30
	12.4 Report and Minutes of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meeting held on 25 February 2026.....	31
	9.3 Appointment of the Design Review Panel	33
	9.4 Submission on WALGA Draft Climate Change Advocacy Position	35
	10.1 Response to Petition - Farr Avenue, North Perth	38
	12.1 Approval to Advertise Amended Council Member Continuing Professional Development Policy - Standard Amendment.....	41
	12.3 Electoral Reform – WALGA Sector Consultation.....	43
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....	48
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....	48
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	48
16	Urgent Business	48
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	48
	17.1 Proposed Major Land Transaction.....	49
18	Closure	50

**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, 21 APRIL 2026 AT 6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward
	Cr Con Poullos	North Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
	Cr Reece Wheadon	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	Michael Hancock	Manager Development & Design
	Mitchell Hoad	Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability
	Lisa Williams	Executive Manager Communications & Engagement (left at 6.37pm after Item 12.4)
	Dale Morrissy	Manager Community Facilities (left at 7.01pm after Item 10.1)
	Ryan Gibson	Principal Engineer, Traffic & Transport (left at 7.06pm after Item 12.1)
	Joslin Colli	Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Emma Simmons	Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Wendy Barnard	Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support
Public:	Approximately 12 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 Noongar people and pay our respects to Elders past and present, acknowledging that the City of Vincent has a role in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Sophie Greer has an approved leave of absence from 11 February 2026 to 19 May 2026, but was in attendance.

Cr Ashley Wallace 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 Theresa Adriansz of North Perth – Item 3.1 of Item 3(B)

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

3.2 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

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

Questions:

- Where did the City publicly advertise the proposed rate increases? I would appreciate a full list of all the platforms, public locations and statutory notices.
- On what dates will the City advertise the proposed rate increase for 2026/2027?
- What process does the City follow if the ratepayer objects to a significant rate increase, like the 25% increase to my rates?
- Has the City ever reduced a rate increase due to a ratepayer objection and applied it across the board?
- How does the City determine the rates for properties with a substantial size dwelling, such as homes with four bedrooms, three bathrooms and multiple toilets compared with properties like mine, a vacant lot with a large City stormwater pipe easement and restrictions?

3.3 Peter Roussos of North Perth – Item 5.2

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

3.4 Minn Khuu of West Perth – Item 11.1 and 12.4

Mr Khuu provided the below statement in writing and spoke to it:

Questions:

1. On 11 November 2020, the City issued a formal written admission stating it had 'no jurisdiction' over the structure on my land. Since then, I have provided the City with five certified land surveys proving this wall is a private structure located up to 180mm inside my property. Why has the Audit and Risk Committee ignored this 2020 admission and the certified cadastral evidence, allowing a prosecution to proceed on the basis of a 'manufactured' jurisdictional fact? Given that the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee is tasked with overseeing legislative compliance and financial reporting, why has the City's 11 November 2020 admission of non-jurisdiction been ignored in the current risk assessment for this litigation?
2. This litigation is causing a direct liquidated debt of \$30.98 per day in bank interest penalties for which the City is liable. This debt now exceeds \$9,500. Is the Council aware of this accruing daily debt, and what is the total expenditure of ratepayer funds on McLeods solicitors for this specific matter?
3. The City is prosecuting my 2.4-metre wall while granting immunity to a neighbour's 3-metre masonry wall and 2.5-metre metal fence. How does the City justify this selective enforcement to the EOC, and how does this serve the 'public interest'?"
4. What is the City's estimated exposure if the Supreme Court grants a Full Indemnity Costs Order due to the 'unreasonable and improper' nature of this prosecution?

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

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.13pm.

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

3.1 Robert & Vesna Trajcevski of North Perth – Item 5.2

Thank you for your response regarding our petition, noted for the Council Meeting on 21 April 2026. Before the matter is put to motion, we would appreciate clarification on one important point to ensure the petition is considered with full context.

Our concern is whether residents, future owners, and commercial tenants of the Celsius development (currently under construction on Alma/Raglan Road, North Perth) would be eligible to apply for parking permits under the City's Parking Permits Policy — now or in the future — and consequently whether they would be entitled to park in any Resident-Only bays on Raglan Road (between Leake Street and Fitzgerald Street) established as a result of our petition.

We note that the City's Parking Permits Policy states that newer apartment and mixed-use developments that include on-site parking as part of their development approval are generally not eligible for on-street parking permits. Our understanding is that the Celsius development's approval includes on-site parking provision.

Could the City please confirm in writing, for inclusion in the Council report on 21 April:

1. Whether residential apartment owners, visitors and tenants within the Celsius development — including any future owners or tenants — are eligible for parking permits on Raglan Road between Leake Street and Fitzgerald Street under the current Parking Permits Policy? We ask that this be confirmed with reference to the specific Development Approval conditions for the Celsius development, rather than in general policy terms only.
2. Whether any commercial tenants and businesses within the Celsius development, including body corporate, facilities management, and regular service contractors, would similarly be ineligible for permits or priority access on Raglan Road between Leake Street and Fitzgerald Street?
3. Whether these eligibility exclusions are permanent and attached to the Celsius property and its Development Approval — not solely dependent on the current Parking Permits Policy, which may be amended in the future?
4. Whether these eligibility exclusions would be formally reflected in the Council report and any motion arising from our petition, so that the intent of Resident-Only parking on Raglan Road is explicitly and permanently protected — not left to future policy interpretation?

We believe this clarification is critical so that the Council and existing residents can be confident that a Resident-Only designation would genuinely and permanently protect Raglan Road for its current and future households, and not inadvertently — or at a later date — create a new parking entitlement for the Celsius development's occupants or operators.

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 19 May 2026 Ordinary Council Meeting.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

3.1 Troy Adriansz – North Perth

I have witnessed the aftermath of a number of accidents at the intersection of Eton St and Ellesmere St, behind the Charles Hotel. My own vehicle was written off by a sober individual on 21 November 2023. On that day alone, there were three serious accidents at that intersection. Speed was not a factor for either vehicle but the other driver simply did not see my vehicle in time.

What are the rubrics around the number of accidents that need to occur at an intersection before, traffic calming instruments, speed bumps, or a raised intersection are installed?

Administration Response:

Generally, the criteria required Main Roads WA is a minimum of 5 crashes, the most severe would score the highest Benefit Cost Ratio.

In July 2024, the City of Vincent was unsuccessful with a Blackspot application to upgrade the intersection of Ellesmere Street and Eton Street. This application was in response to a petition received on 12 December 2023 (Council Meeting (Ordinary and Special) - Tuesday, 12 December 2023), and following a petition received on 24 March 2025 (Response to Petition - Closure of Green Street - Impact Of Increased Traffic on Ellesmere Street and Surrounds) the Engineering team will continue to:-

- Work with Main Roads WA on a treatment for the intersection of Ellesmere Street and Eton Street, with a new application for blackspot funding to be submitted.
- Pursue low-cost traffic calming initiatives such as the recent deployment of the Electronic Speed Radar Signs for the entire length of Ellesmere Street, from Scarborough Beach Road through to Charles Street which are scheduled to be installed in the coming weeks.
- Develop of a 5 – year Road Safety Implementation Plan to traffic model, design and deliver permanent Road Safety projects identified within the Mount Hawthorn Precinct area including Ellesmere St from Scarborough Beach Road through to Charles Street.
- Work with Main Roads WA to slow Ellesmere Street from 50km/h to 40km/h.

3.2 Emma Braban of North Perth – Item 9.1

Given the seriousness of the issues raised and the proposal's inclusion on tomorrow evening's Council agenda, I would like to reiterate my concerns regarding this development.

To be clear, I am not opposed to development or increased density—both are essential for a well-planned, future-focused city. My concern is that developments must be properly designed, assessed and supported by adequate infrastructure to ensure they enhance, rather than compromise, the safety and liveability of the surrounding community.

As you would appreciate, strict adherence to the relevant planning frameworks is critical, particularly for higher-density proposals. This ensures long-term sustainability and protects the amenity of existing residents.

I respectfully request that the following matters be explicitly addressed in the City of Vincent's submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC):

1. Significant Parking Shortfall and Resulting Overflow

The development proposes a substantial parking shortfall—12 fewer resident bays, 5 fewer visitor bays, and 4 fewer motorcycle bays than required. This will inevitably result in overflow parking on surrounding residential streets, which already experience high traffic and parking pressure.

Could the City please confirm:

1. That no exemptions or special arrangements will be granted for residents of this development in relation to parking permits;

Administration Response:

The City's Parking Permit Policy sets out that parking permits will not be issued to developments where a condition or advice note stipulates as such. The City has recommended an advice note to this effect. However, as the WAPC is the determining authority, it is at their discretion to include such an advice note.

2. That the City will extend or adjust parking restrictions on surrounding streets—including Sydney Street—to manage the foreseeable overflow and ensure safety for existing residents.

Administration Response:

Administration is considering the introduction of on street parking restrictions along this portion of Sydney Street. Proposed parking restrictions would be similar to those in place along other parts of Sydney Street, being 1 hour parking between 8.00am and 5.30pm Monday to Friday and 8.00am to 12.00pm Saturday.

2. Building Height and Site Area Compliance

The proposal seeks approval for a five-storey building.

Under the City's planning framework, four storeys are permissible only where the site area exceeds 2,000 m². The proponent appears to reach this threshold only by including PCA 167 road-widening land.

My understanding is that PCA land cannot be included in the developable site area. Excluding PCA land, the true site area is 1,882 m², which does not meet the minimum requirement for four storeys, let alone five. I ask that the City's submission clearly articulate this issue and oppose the height variation on this basis.

3. Additional Departures From the Planning Scheme, R-Codes and Built Form Policy

I also ask the City to address the following non-compliances in its submission to the WAPC:

- Rear boundary setback: Required 6.5–12.5m; proposed as little as 4m, significantly impacting neighbour amenity and privacy.
- Overshadowing: R60 properties should receive no more than 50% shadow; the proposal imposes approximately 70% on the southern neighbour.
- Visual privacy: Several balconies and windows appear to rely on vegetation or driveway distance rather than compliant design measures to achieve screening requirements.
- Corridor widths: Internal corridors as narrow as 1.15m, below the required 1.5m minimum.
- Storage shortfall: The four 2-bedroom apartments provide 3.5 m² instead of the required 4 m².
- Oversized crossover: The City's maximum width is 5.0m, yet the proposal seeks 5.5m, reducing verge greenery and negatively impacting pedestrian safety.

Administration Response:

Administration's report discussed the above matters and considered their satisfaction against the applicable objectives of the R Codes and Built Form Policy. The City's submission included recommended design modifications addressing some of the concerns outlined above.

3.3 Dudley Maier of Highgate

1. At the 10 February meeting I asked about a community funded seat and plaque in Robertson Park. The question was accurately reported in the minutes of that meeting (page 6), but has been summarised in the agenda for the 10 March meeting). Why was the question summarised – was it because the bit that was removed highlighted previous responses I had received from the administration and drew attention to the fact that I raised this in June 2025, and yet the simple matter will not be resolved until nearly a year later? Who made the change to my question – Governance, Parks or elsewhere?

For clarity, the preamble of my question as per the minutes of the 10 February meeting was:

At the meeting of 10 June 2025 I asked the following question concerning a seat and plaque that was installed in Roberston park in 2005, and which was paid for by community members.

In February 2005 a group of residents paid for a seat to be located in Robertson Park. As well as paying for the seat they paid for a plaque that recognised the work that Chris Hair had done in developing a plan for the park, and recording its history. This plaque was affixed to the plinth upon which the seat was fixed. With the recent work installing a new path in Robertson Park the seat has been (temporarily) set aside and the plinth removed. Has the City retained the plaque, and will it be reinstalling it when the seat is replaced in its final position?

The response was:

Yes, the plaque will be reinstalled when the seat is replaced in its final position.

The equivalent 'preamble' that appears in the agenda of 10 March meeting is:

Regarding a seat and plaque that was installed in Roberston park in 2005, and which was paid for by community members. Recent work on installing a new path in Robertson Park has resulted in the seat being (temporarily) set aside and the plinth with the plaque has been removed.

Administration Response:

The Governance team are looking at ways to streamline the minutes and on this occasion summarised the full statement and question as provided in the minutes of the previous meeting.

2. At the meeting of 10 February I asked questions about why Vincent is paying for part of the Perth Inner City Group's initiative to introduce 40kph traffic calming initiative even though it has been completed in Vincent. The response indicated that the city's ratepayers are contributing 20% to the cost of the project. The answer then goes on to say that "*The City of Vincent is ... seeking to implement an expansion of the initiative beyond that of local residential roads*".
 - 1.1. When did the council agree to the concept of reducing the speed on roads other than residential roads?
 - 1.2. Which non-residential roads in Vincent does the City intend to reduce the speed limit?

Administration Response

The City's Accessible City Strategy provides for:

"4.1.1 Work with the State Government and Inner City Group to continue to implement a 40km/h zone in all residential areas...." Some local residential roads are within residential areas and have potential to have lower speed limits. The City has yet to fully analyse which roads would benefit from a lower speed limit.

3. At the meeting of 10 February I asked questions about the expenditure of approximately \$36,000 with the Australian Institute of Company Directors – who attended, what was the course, how much did each cost, and if attendees were required to contribute. The response was 'general' in nature – \$36,270 was spent; three elected members and two staff attended; it was the company directors course and foundations of directorship course; and courses cost between \$3,100 and \$8,450.

Analysis of the records of payments since the beginning of 2023 show the following:

- 21 April 2023 – Company Directors Course - \$16,898 [presumably 2 attendees]
- 2 June 2023 – Company Directors Course - \$8,449 [presumably 1 attendee]
- 25 August 2023 – AICD Foundation Course - \$3099.99 [presumably 1 attendee]
- 13 December 2024 - Company Directors Course - \$9,300 [1 attendee]

I can see that my questions were not specific enough, and noting that the fact that the names of at least one council member who attended the courses is in the public domain, and the names of others can be easily identified online, I ask the following questions:

- 3.1 Who attended each of these courses?

Administration Response

The City does not disclose the names of staff members who attend training courses.

The Elected Members who have attended the Company Directors Course are Cr Nicole Woolf, Cr Alex Castle, Cr Jonathan Hallett, Cr Susan Gontaszewski and Mayor Emma Cole.

- 3.2 Why did the answer say that the total cost was \$36,270 when the sum of the four payments (above) is \$37,746.99 (including GST)?

Administration Response

The amount of \$36,270 referenced in the previous response included a payment of \$7,823 in 2022 and excluded a payment of \$9,300 in 2024.

- 3.3 Did the City pay for any elected members to participate in the Company Directors Course prior to 2023? If so, who, at what cost, and when?

Administration Response

Mayor Emma Cole (2021) and Cr Susan Gontaszewski (2022) attended the course prior to 2023 at a total cost of \$11,734.

4. At the meeting of 10 February I asked questions about the artwork that was commissioned for Leederville in December 2021. The response stated that \$129,167.70 was spent, with \$111,709 going to the artist and the remaining \$17,458.70 being spent on "site investigation and preparation". As my question asked how much the artist received, and how much was paid to "other parties", I assume that the \$17,458.70 was paid to these other parties. The response also states that a further \$20,000 was budgeted for "site investigation and preparation".

Expenditure records spanning the period 14 February 2022 to 30 June 2025 show that the artist was paid \$156,147.83 (including GST) – approximately \$141,950 excluding GST.

My questions are:

- 4.1 Why the discrepancy between the stated payment to the artist of \$111,709 (or \$129,167 if the artist received all payments) and the actual payments of \$141,950 excluding GST?

Administration Response

The figures refer to different components of project expenditure.

The artist's original contracted fee to deliver the artwork was \$111,709 excl. GST. A further \$17,458.70 excl. GST was spent by the City on site investigation and preparation, and that amount was paid to other contractors, not to the artist.

An additional \$30,594 excl. GST was later paid to the artist in relation to storage costs arising from project delays and relocation issues. The artist on-paid these to a storage company. That additional amount explains why the total payments associated with the artist exceed the original artwork fee.

- 4.2 When was the \$20,000 budget for “site investigation and preparation” added to the City’s budget?

Administration Response

The \$20,000 amount for site investigation and preparation was included in the Place Planning team’s operational budget at the commencement of the project.

That budget was separate from the artist’s contract and was intended to cover works that are typically the City’s responsibility, such as site investigations and preparation. Of that budgeted amount, \$17,458.70 excl. GST has been spent over the course of the project.

For a matter of clarity: I have no issue with the work that the artist has done, both artistically or in a management sense. My questions are directed at the way the City has administered the project, and provided less than accurate answers over time.

5. At the meeting of 10 February I asked questions about the ‘Globe’ artwork that was approved in December 2021 and was intended to be erected at the intersection of William and Brisbane Streets. In February 2025 the project was ‘stalled’ by Council in order to determine an alternative location. Last month I asked about the latest estimated cost for the project, and when the final installation was expected. No cost estimate was provided, and a timeframe simply saying that a new location and revised design will be considered by council in mid-2026.

Given that: approval was given over four years ago; significant amounts have already been paid to the artist; and that it looks like the design might be revised:

- 5.1 Does the administration think that a sixteen-month gap between being asked to come up with a new location, and the recommendation for that location is a timely response.

Administration Response

The timeframe reflects the level of due diligence required to identify and confirm a suitable alternative location for a complex public artwork of this scale. This includes site investigations, stakeholder engagement, design refinement, servicing assessments and updated costings before bringing a recommendation back to Council.

Following Council’s February 2025 resolution not to proceed with the originally approved location, Administration investigated a range of alternative sites and undertook land tenure and management checks, stakeholder engagement, underground service enquiries, access and installation assessments, and electrical and servicing investigations.

Shortlisted locations were then subject to more detailed review, including geotechnical investigations, cost estimates, and refinement of the artwork design and installation methodology in consultation with the artist.

Since February 2025, progress on the project has been reported to Council through four workshop briefings where potential locations, investigation outcomes and design refinements have been presented to Council prior to a final recommendation being prepared.

These steps were necessary to ensure that any revised location and design is feasible, safe, and capable of delivery, and the timeframe reflects the due diligence required for a project of this complexity.

- 5.2 Will previous payments to the artist be taken into consideration if a new design is decided upon or will payments be simply made for a new design – basically, the money spent on the previous design is lost to the community.

Administration Response

Yes, previous payments made under the existing contract will be taken into account in any further consideration of the project.

Additional expenditure may be required to support redesign and associated engineering, fabrication and installation works resulting from the change in location and revised project scope. Further detail will be provided when the revised proposal is presented to Council at an Ordinary Meeting in mid-2026.

- 5.3 What are the estimated cost increases due to inflation since the project was first approved in 2021?

Administration Response

An inflation cost has not been separately calculated. Cost increases since 2021 will be reflected in the revised project budget.

The extent of any increase will be reported to Council at an Ordinary Meeting in mid-2026 on the revised location and design.

6. The western island in Hyde Park has had many of the trees removed as a response to the borer. Many of the removed trees were Melaleuca Quinquenervia, also known as a broad-leaf paperbark. These trees are native to the east coast of Australia and have been introduced to Western Australia. Once established they can outcompete local tree species in swampy areas. For example, they were introduced to the US Everglades in the 1900s and are now declared a noxious weed in those areas.

The western island of Hyde Park is such an area, and we have seen these trees progressively dominate the island over the last 40 years. In my view there is little prospect of the trees becoming weeds in the surrounding areas – they thrive on having wet feet. However, there is a risk that dormant seed on the island will germinate.

These paperbarks were removed as a result of the borer – indicating that they would be vulnerable in future. The City has also said it will plant species that are endemic to the area, in particular the Swan coastal plain.

- 6.1 My question is: will the City perform regular inspections of growth on this island to ensure that any self-sown Quinquenervia are removed in a timely manner?

Administration Response

Yes. The city has engaged an environmental contractor to undertake planting and monthly maintenance of the islands (including weed control) over the next three years.

3.4 Laura Maekivi of North Perth – Item 9.1

Speaking to recommendation 2.1.1, the Western interface, the suggestion by planning that the two rear apartments on the upper level are removed is welcome. However, the 4th floor apartments will still be 8 1/2 metres too close to comply, and the lower floors 2 1/2 metres too close.

The building will still be a very imposing presence for the western neighbours, particularly 38 BB Sydney Street, where the rear walls of the development run for 75% of their boundary. It will be visible from habitable rooms and from everywhere in their outdoor courtyard. Given the interface with R20 compliant properties, I request that the recommendation is amended so that rear setbacks for all floors comply with code. Doing so would also allow for more effective landscaping at the rear. I would also like to request that the landscaping plan is re-examined to ascertain, one, the suitability of planting trees with a mature height ranging between 8 and 25 meters, just 50 centimetres from the fence, and almost directly over sewer mains that run along the western boundary.

Two, whether there is sufficient deep soil area to accommodate their growth, and three, how it is proposed to prevent branches overhanging neighbouring roofs given the tree's potential to spread between 5 and 15 metres.

At 2.13, social housing details, if the apartments are ultimately used entirely or in part as social housing, are there any recommendations Council can make to obtain a guarantee for the neighbourhood that tenants with known complex needs, more suited to supported accommodation, will not be housed in this project. Small bedrooms. It appears the administration have dismissed DPR's concerns over 2.8 metre deep bedrooms. If this is the case, I would request that this be reconsidered.

This dimension will result in difficulty navigating around the bed for anyone using walking aids or a wheelchair. This will limit the range of potentially suitable tenants and pose difficulties for seniors ageing in place.

Disabled parking.

1. Is the Council able to make recommendations that provision is made for disabled parking?
I note State Planning Policy Principle 9 requires the development to cater to a diverse range of people. Additional points. Have mould issues been considered in relation to laundry position and the windowless bathrooms?

Where is washing going to be dried? Isn't it a bit late to leave it until after construction to be determined? Will the local community be given an input on the community art proposed?

Administration Response

Accessible parking requirements are regulated under the Building Act 2011 and the National Construction Code and are addressed at the building permit stage rather than through the planning assessment.

Internal building layout matters, including ventilation, moisture control, and bathroom and laundry design, are also regulated under the Building Act 2011 and the National Construction Code and are not determined as part of the planning approval process.

A recommended condition of approval requires clothes drying areas to be screened from public view. Public art forms part of the development assessment where required and any proposal is reviewed through the City's established design and public art processes. Community consultation is not a statutory requirement for public art associated with a development application.

2. *How are noise issues related to parking right on the rear and side boundaries going to be managed because there are bedrooms in those positions and it will be noisy.*

Administration Response

Noise associated with residential car parking is expected to occur in accordance with normal residential activity patterns, typically during morning and evening peak periods and intermittently at other times. General vehicle movements associated with residential use are not regulated under the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.

3.5 Maureen Schoch of North Perth – Item 9.1

Regarding solar access

The applicant's assertion that the southern neighbour, being me, may develop to R100 where there would be no overshadowing provisions is disingenuous/ not correct.

The property can only be developed to R60. Even combined with 403 Charles Street, the total area is well short of the 2000m² required for R100. (1078 + 633 + 1711 m²).

Administrations response that sunlight is adequate throughout most of the year does not address the loss of winter sunlight.

It is disappointing that they too refer to potential development to R100.

Position of bins and bicycle storage

1. Are council able to consider in their response the issue of noise of noise and smell associated with the bin storage area and bicycle storage right on the southern boundary – with bike storage and access immediately adjacent to the neighbour's habitable rooms?

Administration Response

Nuisance odour from waste storage areas is managed through the City's Health Local Law 2004.

2. Can DRP investigate compliance with acceptable outcome A4.7.2 in relation to:
 1. The walkway to bike storage being located adjacent to, and within 3 m of windows to habitable rooms both in the development and to those of 405 Charles Street.
 2. Positioning of the bin area directly opposite the bedrooms of the southern B2 ground floor apartment; and
 3. The bedroom of the apartment directly adjacent to the communal space on the 5th story.

Administration Response

The proposal was reviewed by the City's Design Review Panel at pre-lodgement stage and subsequently by its Chairperson following lodgement of the application. The matters raised were not identified by the Design Review Panel as issues requiring further modification.

3.6 Jennifer Novatscou of North Perth – Item 9.1

I respectfully request that Council recommend the development comply with the residential design codes in relation to building height, rear setbacks and plot ratio to assist with the transition to the western interface. I agree with the recommendation that the rear apartments in the upper level be removed. However, this is not enough. At 38 B Sydney Street, 3 bedrooms, a living area, and a courtyard directly face the development site.

Approximately 73% of that rear boundary at 38 B Sydney Street will be occupied by the proposed development and will be particularly vulnerable to noise, anti-social behaviour, light spill, fumes and other impacts. Item 2.1.2, car parking. I support Council's recommendation to increase car parking to 45 residential bays and 8 visitor bays.

In relation to the car park itself, I believe that the trees proposed to be planted along the rear boundary will not offer any meaningful protection against noise, security, antisocial behaviour, light, fumes and littering, and will instead create problems to the sewage system, gutters and paving, etc. due to their size and extensive root systems.

In relation to item 2.1.5, I request Council to provide the actual authority for allowing the PCA167 land in the total development area. Even if the West Australian Planning Commission approved works for the development within that land, I believe it should be treated separately from the development site as it is for a different purpose.

If this land is required for future road widening, will the bicycle parking, driveway and landscaping need to be removed? If so, then is it appropriate for it to be included in the total development area now?

Administration Response

Yes, it is possible that works within the Primary Control Area (PCA 167) could be removed in the future if road widening were required. Approval of development within the PCA does not prevent the Western Australian Planning Commission from requiring that land for road purposes at a later time.

The works proposed within the PCA include the vehicle crossover, visitor bicycle parking and landscaping/deep soil areas. These elements were not relied upon to meet the development's minimum requirements for bicycle parking or deep soil area, and therefore their removal in the future would not compromise the core planning assessment of the development.

An application duly executed by an authorised person at the Western Australian Planning Commission for works associated with the subject development within the PCA has been submitted to the City of Vincent.

3.7 Jeremy Milne of Mount Lawley – Item 9.2

I spoke at the Council briefing last week and won't repeat anything said then tonight.

I would like to have on record that the application is for 6 guests but the property is bookable for 8-10 guests on booking websites and often accommodated 8 guests when it was operating as a short term rental last year.

This is an important distinction as according to the relevant local planning policy 6 guests requires 2 off street parking bays and more than 6 requires 3 or more. 128A Harold street has a 2 car garage off street which would be available to guests if it is not occupied by the owners cars and possessions.

Administration Response

The application has been assessed based on the proposal before Council, which is for short-term rental accommodation for a maximum of six guests.

If approved, the use must operate in accordance with the approved plans and conditions, including any limit on guest numbers. Any operation outside those limits would constitute non-compliance and subject to investigation and enforcement by the City in accordance with its Compliance and Enforcement Policy.

I would also like to make a general comment: It was discussed at the council briefing last week that a demonstrated lack of compliance with the relevant rules and regulations cannot be taken into account in assessing a current application. I don't feel this is a just situation. It seems easy for an applicant to do the wrong thing without consequence. I would ask the council to consider altering their process so that demonstrated non compliance can be taken into account.

Administration Response

Council is required to determine applications in accordance with the statutory planning framework and cannot vary that process.

Under the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, previous non-compliance is not a relevant planning consideration that can be considered in determining an application. Any non-compliance is addressed separately through the City's enforcement powers.

3.8 Minh Khuu of West Perth

1. Mr Khuu requested clarification regarding the status of the matter currently before the court and whether the City intends to discontinue the matter.

Administration Response

As the matter referenced is currently subject to legal proceedings, it is not appropriate for the City to comment on the specifics of the case.

2. Mr Khuu requested clarification regarding the circumstances in which a Restricted Communication Notice may be issued by the City.

Administration Response

The City may issue a Restricted Communication Notice in accordance with section 5.130 of the Local Government Act 1995.

3. Mr Khuu requested clarification regarding how the City progresses matters of compliance and enforcement.

Administration Response

The City assesses compliance and enforcement matters having regard for the relevant legislation, and in accordance with the City's Development Compliance Enforcement Policy.

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 The Presiding Member granted Gaetano Siano a 5 minute deputation on Item 5.2 Petition to Reclassify the 3 hour parking bays on Raglan Road. His presentation can be heard [here](#).

5.2 Petition to Reclassify the 3 Hour Parking Bays on Raglan Road

Vesna and Robert Travcevski of North Perth submitted a petition with 27 signatures requesting that Council:

1. Reclassify the existing 3-hour parking bays on Raglan Road (between Leake Street and Fitzgerald Street) as Resident-Only Parking at all times.
2. Install clear signage indicating the new resident-only status and the applicable hours.
3. Issue resident parking permits to households on Raglan Road to accommodate resident visitors, carers and own trades people.
4. Empower local parking enforcement officers to issue fines or warnings to non-resident vehicles that occupy these bays during the designated hours.

PETITION

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the petition be received and a report be prepared.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

5.3 Petition to enable safe pedestrian crossing on Lord Street

Alex Warren of East Victoria Park submitted a petition with 33 signatures (as well as 8 signatures that did not comply with the petition requirements) has been received from Alex Warren of East Victoria Park requesting that Council prioritise and install a signalised pedestrian crossing (traffic lights) or construct an underpass on Lord Street to enable safe access between: East Perth Train Station and North Metropolitan TAFE - Mt Lawley Campus (350 Lord Street, Mt Lawley).

PETITION

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Poullos

That the petition be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 10 March 2026 be confirmed.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace 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 POLYPHAGOUS SHOT HOLE BORER

As people are aware, the City is in the throes of trying to determine the budget for 26/27 financial year. The City is already grappling with significant financial pressures. In particular the City has been significantly affected by the increasing costs of not just petrol but everything, as a result of the Iran war.

In this environment the City is very concerned about the increased levels of cost shifting onto local governments. A particular concern is the level of costs shifting that has occurred in the ongoing management of Polyphagous Shot Hole Borer (PSHB), a challenge that has only arisen as a result of state-wide biosecurity failures.

When the PSHB was first detected, and it became a federal strategy to address this, elimination was the focus and as a result there were significant funds which were made available to entities, including our local government, to be able to address this. Now that the decision has been made to move into a management phase, which also incorporates measures to try and contain the affected areas, local governments are becoming increasingly concerned about the lack of detail being made available as to how this is going to be funded.

To date no monies have been offered to local governments to ensure that ongoing management measures are going to be paid for.

Biosecurity is a State Government responsibility but it is now the ratepayers that are going to be left to bear these costs. These are ratepayers that are already paying taxes and now they are going to be paying twice, for what is a State Government responsibility.

The sorts of figures we are talking about in terms of ongoing management is huge. We know that the figure the City is looking at is \$400,000 just for the very basic PSHB management measures for the next financial year.

In order to be able to put in the optimal level of management we are talking about \$1m. The City does not have that kind of money. Every \$480,000 the City has to find above our regular business translates to an additional 1% increase in rates for every ratepayer, which is significant.

This level of cost, trying to manage what is a State Government responsibility, in order to ensure we don't lose our tree canopy and that PSHB doesn't move out of the containment zone, is being borne by the City and is unacceptable.

We are one of many local governments that is going to speak up about this. When you look at the number of local governments starting to bear these costs, it adds up to millions of dollars that ratepayers have to fund over and above the regular core business of local government. That is not remediation, that is purely management.

On the topic of remediation works, a shout out to Patrick Gorman, Perth Federal Member, who gave us an election commitment of \$500,000 to look at the remediation of the islands and surrounds of Hyde Park, after the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) decided to clear the islands. A thank you to him for ensuring those monies were made available. The City would be in a very difficult situation if we had to fund those remediation measures ourselves, we possibly would have struggled to do it.

It has highlighted how important it is that other tiers of government are able to assist, particularly in parks of state significance like Hyde Park.

We do need a very clear fundraising arrangement moving forward and we need it now. The City is writing to the Minister to request that the funding be urgently addressed.

Hopefully there will be some movement on this before we have to advertise what the new rates are going to be, because we are already facing enough pressure, in terms of trying to meet the needs and expectations of our ratepayers in terms of delivery of services as a local government.

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

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 David MacLennan, CEO, declared an impartiality interest in Item 11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 February 2026 to 28 February 2026 . The extent of his interest is that he is friends with the owner of a provider of one of the items in the expenditure list. He has had no involvement in the procurement process.
- 8.2 Cr Suzanne Worner declared an impartiality interest in Item 10.1 Response to Petition - Farr Avenue, North Perth. The extent of her interest is that she has close friends who are residents of Farr Avenue.

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 11.1 and 12.4.
- (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 Castle	12.3 and 17.1
Cr Worner	10.1
Cr Greer	9.3 and 9.4

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon therefore requested the Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance, to advise the meeting of:

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved “En Bloc”, being:**
Items **9.1, 9.2, 9.5, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 12.2, 12.5, 12.6**
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**
Items 17.1.

ITEMS APPROVED "EN BLOC":

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

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:
Items 9.1, 9.2, 9.5, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 12.2, 12.5, 12.6**

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.1 NO. 389 (LOT: 3; D/P: 1283) BULWER STREET, WEST PERTH - PROPOSED THREE GROUPED DWELLINGS (AMENDMENT TO APPROVAL)**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Location Plan 
 2. Development Plan 
 3. Clause 67 Assessment 
 4. Approved Development Plans 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, **APPROVES** the application for Three Grouped Dwellings (Amendment to Approval) at No. 389 (Lot: 3; D/P: 1283) Bulwer Street, West Perth subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions, requirements and advice notes detailed on the development approval 5.2025.167.1 granted on 7 October 2025 continue to apply to this approval except as follows:

- 1.1 Condition 7.5 is added as follows:

The surface finish of Lot B's wall facing south shall be of good and clean condition, prior to the occupation or use of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City. The finish of wall is to be fully rendered or face brick; or material as otherwise approved and to be treated with anti-graffiti coating; to the satisfaction of the City;

- 1.2 Condition 7.6 is added as follows:

- 1.2.1 Prior to the issue of a Building Permit for Lot A and Lot B, details of the proposed artwork shall be submitted to and approved by the City, on advice from the Design Review Panel; and

- 1.2.2 Prior to occupation or use of the development on Lot A or Lot B, the approved artwork shall be installed and maintained until the commencement of works for Lot C;

- 1.3 Condition 9.1 is modified as follows:








Dwellings on Lot A and B shall be constructed concurrently; and

- 1.4 Condition 10 is added as follows:

Prior to the occupation or use of the development on Lot A or Lot B, the creeping landscaping identified on the approved plan dated 16 March 2026 shall be implemented and irrigated until the commencement of development for Lot C, and thereafter maintained and replaced if failed to the satisfaction of the City, at the expense of the owners/occupiers.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)**

9.2 NO. 6 (LOT: 72 AND 77; D/P: 4576) BROOKMAN STREET, PERTH - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO A SINGLE HOUSE**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Heritage Impact Statement 
 4. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response 
 5. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response 
 6. Determination Advice Notes 
 7. Clause 67 Assessment 

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 Single House at No. 6 (Lot: 72 and 77; D/P: 4576) Brookman Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 6:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to Single House as shown on the approved plans dated 28 October 2025 and 15 March 2026. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Heritage

2.1 The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with the details and annotations as indicated on the approved plans dated 28 October 2025 and 15 March 2026 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, unless otherwise approved by the City; and

2.2 Prior to the commencement of development, details of any proposed damp remediation works to the existing building, including the method of installation of any Damp Proof Course, shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Vincent and on advice from the Heritage Council of Western Australia. The use of chemical injection treatments is not permitted. The approved remediation works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Following removal of render, damp monitoring shall be undertaken to track changes in moisture levels and guide any future remedial actions to the satisfaction of the City;

3. Landscaping

All landscaping shown in the approved plans dated 28 October 2025 and 15 March 2026, shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to the City's satisfaction, prior to occupancy or use of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

4. Redundant Crossover

Prior to completion of the development, redundant or "blind" crossovers shall be removed and the verge and kerb made good to the satisfaction of the City, at the applicant/owner's full expense;

5. Construction Management

A Construction Management Plan shall be lodged with and approved by the City prior to the commencement of development. This plan is to detail how construction (including demolition and/or forward works) will be managed to minimise disruption in the area and shall include:

- 5.1 The delivery of and delivery times for materials and equipment to the site;
- 5.2 Parking arrangements for contractors and sub-contractors;
- 5.3 Dilapidation reports of the adjoining properties at Nos. 4 and 8 Brookman Street;
- 5.4 Notification to affected landowners;
- 5.5 Management of noise;
- 5.6 Public communication and complaint handling procedures; and
- 5.7 Construction times.

The approved Construction Management Plan shall be complied with for the duration of the construction of the development;

6. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennas, 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; and

7. Stormwater Management

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 Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

9.5 ADVERTISING OF LOCAL PLANNING POLICY: HERITAGE AREA GUIDELINES, LOCAL PLANNING POLICY: CHARACTER AREA GUIDELINES AND PROPOSED LACEY STREET HERITAGE AREA

- Attachments:**
1. Local Planning Policy: Heritage Area Guidelines 
 2. Local Planning Policy: Character Area Guidelines 
 3. Local Planning Policy: Heritage Area Guidelines - Schedule of Modifications 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **RESOLVES** in accordance with Schedule 2, Clauses 5(1), 9(3) and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* to PREPARE and PUBLISH a notice for the purpose of advertising of:
 - Amendments to Local Planning Policy: Heritage Area Guidelines and the inclusion of the Lacey Street Heritage Area included in Attachment 1; and
 - Amendments to Local Planning Policy: Character Area Guidelines included in Attachment 2; and
2. **NOTES** that any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration.




COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 1 FEBRUARY 2026 TO 28 FEBRUARY 2026

- Attachments:
1. February 2026 - Payments by EFT and Payroll 
 2. February 2026 - Payments by Direct Debits 
 3. February 2026 - Payments by Cheques 
 4. February 2026 - Payments by Fuel Cards 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 February 2026 to 28 February 2026 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll		\$ 5,321,239.36
Direct debits, including credit cards		\$ 589,047.47
Cheque	82816-82819	\$ 772.55
Total payment for February 2026		\$ 5,911,059.38

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 28 FEBRUARY 2026

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 28 February 2026 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 28 February 2026 as detailed in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

11.4 APPROVAL TO ADVERTISE AMENDED COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT POLICY

- Attachments:
1. DRAFT Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy 
 2. DRAFT Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy with tracked changes 
 3. Community and Stakeholder Engagement Framework 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES the proposed amendments to the Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy at Attachment 1 for the purpose of community consultation.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

12.2 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF NEW PRIVACY AND INFORMATION BREACH POLICY - STANDARD AMENDMENT

- Attachments:
1. Privacy and Information Breach Policy (updated) - clean 
 2. Privacy and Information Breach Policy (updated) - marked up 
 3. Policy No. 4.1.31 - Privacy Management (current) 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ADOPTS** the Privacy and Information Breach Policy at Attachment 1, which is proposed to replace Policy No. 4.1.31 – Privacy Management, at Attachment 3.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

12.5 GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK REVIEW

- Attachments:
1. Draft Governance Framework - clean version 
 2. Draft Governance Framework - tracked changes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ADOPTS** the updated Governance Framework, in its draft form at Attachment 1; and
2. **NOTES** that final editorial, design and formatting of the document will be determined by the Chief Executive Officer prior to publication.


COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.5

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

12.6 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. Minutes for Arts Advisory Group Meeting held on 25 February 2026 
 2. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Special Meeting held on 19 March 2026 
 3. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of February 2026 
 4. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of March 2026 
 5. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 6. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 16 April 2026 
 7. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 8. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 9. Snap, Send, Solve Update as at March 2026 
 10. Unrecoverable Parking Infringements - 3rd Quarter 2025/2026 
 11. Register of Petitions - Progress Report April 2026 
 12. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - April 2026 
 13. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - April 2026 
 14. Council Workshop Items since 11 March 2026 
 15. Council Briefing Notes - 3 March 2026 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated April 2026.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.6

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION**11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 28 FEBRUARY 2026**

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 28 Feb 2026 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the Financial Statements for the month ended 28 February 2026 as shown in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

12.4 REPORT AND MINUTES OF THE AUDIT, RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2026

- Attachments:**
1. **Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Minutes - 25 February 2026** 
 2. **Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Attachments - 25 February 2026 - Confidential**
 3. **Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Terms of Reference** 

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. APPROVES:

- 1.1 **The Chief Executive Officer to commence an Expression of Interest process to identify suitably qualified candidates for appointment as an independent Deputy of the Presiding Member for the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee, in accordance with section 7.1B of the *Local Government Act 1995*, with a report to be returned to Council for appointment prior to 30 June 2026.**
- 1.2 **The payment of meeting fees for independent members of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee in accordance with the updated Terms of Reference and the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal determination, as follows:**
 - a) **Presiding Member (Chair): payment at the maximum meeting fee permitted under the applicable Salaries and Allowances Tribunal determination;**
 - b) **Deputy of the Presiding Member (appointed under section 7.1B of the *Local Government Act 1995*): payment at the maximum meeting fee permitted under the applicable Salaries and Allowances Tribunal determination when presiding at a meeting in the absence of the Presiding Member;**
 - c) **Deputy Presiding Member (appointed under section 5.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*): a meeting fee of \$600 per meeting when attending but not presiding; and**
 - d) **Independent Committee Members: a meeting fee of \$450 per meeting.**
- 1.3 **The updated Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Terms of Reference at Attachment 3; and**
- 1.4 **The proposed updates to the risk management actions for the medium and high risks.**

2. RECEIVES:

- 2.1 **The Minutes of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meeting held on 25 February 2026, at Attachment 1, and the Confidential Attachments Paper at Attachment 2;**
- 2.2 **The Corporate Risk Register; and**
- 2.3 **The Ageing Workforce and Retirement Transition Plan;**

3. NOTES:

- 3.1 **The legislative changes relating to Audit, Risk and Improvement Committees (ARICs) and the Local Government Inspector;**
- 3.2 **The updates to the Audit and Risk Committee Forward Agenda for 2026 and status of the Action Register;**
- 3.3 **The status of the Compliance Calendar and the associated reporting requirements for the 2026 calendar year;**
- 3.4 **the status and progress of the three open audits listed in the Year 3 Internal Audit Program;**

- 3.5 The Privacy and Responsible Information Sharing (PRIS) Action Plan;
- 3.6 The ongoing implementation of the City's PRIS actions;
- 3.7 The alignment of Corporate Risks to risk appetite and tolerance ratings;
- 3.8 The update on the use of Artificial Intelligence at the City;
- 3.9 The AI Readiness Assessment Report;
- 3.10 The AI Readiness Action Plan;
- 3.11 The draft ICT Artificial Intelligence (AI) Procedure;
- 3.12 The cyber security resilience update;
- 3.13 The Draft ICT Training and Awareness Plan; and
- 3.14 The status of the City's Audit Log.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 6.37pm Executive Manager Communications & Engagement left the meeting and did not return.

9.3 APPOINTMENT OF THE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**Ward:** Various**Attachments:**

1. Summary of Applicants - Confidential
2. Summary of Interviews - Confidential
3. Design Review Panel Recommended Members 2026 - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:**That Council:**

1. **APPOINTS** the Applicants in Confidential Attachment 3 to the City's Design Review Panel from 19 May 2026 to 19 May 2028:
 - 1.1 James Christou;
 - 1.2 Simon Venturi;
 - 1.3 Dominic Snellgrove;
 - 1.4 Joe Chindarsi;
 - 1.5 Oliver Grimaldi;
 - 1.6 Munira Mackay;
 - 1.7 Anthony Duckworth;
 - 1.8 Brett Wood-Gush;
 - 1.9 Damien Pericles;
 - 1.10 Caine Holdsworth;
 - 1.11 Marc Beattie
 - 1.12 Mitchell Cook
 - 1.13 Stephen Carrick
 - 1.14 Peter Ciemitis
 - 1.15 Eddie Marcus; and
2. **NOTES** that:
 - 2.1 The City's Design Review Panel term expires on 18 May 2026; and
 - 2.2 Administration will notify all applicants of the Design Review Panel appointments and induct the successful applicants onto the Design Review Panel.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

9.4 SUBMISSION ON WALGA DRAFT CLIMATE CHANGE ADVOCACY POSITION

Attachments: 1. 2026 WALGA Climate Change Advocacy Position Consultation Paper 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ENDORSES** a submission to WALGA on the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position advising that it:

1. **SUPPORTS** the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position in-principle to recognise the growing climate risks facing local government and the critical role of coordinated advocacy, which aligns with the City's broader approach to sustainability and climate change including the Sustainable Vincent Framework and Enhanced Environment Strategy; and
2. **OUTLINES** recommendations to improve and strengthen the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position including:
 - **Explicit recognition of local government climate priorities and delivery areas such as urban tree canopy and Water Sensitive Urban Design, biodiversity protection, circular economy and waste minimisation, and the transition to renewable energy and electrification of new homes;**
 - **The need for stable, multi-year funding from the State and Federal Governments to deliver local outcomes;**
 - **Clearer guidance from the State and Federal Governments to inform local governments in achieving Net Zero;**
 - **The need for planning and regulatory reforms to support the delivery of climate resilient housing; and**
 - **A commitment to partnering with and incorporating First Nations knowledge and practices in responding to climate change.**

Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the Recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council **ENDORSES** a submission to WALGA on the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position advising that it:

1. **SUPPORTS** the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position in-principle to recognise the growing climate risks facing local government and the critical role of coordinated advocacy, which aligns with the City's broader approach to sustainability and climate change including the Sustainable Vincent Framework and Enhanced Environment Strategy; and
2. **OUTLINES** recommendations to improve and strengthen the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position including:

- **Recognising that Local Government is committed to leading by example to address climate change by reducing emissions with our community through:**
 - **Investing in renewable energy, electrification of buildings and transport, and by reducing waste through recycling and FOGO; and**
 - **Helping our communities to adapt to a warming climate through science-led planning and expanded urban greening;**
- **Noting that Western Australia is the only state without an emissions reduction or renewable target, and leadership, coordination and action is need from both the State and Federal Governments to define and achieve science-led emission reduction targets;**
- **Explicit recognition of local government climate priorities and delivery areas such as urban tree canopy and Water Sensitive Urban Design, biodiversity protection, circular economy and waste minimisation, and the transition to renewable energy and electrification of new homes;**
- **The need for stable, multi-year funding from the State and Federal Governments to deliver local outcomes;**
- **Clearer guidance from the State and Federal Governments to inform local governments in achieving Net Zero;**
- **The need for planning and regulatory reforms to support the delivery of climate resilient housing; and**
- **A commitment to partnering with and incorporating First Nations knowledge and practices in responding to climate change.**

REASON:

The City of Vincent is a progressive leader in sustainability. Through our Sustainable Vincent Framework (SVF), we have committed to bold, aspirational targets that go beyond minimum requirements.

This amendment seeks to strengthen WALGA's climate change advocacy position in line with the goals of our SVF and the City's Enhanced Environment Strategy (EES).

In particular, it aligns with our objectives to deliver resilient, low-carbon infrastructure and improve resource recovery, while recognising that all levels of government must work together to address the climate crisis.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Administration supports this amendment.

This would align with the City's existing sustainability setting including the SVF and EES, and it would further strengthen the City's submission to WALGA to inform the draft Climate Change Position.

Increased uptake in renewable energy, the shift to electrification, waste reduction and improved circularity, and expanded tree canopy are all key opportunities for the City and the community to improve climate resilience.

Support and leadership is needed from the State and Federal Governments to effectively deliver on these opportunities in the face of increasing climate change effects.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4

That Council **ENDORSES** a submission to WALGA on the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position advising that it:

1. **SUPPORTS** the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position in-principle to recognise the growing climate risks facing local government and the critical role of coordinated advocacy, which aligns with the City's broader approach to sustainability and climate change including the Sustainable Vincent Framework and Enhanced Environment Strategy; and
2. **OUTLINES** recommendations to improve and strengthen the draft Climate Change Advocacy Position including:
 - **Recognising that Local Government is committed to leading by example to address climate change by reducing emissions with our community through:**
 - Investing in renewable energy, electrification of buildings and transport, and by reducing waste through recycling and FOGO; and
 - Helping our communities to adapt to a warming climate through science-led planning and expanded urban greening;
 - **Noting that Western Australia is the only state without an emissions reduction or renewable target, and leadership, coordination and action is need from both the State and Federal Governments to define and achieve science-led emission reduction targets;**
 - **Explicit recognition of local government climate priorities and delivery areas such as urban tree canopy and Water Sensitive Urban Design, biodiversity protection, circular economy and waste minimisation, and the transition to renewable energy and electrification of new homes;**
 - **The need for stable, multi-year funding from the State and Federal Governments to deliver local outcomes;**
 - **Clearer guidance from the State and Federal Governments to inform local governments in achieving Net Zero;**
 - **The need for planning and regulatory reforms to support the delivery of climate resilient housing; and**
 - **A commitment to partnering with and incorporating First Nations knowledge and practices in responding to climate change.**

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

10.1 RESPONSE TO PETITION - FARR AVENUE, NORTH PERTH

- Attachments:
1. Petition - Farr Avenue, North Perth - Confidential
 2. LATM Report - Farr Avenue, North Perth 

RECOMMENDATION:

That in response to a petition received in February 2026 in relation to parking, traffic and amenity concerns on Farr Avenue, COUNCIL:

1. **NOTES** the request for parking and traffic management measures on Farr Avenue and the outcomes of the formal traffic assessment completed by Administration;
2. **SUPPORTS** Administration in continuing to monitor Farr Avenue, including heavy vehicle activity and parking behaviour, and to undertake increased enforcement activities where required;
3. **SUPPORTS** Administration in undertaking ongoing communication with staff and patrons of Beatty Park Leisure Centre and Beatty Park Reserve in respect to parking requirements; and
4. **SUPPORTS** Administration in reassessing the location should conditions materially change in the future, in accordance with the City's traffic assessment methodology.

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the motion be **AMENDED** by adding parts 5 and 6 as follows:

That in response to a petition received in February 2026 in relation to parking, traffic and amenity concerns on Farr Avenue, COUNCIL:

1. **NOTES** the request for parking and traffic management measures on Farr Avenue and the outcomes of the formal traffic assessment completed by Administration;
2. **SUPPORTS** Administration in continuing to monitor Farr Avenue, including heavy vehicle activity and parking behaviour, and to undertake increased enforcement activities where required;
3. **SUPPORTS** Administration in undertaking ongoing communication with staff and patrons of Beatty Park Leisure Centre and Beatty Park Reserve in respect to parking requirements; and
4. **SUPPORTS** Administration in reassessing the location should conditions materially change in the future, in accordance with the City's traffic assessment methodology;
5. **REQUESTS** Administration to install "No Bus Parking" Signage (Southern Side of Farr Avenue); and
6. **REQUESTS** Administration to investigate 'Residents Only' parking (Northern Side of Farr Avenue).

REASON:

Regarding part 5, while Beatty Park management actively monitors the parking of larger vehicles, particularly school buses, formal signage would provide unambiguous direction to drivers. This would reduce reliance on staff intervention and support more consistent compliance. This is a step up from the recommendation of “investigate” to “implementation”.

Regarding part 6, restricting parking on this side of the street to residents only would help minimise driveway obstructions and improve vehicle manoeuvrability along what is an undeniably narrow roadway. This proposal is not intended to establish a broader precedent, but rather to address a specific, localised issue through a considered, place-based response.

Farr Avenue’s constrained width, combined with parking on both sides, creates significant challenges for safe and efficient navigation. This concern extends beyond proximity to a public facility and instead reflects the physical limitations of the street itself, including the absence of verges and the resulting impact on residents’ ability to safely access their properties.

While the existing framework suggests that an 85% parking occupancy threshold should be met before introducing restrictions, this measure does not adequately account for the unique conditions present on Farr Avenue and risks drawing an overly simplistic comparison that does not reflect the realities on the ground.

These are modest, practical steps—but they directly reflect the lived experience of residents and would make a noticeable difference to how the street functions day to day.

ADMINISTRATION’S COMMENT:

Amendment supported.

In respect to part 5, appropriate bus parking prohibition signage can be installed.

In respect to part 6, Administration will investigate the potential for ‘resident only’ parking at this location; in doing so it will consider other locations where similar requests have been made and identify any unique conditions that may differentiate Farr Avenue as warranting this consideration. This investigation can be part of the greater work being undertaken in respect to the review of the Parking Permit Policy.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (7-1)

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

Against: Cr Wheadon

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1

1. **NOTES the request for parking and traffic management measures on Farr Avenue and the outcomes of the formal traffic assessment completed by Administration;**
2. **SUPPORTS Administration in continuing to monitor Farr Avenue, including heavy vehicle activity and parking behaviour, and to undertake increased enforcement activities where required;**
3. **SUPPORTS Administration in undertaking ongoing communication with staff and patrons of Beatty Park Leisure Centre and Beatty Park Reserve in respect to parking requirements; and**
4. **SUPPORTS Administration in reassessing the location should conditions materially change in the future, in accordance with the City’s traffic assessment methodology.**
5. **REQUESTS Administration to install “No Bus Parking” Signage (Southern Side of Farr Avenue); and**
6. **REQUESTS Administration to investigate ‘Residents Only’ parking (Northern Side of Farr Avenue).**

CARRIED (8-0)




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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.01pm Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

12.1 APPROVAL TO ADVERTISE AMENDED COUNCIL MEMBER CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY - STANDARD AMENDMENT

- Attachments:
1. Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy - 2026 review (tracked) 
 2. Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy - 2026 review (clean) 
 3. WALGA Template Policy - Council Member Continuing Professional Development 

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES the proposed amendments to the Council Member Continuing Professional Development Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation.

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That Council APPROVES the proposed amendments to the Council Member Continuing Professional Development Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, **with the following changes:**

That Section 2 *Accessing professional development* of the policy is amended as follows:

~~No more than two council members are permitted to be on an extended CPD absence at the same time, unless otherwise approved by Council.~~

~~The CEO is authorised to approve requests from Council Members for professional development based on consultation with the Mayor and provided that **the training, development or conference is:**~~

- ~~• **The training, development or conference is** organised by an identified, industry recognised training provider; **and**~~
- ~~• **The training, development or conference is** held within the Perth metropolitan region.; **and**~~
- ~~• **The training, development or conference does not conflict with scheduled Council or Committee meetings.**~~

~~Any requests that do not meet the above criteria, **including those for attendance at courses or conferences outside of the Perth metropolitan region** are to be submitted to Council for consideration.~~

~~When assessing requests from Council Members for professional development, the CEO, in consultation with the Mayor, must consider scheduling conflicts with Council or Committee meetings and the potential impact on quorum requirements for those meetings.~~

REASON:

- 'Extended CPD absence' is undefined, so it's not clear when ordinary absence becomes extended.
- Limit of two council members is arbitrary and does not necessarily reflect the actual risk to quorum.
- A discretionary approach allows the CEO and Mayor to consider other anticipated Council Member absences to ensure quorum requirements are managed.
- Amendment also proposes removal of superfluous wording.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Administration supports this amendment.

The proposed changes clarify the operation of the policy by removing the undefined term "extended CPD absence," ensuring greater certainty and consistency in its application. The removal of a fixed numerical limit on Council Member absences avoids an arbitrary threshold that may not accurately reflect quorum risk in all circumstances.

A discretionary approach enables the CEO and Mayor to consider known and anticipated Council Member absences holistically, supporting proactive management of quorum requirements.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1

That Council **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Council Member Continuing Professional Development Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of community consultation, with the following changes:

That Section 2 *Accessing professional development* of the policy is amended as follows:

~~No more than two council members are permitted to be on an extended CPD absence at the same time, unless otherwise approved by Council.~~

The CEO is authorised to approve requests from Council Members for professional development based on consultation with the Mayor and provided that the training, development or conference is:

- ~~The training, development or conference is organised by an identified, industry recognised training provider; and~~
- ~~The training, development or conference is held within the Perth metropolitan region.; and~~
- ~~The training, development or conference does not conflict with scheduled Council or Committee meetings.~~

~~Any requests that do not meet the above criteria, including those for attendance at courses or conferences outside of the Perth metropolitan region are to be submitted to Council for consideration.~~

When assessing requests from Council Members for professional development, the CEO, in consultation with the Mayor, must consider scheduling conflicts with Council or Committee meetings and the potential impact on quorum requirements for those meetings.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.06pm Principal Engineer, Traffic & Transport left the meeting and did not return.

12.3 ELECTORAL REFORM – WALGA SECTOR CONSULTATION

- Attachments:
1. WALGA Sector Consultation Paper 
 2. WALGA Electoral Reform Discussion Paper 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council CONFIRMS its position in response to the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Sector Consultation on Electoral Reform, as set out in the table contained within this report.

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That Council CONFIRMS its position in response to the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Sector Consultation on Electoral Reform, as set out in the table contained within this report, **with the following modifications:**

1. **Question 2 – “What are the key considerations informing this view?”**
Amend the City of Vincent position to include an explicit reference to Council’s governance model, by adding the following sentence to the existing response:

“Council operates more like a Board than a Parliament, and contemporary good governance practice for Boards supports half spill appointments to ensure continuity of corporate knowledge and to minimise disruption to organisational functioning.”
2. **Question 5 – “Does your Local Government support compulsory voting or voluntary voting in Local Government elections?”**
Amend the City of Vincent position to qualify Council’s support for compulsory voting by replacing the existing response with the following:

“The City supports compulsory voting at Local Government elections, subject to any additional costs associated with the introduction of compulsory voting being borne by the State Government, and subject to clarity regarding the inclusion of businesses on the electoral roll.”

REASON:

The proposed amendment seeks to more clearly articulate the rationale underpinning Council’s existing position on biennial (half spill) elections, by explicitly linking that position to recognised Board governance principles.

The amendment also clarifies Council’s support for compulsory voting by acknowledging the importance of cost responsibility and electoral roll composition, ensuring that Council’s position is accurate, balanced and reflective of practical implementation considerations.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Administration supports the intent of the proposed amendment.

The amendments do not alter Council's underlying position but provide additional clarity and qualification to the existing responses contained within the table. This ensures Council's submission to WALGA accurately reflects its governance rationale and acknowledges outstanding financial and implementation considerations associated with compulsory voting.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3**AMENDMENT**

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

That Council CONFIRMS its position in response to the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Sector Consultation on Electoral Reform, as set out in the table contained within this report, **with the following modifications:**

1. **Question 3 – “If full spill elections every four years were introduced, what transitional arrangements and consequential amendments may be required?”**

Delete: *This has not been specifically considered by Council. Further assessment would be required if this reform were progressed, including transitional arrangements relating to Council Member terms, election timing and any required legislative amendments.*

Insert: *Full spill elections should be grandfathered so that Council Members who are currently elected do not have their terms reduced or prematurely terminated. This would support continuity of governance, fairness, and the mandate provided by the community to Council Members at the time of their election.*

Further assessment would be required if this reform were progressed, including consideration of election timing, transitional arrangements and any required legislative amendments.

2. **Question 6 – “If the frequency of Local Government elections were changed to every four years, would your Local Government support compulsory or voluntary voting?”**

Delete: *The City supports compulsory voting; however, this specific scenario has not been separately considered by Council and would require further assessment if progressed.*

Insert: *The City supports compulsory voting, consistent with its response to Question 5. Under a four-year election cycle, compulsory voting would become more important, as opportunities to refresh Council representation would occur less frequently than under the current staggered election model. Compulsory voting would assist in ensuring that less frequent elections reflect broad and representative community participation.*

REASON:

The proposed amendment seeks to ensure that Council’s response to the WALGA consultation reflects a considered and complete position on transitional arrangements associated with a potential move to full spill elections.

The amendment also clarifies Council’s support for compulsory voting in the context of a four-year election cycle, replacing statements that the matter has not been considered with a reasoned position that aligns with Council’s broader democratic principles.

ADMINISTRATION’S COMMENT:

Administration supports the intent of the proposed amendment.

The amendment provides additional clarity to Council’s position on transitional arrangements and compulsory voting without altering Council’s broader advocacy stance. The revised responses strengthen the submission by ensuring Council’s position is clearly articulated and appropriately reasoned for inclusion in WALGA’s consultation process.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (8-0)

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

Wheadon

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

That Council CONFIRMS its position in response to the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Sector Consultation on Electoral Reform, as set out in the table contained within this report, with the following modifications:

1. Question 2 – “What are the key considerations informing this view?”
Amend the City of Vincent position to include an explicit reference to Council’s governance model, by adding the following sentence to the existing response:

“Council operates more like a Board than a Parliament, and contemporary good governance practice for Boards supports half spill appointments to ensure continuity of corporate knowledge and to minimise disruption to organisational functioning.”

2. Question 3 – “If full spill elections every four years were introduced, what transitional arrangements and consequential amendments may be required?”

Delete: This has not been specifically considered by Council. Further assessment would be required if this reform were progressed, including transitional arrangements relating to Council Member terms, election timing and any required legislative amendments.

Insert: Full spill elections should be grandfathered so that Council Members who are currently elected do not have their terms reduced or prematurely terminated. This would support continuity of governance, fairness, and the mandate provided by the community to Council Members at the time of their election.

Further assessment would be required if this reform were progressed, including consideration of election timing, transitional arrangements and any required legislative amendments.

3. Question 5 – “Does your Local Government support compulsory voting or voluntary voting in Local Government elections?”

Amend the City of Vincent position to qualify Council’s support for compulsory voting by replacing the existing response with the following:

“The City supports compulsory voting at Local Government elections, subject to any additional costs associated with the introduction of compulsory voting being borne by the State Government, and subject to clarity regarding the inclusion of businesses on the electoral roll.”

4. Question 6 – “If the frequency of Local Government elections were changed to every four years, would your Local Government support compulsory or voluntary voting?”

Delete: The City supports compulsory voting; however, this specific scenario has not been separately considered by Council and would require further assessment if progressed.

Insert: The City supports compulsory voting, consistent with its response to Question 5. Under a four-year election cycle, compulsory voting would become more important, as

opportunities to refresh Council representation would occur less frequently than under the current staggered election model. Compulsory voting would assist in ensuring that less frequent elections reflect broad and representative community participation.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

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

Nil

15 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

16 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

17 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**COUNCIL DECISION****Moved: Cr Wheadon, Seconded: Cr Greer**

Pursuant to Section 5.23(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and clause 2.14 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, Council moves that the meeting proceeds “behind closed doors” to consider the item 17.1.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.24pm the livestream was paused to consider Item 17.1 Proposed Major Land Transaction.
At 7.24pm Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability left the meeting and did not return.
At 7.24pm Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the Council resume an “open meeting”.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 7.26pm after consideration of Item 17.1 the livestream resumed and the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon advised that the below decision had been made behind closed doors.

17.1 PROPOSED MAJOR LAND TRANSACTION

Attachments:

1. Leederville Town Centre Redevelopment - Frame Court Revised Proposal
2. Major Land Transaction Business Plan
3. Major Land Transaction Business Plan - Appendix 1
4. Key Terms
5. Selection Criteria
6. Evaluation Panel Report and Recommendation
7. Valuation Report - The Avenue and Frame Court, Leederville - Car Parks (April 2026)

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the Major Land Transaction Business Plan at Attachment 2 and 3 for state-wide public notice as per section 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, to invite and consider submissions on the updated Business Plan before Council considers whether to enter into a major land transaction under section 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to execute a Heads of Agreement with the proponent in relation to the key terms as outlined in Attachment 4, provided that the Heads of Agreement is not a binding agreement to sell or undertake any redevelopment of the land due to the City's obligations under section 3.58 and 3.59 of the *Local Government Act 1995* that must be complied with before the City can agree to proceed with any major land transaction.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr Wallace was an apology for the Meeting.)

18 CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 7.26pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward
	Cr Con Poullos	North Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
	Cr Reece Wheadon	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	Joslin Colli	Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Emma Simmons	Coordinator Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Wendy Barnard	Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support

Public: No members of the public.

These Minutes were confirmed at the 19 May 2026 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 21 April 2026.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated: