



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

13 May 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country.....	4
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence.....	4
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	5
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice.....	12
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	17
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	17
6	Confirmation of Minutes	18
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	18
	7.1 Office of the Auditor General	18
8	Declarations of Interest	19
	Reports	19
	Items Approved "En Bloc":	20
	9.3 No. 188 (Lot: 1; D/P: 33790) Vincent Street, North Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship (Amendment to Approved).....	21
	9.6 Advertising of Draft Sustainable Vincent Framework and Enhanced Environment Strategy.....	22
	10.1 Draft Beaufort Street Precinct Area, Road Safety Implementation Plan	23
	10.5 RFT IE384-2025 HVAC Chiller Replacement - 246 Vincent Street Leederville	24
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 31 March 2025	25
	11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 March 2025 to 31 March 2025.....	26
	11.3 Investment Report as at 31 March 2025.....	27
	12.2 Advertising of Amended Policy - Attendance at Events Policy.....	28
	12.3 Information Bulletin	29
	Reports with Discussion.....	30
	9.1 No. 20 (Lot: 9; Plan: 1237) Grosvenor Road, Mount Lawley - Proposed Change of Use from Single House to Holiday House.....	30
	9.2 No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth - Proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Cafe to Restaurant/Cafe and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved).....	32
	10.4 Response to Petition - Closure of Green Street - Impact Of Increased Traffic on Ellesmere Street and Surrounds.....	33
	10.3 Response to Petition - Leake/Alma Street Eco-zoning.....	34
	9.5 Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List.....	35
	10.2 Beatty Park Reserve - Toilet Block Installation.....	36
	9.4 Review of Policy No. 7.5.23 - Construction Management Plans	40
	11.4 Event Sponsorship 2025/26 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	41
	11.5 Differential Rating Strategy 2025/26.....	43
	11.6 Adoption of the Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 - 2034/35	45
	12.1 Annual Review of Delegations [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	46
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....	48
	13.1 Notice of Motion - Cr Woolf and Cr Worner - LifeVac Devices Installed at City Of Vincent Community Facilities.....	48

14 Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....49
15 Representation on Committees and Public Bodies49
16 Urgent Business49
17 Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed49
18 Closure49

**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, 13 MAY 2025 AT 6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	<p>Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Sophie Greer Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</p>	<p>Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward</p>
IN ATTENDANCE:	<p>David MacLennan Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Karsen Reynolds Mitchell Hoad Lisa Williams Ruth Markham Sarah Hill Luke McGuirk Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development A/Manager Development & Design (left at 9.02pm after Item 12.1) A/Manager Strategic Planning (left at 9.02pm after Item 12.1) Executive Manager Communications and Engagement (left at 8.52pm after Item 11.5) Manager City Buildings and Asset Management (left at 8.31pm after Item 10.2) Manager Parks (left at 7.38pm after Item 10.3) Manager Engineering (left at 8.29pm after Item 10.2) A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support</p>

Public: Approximately 23 members of the public.

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

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

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

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

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

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

3.1 Lissa McGuire of Mt Lawley – Item 9.1

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

3.2 Alex Uchanski of North Perth – Item 9.2

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

3.3 M Morgan of North Perth – Item 9.2

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

3.4 Linda Harris of Leederville

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

The speaker further advised that a dog had recently been bitten by a snake in Britannia Reserve and had subsequently died.

She requested that the Council investigate the area and consider thinning out the undergrowth, particularly the lower branches of the woollybutt trees located close to nearby houses.

3.5 Claudia Papanoum of North Perth – Item 9.2

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

3.6 Daniel Habib of Mt Hawthorn – Item 10.4

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

3.7 Brenton Williams of North Perth - Item 9.2

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

3.8 Raffaella D'Alonzo of North Perth – Item 9.2

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

3.9 Shaun Oostrik of North Perth - Item 10.3

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

3.10 Marie Marie Slyth of West Perth – Item 9.5

Marie Slyth submitted the below comments in writing and spoke to them. Her full statement can be heard [here](#).

My statement/request:

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

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

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

My statement/request in effort to protect my house:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Taxi situation in Carr Street

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.11 Alf Parolo of West Perth - Item 9.5 and 10.2

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

3.12 Stephen Beaumont of Highgate

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

The speaker further proposed reallocating funds currently allocated to the Noongar Patrol towards the installation of CCTV cameras for individual businesses, with footage that can be accessed by other businesses in the area. He asked whether the Council would consider this reallocation of funding.

3.13 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 10.2

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

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

Laurie Vosnakos of North Perth – Item 10.3

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

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

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

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

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

Some Background:

The park can be considered as 4 separate areas, each with an area of approximately 600m², for total area of 2,400m². Each area is approximately 15m wide and 40m long.

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

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

The second area also has some native plants along the eastern and southern border. A bench faces away from the playground area and the city skyline. The rest of the area is turf, which would equate to roughly 300m².

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

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

The turf area of this area would approximate 200-300m². This area had been identified for the location of Western Power infrastructure, which will further reduce the amount of turf area.

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

Concerns

Community Engagement

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

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

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

No where was it clear that comments could be made.

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

There was no local letter drop.

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

And perform a letter drop.

Council Approval

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

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

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

Comments Input/Feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This comment by Administration is erroneous.

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

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

3. Personal preference on park aesthetics

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

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

Benefits

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

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

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

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

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

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

In summary

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

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

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

All current benefits and future benefits should be analysed.

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

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

Christina Hoang of Mount Lawley – Item 9.1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Matthew Selby of Mt Lawley – Item 9.1

Hope the New Year has started well and further this matter, it has been brought to my attention that this residence is currently being advertised for commercial short stay rent via AirBnB.

In case this hasn't been brought to your attention, please see the link below.

https://www.airbnb.com.au/rooms/1315855590666353220?search_mode=regular_search&check_in=2025-01-23&check_out=2025-01-27&source_impression_id=p3_1735305202_P3GALjd8uxRurjJ2&previous_page_section_name=1000&federated_search_id=3677302d-a16b-4eeb-8b5a-8eaca6c0d123

I assume that approval to undertake this activity hasn't been obtained, but could you please advise?

If approval hasn't been obtained, this highlights the blatant disregard that such operators and owners have for due process of councils and the communities in which they seek to take advantage of and profit from.

In addition, yesterday evening when returning home I was blocked by a large Ford Transit people mover van "trying" to execute a three-point turn out this residence. This seemed unusual for the street and when I saw this van again in the morning it had multiple people loading their luggage into the van (please see attached a photo confirming) it confirmed to be that the property was indeed being rented.

Further, when returning home again this afternoon, there was a commercial cleaning van semi-parked on the driveway for this resident and the road to clean the property for the next visitor!!!

This experience over the past 24 hours demonstrates the adverse impacts that commercial short stay rentals do have on residential communities - so I do hope you take action to protect the local community and I look forward to your response.

Follow up email:

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

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

Hope you understand and do reject this proposal.

Dudley Maier of Highgate**Waste**

- 1.1. What was the total cost of the recent e-waste collection day?
 - 1.2. Did the City receive any grants from external bodies to fund the day?
 - 1.3. How much e-waste was collected?
 - 1.4. What is the total FTE for employees in the waste management section who work in an administrative role, and those employed 'in the field'?
2. Monthly expenditure for March shows a payment of \$5,000 to Rxxx Rxxx for "*Smarty Grants Heritage assistance Fund 5*".
- 2.1. What works were undertaken?
 - 2.2. What was the total cost of those works?
 - 2.3. Why is it described as "Smarty Grants"?
3. The City's Greentrack Program

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

4. Underground Power

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

- 4.1. Given that Western Power has identified a payment schedule, and given that when required to indicate their intentions, only 29.9% of owners for Area 1 indicated that they wish to pay over a 4-year period (i.e. 70% have chosen to, or have defaulted to pay up front), and given that the first cash call is due on 30 September 2025; when will the City take out the loan (estimated to be in the order of \$2.5 million) – for the first cash call, the second cash call etc?
- 4.2. The assumptions in the LTFP state that they were adopted nearly two years ago (June 2023) and included that up to 70% of property owners will choose to pay over a 4-year period. The need to cater for such a high level of time-payments was used as a reason for spacing out projects in order to reduce the 'lumpiness' and magnitude of borrowed funds. The administration has also confirmed that it has twice asked Western Power to delay projects to fit in with the financial model as it stood at that time. Given that the actual initial response from the community indicated that only 30% (not the 70% that was provided for) chose to pay over-time, will the City be reviewing the financial model to determine if future projects (which have previously been delayed) can be brought forward? If not, why not?

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

5. Drainage Truck

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

- 5.1. Do any other local governments have such a truck?
- 5.2. Was a full business case developed and presented to Council to justify such a large expenditure?
- 5.3. What is the expected level of utilisation for such a truck – will it be used seasonally or year-round?
- 5.4. Was the option of hiring such a device when required considered?

6. FOGO

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

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

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

- 6.1. Why is the administration claiming that FOGO has resulted in a 42% reduction of waste going to landfill when the figures clearly demonstrate that it is only approximately 19%?
- 6.2. Have the administration simply assumed that all 'waste' going to the MRC prior to the introduction of FOGO was sent to landfill rather than accepting that a significant proportion of material was already being diverted from landfill?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 17 June 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.38pm.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Loretta Tolnai of Perth

Administration has provided the responses below in italics:

I am writing to request a discussion at the meeting on Tuesday, 8th April, regarding how the Council can better manage vandalism and enhance the safety of its residents who use the laneway running parallel to Lord Street and Gladstone Street, behind our apartment in block 224-226 Lord Street. This laneway provides car access for those of us with garages that are only accessible via this laneway, as well as foot traffic for those of us who use the laneway to reach the local cafes and Gladstone Street Reserve.

I want to discuss:

1. Safety Concern:

How can the council facilitate the installation of a gate or door on the adjoining property (228 Lord Street)? The alcove is frequently used as a toilet, a hideout, and a rubbish storage area. It is continually tagged and vandalised. (FYI, the property remains primarily unoccupied for much of the year.) I've walked past this alcove several times on my own, only to be surprised by someone inside it. In winter, the alcove will undoubtedly be used more frequently, which presents a safety risk to those living in the area and those who have no choice but to use the laneway.

I recently disposed of rubbish in the alcove, and the shopping trolley there for weeks has also recently been removed. However, as you can see from the photograph, this alcove hideout poses a serious health and safety risk to residents.

The property is privately owned. The City will contact the owner to pass on the concerns and explore whether a gate or other measures can be provided to improve safety and amenity.

2. Clean up

When is the Council scheduling its next regular graffiti clean-up? A fellow ratepayer from the City of Vincent mentioned that the Council cleared all the graffiti a few years back, and I'd like to know when the next clean-up is set to occur.

In accordance with the City's Graffiti Management Policy the City will schedule the removal of the graffiti that abuts to City property (the laneway), is accessible from City property, does not carry an unacceptable level of risk, is clearly visible from the adjoining streets (Gladstone and Edward St), and is accessible from ground level. This will require signed waivers from the property owner prior to removal which we will seek to obtain.

The City is looking to target a series of focus areas for graffiti removal on an ongoing basis, predominately where this is clearly visible from the adjoining street. This is in very early stages of planning. Any acts of vandalism can be reported as and when they occur to WA Police on 131 444 or through the WA Police [Goodbye Graffiti](#) website which also forwards reports to the relevant asset owner for removal. The City will report this event to the WA Police via the Goodbye Graffiti website.

3. Graffiti treatment kits

Why aren't other ratepayers and residents informed about the availability of graffiti removal kits? I recently received a kit from the Council, along with two solar lights for our property, which was terrific. However, when I mentioned the kit to a local business owner, she said she didn't know these were available. Her business often gets tagged, including an artwork she funded.

The City is working on updates to the graffiti webpage which will include more details on how best to report graffiti, as well as ways to deter graffiti. This will include details of the graffiti removal packs and sensor lights the City makes available to residents and businesses. Our existing website includes a webform application for the Vincent Graffiti Safewipe Citizens' Packs which are available upon request.

4. Solar lights

Why aren't other ratepayers being informed about the solar lights meant to deter vandalism? A few weeks ago, when our garage entrance wall was vandalised, the solar light on a nearby building was wrenched from its hinges. It's likely the vandals removed the light to avoid being seen while they vandalised our garage entrance and several external walls in the lane. This light provided a sense of safety in what is otherwise a dark, narrow lane. More lighting in the laneway isn't just a 'nice to have'; it's something the Council must address.

The City currently offers solar lights to residents as long as they qualify as per the criteria. For further information please go to: [Application for Safer Vincent Solar Power Sensor Light » City of Vincent](#).

5. Surveillance cameras

Does the City of Vincent Council subsidise residents for installing cameras? We have paid for our own Eufy cameras to monitor the entrance to our garage. If these vandals are captured on camera and this footage is provided to the police, it could lead to possible charges being laid and, in turn, serve as a deterrent to other vandals. I think more cameras on the laneway will help to keep the vandalism down. I look forward to hearing from you.

The City does not currently offer a subsidy for private CCTV cameras. The City is about to commence a review of the Safer Vincent Plan, where a rebate scheme may be considered. We will advise you when the public consultation commences.

Dudley Maier of Highgate

Administration has provided the responses below in italics:

1. What is the status of the Leederville Structure Plan?

The Statutory Planning Committee (SPC) of the Western Australian Planning Commission considered the draft LPSP in May 2024. The SPC resolved to require modifications to be made, and for these to be advertised.

These modifications include the preparation of a community needs analysis to inform a community benefit framework, along with changes to the density coding and building height standards within some of the sub-precincts.

Administration is currently making the requested modifications before the draft LPSP is readvertised.

2. Responses to questions I have previously asked state that DAs for single houses and grouped dwellings are governed by the local housing objectives of the Built Form Policy that cover environmentally sustainable design outcomes. Clause P1.8.6 of the Built Form Policy (page 34) states that the applicant must demonstrate one of the performance standards listed.

The policy also states that a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) would be one way of demonstrating compliance with these requirements, and that recognised equivalents would be accepted although none are listed.

An answer I received on 11 February 2025 states that the WAPC is required to approve local housing objectives of Section 1.8 of the Built Form Policy and that the WAPC has not made a determination [see page 11, minutes 11 February 2025]. Yet an answer I received on 11 March 2025 states that "the WAPC's approval is not required for local housing objectives" (such as Clause 1.8).

Another answer I received states that LCAs are only required if an applicant opts in to the GreenTrack pathway.

Recent 'press releases' from the City indicate that only 21% of all single house and grouped dwelling applications have gone through the GreenTrack assessment service. A possible scenario being that only 21% of single and grouped dwelling applications had submitted a LCA, and conversely that 79% of applications have not submitted a LCA.

So the questions are:

- Do clauses 1.8 and 1.9 of the Built Form Policy require WAPC approval or not?

No. The WAPC's approval is not required for the local housing objectives of Clauses 1.8 and 1.9 of the Built Form Policy.

- are all development applications for single houses and grouped dwellings required to comply with clause P1.8.6 and demonstrate that they are capable of meeting the stated performance requirements?

No. Applications are accepted and assessed without a lifecycle assessment.

The Built Form Policy includes a number of local housing objectives related to ESD. The submission of a lifecycle assessment is one of these.

All applications would be assessed against Local Housing Objectives P1.8.1 to P1.8.6 of the Built Form Policy. This is because there is no corresponding deemed-to-comply standard/s for ESD.

A performance assessment would be carried out to consider the merits of a proposal against these local housing objectives. It would be possible to meet these overall objectives without the submission of a lifecycle assessment.

- If not, how do applicants know that they are not required to comply with the clause?

The City's supporting application checklists provide clarity that lifecycle assessments are not required for an application to be lodged.

Applicants are encouraged to contact the City if there are any questions about supporting information that is to accompany an application.

This would include any questions about the requirements for the GreenTrack pathway.

- Similarly, are all development applications for single houses and grouped dwellings required to submit an Urban Design Study in accordance with clause 1.9 of the Built Form Policy?

No. Applications are accepted and assessed without an Urban Design Study.

The Built Form Policy includes a number of local housing objectives related to urban design. An Urban Design Study would consider all of these local housing objectives.

All applications would be assessed against Local Housing Objectives P1.9.1 to P1.9.14 of the Built Form Policy. This is because there is no corresponding deemed-to-comply standard/s for an Urban Design Study.

A performance assessment would be carried out to consider the merits of a proposal against these local housing objectives. It would be possible to meet these overall objectives without the submission of an Urban Design Study.

- If development applications are being assessed and approved without an LCA or submitting an Urban Design Study, and given that the Built Form Policy does not explicitly state that these elements are optional, is the City bluffing applicants into submitting these documents when they are not in fact mandatory?

No. This is because the submission of an Urban Design Study and lifecycle assessment are valid local housing objectives within the Built Form Policy to inform the City's assessment of applications.

3. In late 2024 the City advertised the position of Executive Director Strategy and Development. The Position Description for this position shows that one of the positions under direct supervision is the Executive Assistant – Strategy and Development. The City has also recently advertised the positions of Manager Development and Design, and Manager Strategic Planning and Sustainability. Both of these positions show that each position has an Administration Officer under direct supervision. What is the aggregated Full Time Equivalent of these three supporting roles (i.e. Executive Assistant + Administration Officer + Administration Officer)?

The aggregated Full Time Equivalent of these three roles is 2.6.

Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

Administration has provided the responses below in italics:

As a major stakeholder in matters related to stormwater infrastructure, drainage and associated flooding issues, I'm extremely disappointed that I was not informed, engaged or consulted in regards to the Menzies Park drainage project. It is particularly interesting and concerning to note that I'd proposed Menzies Park as a potential location for a storm water storage and infiltration system last year, despite this this, there was no follow up or engagement with me regarding the project that has now taken place.

Consultation with the effected residents was completed via a letter drop and details put on the public website link [News Story - Menzies Park drainage project » City of Vincent](#)

I request full transparency on the following:

- The total cost of the installed system, including the storage and installation ground works and turf replacement.
Breakdown of the costs are not yet known as the project is still in progress.
- Any assessments or planning documents that inform the design and scope of the system.
- *The drainage system has been designed to the applicable standards, to mitigate the risk and severity of flooding. The capacity of the system is 300m3 which increases the capacity of the existing system."*

Previously, I raised concerns about the negative impacts of the built environment on my health and well-being with the designated and authorised senior Public Health Officer and the designated and authorized Manager of Public Health. These concerns are not isolated to me, but approximately 50 other residents as well. Unfortunately, I've yet to receive any response from these officers. My correspondence was redirected to the executive level staff, which I find inappropriate given the specific public health implications involved. I now seek clarification on the formal qualifications held by these executives in relation to public health, given they are now handling matters of significant health and well-being importance, I'll forward the relevant details and correspondence to the governance Department for review and appropriate action.

I respectfully request a formal response addressing the following.

- Why, as a key stakeholder, was I not consulted or engaged on the Menzies Park project?
The City targets stakeholder consultation on drainage works based on the scale of works and potential Impact. Consultation on the works at Menzies Park focused on those within the immediate catchment area.
- What is the breakdown of the total cost of the drainage system, recently installed at Menzies Park.
Breakdown of the costs are not yet known as the project is still in progress.

- What formal qualifications do the City of Vincent Executives hold in relation to public health.

The City's executives do not hold formal public health qualifications. The response provided by the executives were informed by qualified public health staff at the City. Senior management regularly coordinate responses on behalf of the organisation, based on input from subject matter experts.

- What are the details of the City of Vincent's most recent and current drainage truck?
- *The City of Vincent has previously contracted the cleaning of drainage pits and has not owned a drainage truck in the (recent) past. The City will be able to escalate service levels to drainage pit cleaning and maintenance, which will in turn optimise the service capacity of the drainage system.*

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Brian Omondi of Perth made a deputation to Item 13.1.

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

Content Warning: This recording contains distressing content regarding the loss of a child. Viewer discretion is advised.

5.2 Stan Dziecol of Mt Lawley made a deputation to Item 9.1.

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

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

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

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 8 April 2025 be confirmed.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

7.1 OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

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

Councillors will remember that last month I talked about some of the challenges local governments are facing in terms of having our audits performed by the Office of the Auditor General (OAG), principally around the significantly increased costs associated with that.

I have since met with the Auditor General and discussed these challenges. The Auditor General is investigating potential solutions to ensure that audits moving forward are more cost-effective for local governments.

I have also reiterated that I'm supportive of the changes, which were passed in Parliament, to have the OAG undertake those oversights because it means you get a sector-wide approach as to what is happening with audits. It also means that there is an extra layer of protection for ratepayers and residents to have that extra pair of eyes looking at what's happening with local government finances.

It is very pleasing that the OAG, who is taking this sector-wide approach, has recognised the City of Vincent as one of the 2023/24 best practice entities for performance across a number of criteria, including a clear opinion, the timely preparation and certification of statements for audit, high-quality financial reporting and working papers, and maintenance of good financial management controls.

This has since been tabled in Parliament. As was rightly pointed out, we are one of the more complex entities that ended up in the top 20 and one of only three metropolitan councils to have achieved that outcome.

Congratulations to the team, who worked really hard to ensure this outcome. It is wonderful to have this recognised. It is important for our residents and our ratepayers to be able to have that independent verification and confidence that the books are being kept appropriately. Well done.

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 Cr Suzanne Worner declared a financial interest in Item 11.4 Event Sponsorship 2025/26. The extent of her interest is that she is the General Manager of Revelation Perth International Film Festival, one of the events which has applied for funding. She is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.
- 8.2 Cr Ashley Wallace declared a financial interest in Item 9.5 Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List. The extent of his interest is that his house is included in the heritage list. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.
- 8.3 Cr Ron Alexander declared a financial interest in Item 9.5 Advertising of Local Heritage Survey and Amended Heritage List. The extent of his interest is that his house is included in the heritage list. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote in the matter.

REPORTS

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

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**
Items 9.1, 9.2, 9.5, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 13.1
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Items 11.4 and 12.1
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Items 9.5 and 11.4.

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	11.5 and 11.6
Cr Woolf	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 9.3, 9.6, 10.1, 10.5, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.2 and 12.3
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**
Nil

ITEMS APPROVED "EN BLOC":

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

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Worner

**That the following unopposed items be adopted "En Bloc", as recommended:
Items 9.3, 9.6, 10.1, 10.5, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.2 and 12.3**

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

Ward: South

Attachments:

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, **APPROVES** the application for Alterations and Additions to Place of Worship (Amendment to Approved) at No. 188 (Lot: 1; D/P: 33790) Vincent Street, North Perth, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions, requirements and advice notes detailed on the development approvals 5.2022.280.1 granted on 13 December 2022 and 5.2023.117.1 granted on 19 September 2023 continue to apply to this approval, except as follows:

1.1 Condition 1 is deleted and replaced as follows:

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

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

1.2 Condition 8 is added as follows:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

9.6 ADVERTISING OF DRAFT SUSTAINABLE VINCENT FRAMEWORK AND ENHANCED ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY

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

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.6

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (9-0)

10.1 DRAFT BEAUFORT STREET PRECINCT AREA, ROAD SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **NOTES** the draft to date of the proposed Highgate Precinct Road Safety Implementation Plan, its key modelling findings and potential treatments as detailed in Attachment 1;
2. **REQUESTS** Administration to engage with the Highgate and Mt Lawley community and inform it of the precinct wide modelling and findings, and seek feedback on the potential treatments;
3. **REQUESTS** that the final Road Safety Implementation Plan be presented to the Council Workshop in early 2026, incorporating –
 - a. the Mount Lawley Precinct Area;
 - b. community feedback on the findings and proposed treatments; and
 - c. consideration of the North Perth Precinct Traffic Study.
4. **SUPPORTS** Administration in undertaking preparatory designs for the potential treatments to facilitate the community consultation process and to obtain preliminary in-principal support from Main Roads WA; and
5. **NOTES** construction work for the potential treatments is subject to Council's adoption of the final Road Safety Implementation Plan and an understanding of any funding implications.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

10.5 RFT IE384-2025 HVAC CHILLER REPLACEMENT - 246 VINCENT STREET LEEDERVILLE**Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE384-2025 - Confidential****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.5**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Worner****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)**

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 MARCH 2025

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 31 March 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

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

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

Recommendation:

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 MARCH 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 31 March 25 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.2 ADVERTISING OF AMENDED POLICY - ATTENDANCE AT EVENTS POLICY

Attachments: 1. Attendance at Events Policy - marked up 

RECOMMENDATION

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.3 INFORMATION BULLETIN

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated May 2025.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

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

Ward: South Ward

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

9.2 NO. 500 (LOT: 41; D/P: 418433) FITZGERALD STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM RESTAURANT/CAFE TO RESTAURANT/CAFE AND SMALL BAR (AMENDMENT TO APPROVED)

Ward: South

- Attachments:
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Acoustic Assessment 
 4. Previous Joint Development Assessment Panel Approval 
 5. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
 6. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
 7. Clause 67 Assessment 
 8. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 REFUSES the development application for a proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Café to Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) at No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth, for the following reasons:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

Attachments: 1. Petition - Ellesmere Street - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.4

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

10.3 RESPONSE TO PETITION - LEAKE/ALMA STREET ECO-ZONING**Attachments:** 1. **Leake/Alma Street Reserve - Amended Eco-Zoning Plan** **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.3**Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (5-4)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Hallett and Cr Greer**Against:** Cr Alexander, Cr Woolf, Cr Wallace and Cr La Fontaine

At 7.38pm Manager Parks left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:39 pm, Cr Ron Alexander left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.
At 7:39 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.

9.5 ADVERTISING OF LOCAL HERITAGE SURVEY AND AMENDED HERITAGE LIST

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

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (7-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

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

At 7:41 pm, Cr Ashley Wallace returned to the meeting.
At 7:41 pm, Cr Ron Alexander returned to the meeting.

10.2 BEATTY PARK RESERVE - TOILET BLOCK INSTALLATION

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2

Moved: Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

LOST (4-5)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner and Cr Woolf

Against: Cr Alexander, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That Council:

1. **ENDORSES** in principle the installation of a toilet block including storeroom at Beatty Park Reserve;
2. **NOTES** the \$100,000 commitment from Perth Soccer Club through the Women's World Cup Legacy Funding program to partially fund this project;
3. **APPROVES** the allocation of up to \$40,000 for detailed design of the toilet block by a registered architect, and this cost be reflected in the total Capital Works Budget for project delivery;
4. ~~**REQUESTS** Administration, in conjunction with the engaged architect, to reconsider the location of the proposed block, including the location of the former Alfred Spencer Pavilion; and~~
5. **REQUESTS** the final location, design and budget are presented to Council for authorisation prior to construction.

REASON:

Beatty Park reserve is a historic, heritage area within the City and any new public infrastructure should respond appropriately to this and strive to achieve the City's own built form objectives.

The City's Built Form Policy sets out several objectives for development in the City, including:

- Be respectful of local and historic context

- Maintain and enhance amenity
- Integrate land use, public space and the form of the built environment to enable attractive, interesting outcomes for people
- Be high quality and well-designed, including both buildings and landscaping
- Contribute to public space through design and maximise street-level interest, articulation and openness...
- Respond to the changing needs of the community, environment and the economy over time in an efficient, functional and attractive manner

The proposed 'modular' design does not meet many of these objectives, in particular those related to visual amenity and sustainability, due to its design and materiality being driven largely by cost.

The proposed budget of \$180k (building plus hardstand pad, excluding contingency) equates to approximately \$7k/sqm. A moderate increase in the budget would deliver a far better design outcome and a greater life expectancy.

Regarding the location, there is a significant cost-saving available - circa \$50k - if the new block is located in the position of the former pavilion. It was noted at the 6 May briefing that this location was not proposed due to perceived community opposition to the location, however the community was not given the opportunity to provide this feedback due to it being excluded from the consultation plan. The architect should be provided the option of this location, and further consultation could be undertaken if it is considered the most appropriate location.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Design Review Feedback:

To address concerns raised regarding design and alignment with the City's Built Form Policy, the modular proposal was reviewed by a member of the City's Design Review Panel.

Key comments include:

1. ***The appropriateness of the location of the proposed toilet block when considering the site context.***
 - *Preferred option 2 appears suitable. It is located in proximity to the later playground additions to the park and has no impact on its existing planning.*
 - *This portion of the park is less intact than others given the inclusion of the playground and is therefore most suitable for the proposed works.*
 - *The location has no adverse impact on the adjoining Beatty Park Leisure Centre which is setback from the proposed toilet block location with no significant views or vistas of the place impacted.*
 - *The proposed building will not adversely alter the setting or context of the Leisure Centre or the Park and is in keeping with typical recreation reserve structures.*
2. ***The suitability of the design in considering the context and existing built form on the site.***
 - *Modest modular design of the toilet block appears visually recessive to the notably architecturally significant leisure centre. Being single storey skillion roofed structure with a simple front veranda.*
3. ***Any detailed design elements that should be considered including materials and finishes.***
 - *Chosen blue exterior cladding appropriately responds to the blue elements of the Leisure Centre no other detailed design elements are required.*
4. ***The presentation of the building to the oval and car park.***
 - *The proposed toilet block appears to have a suitable presentation to the oval and park.*
 - *Its modular construction and modest contemporary architecture are typical for its type and consistent with others located in the City, so it will not look out of place or draw undue attention away from the places noted cultural heritage significance.*
5. ***Any other relevant comments relating to the design and location of the development.***
 - *N/A the design and location appear suitable*
 - *The modular nature of the building means it can be readily removed in the future with no ongoing adverse impact to the heritage place. This is in accordance with the ICOMOS Burra Charter Principles.*
 - *The proposed toilet block appears is in accordance with City's Local Planning Policy: Development Guidelines for Heritage Places particularly in regard to scale, setting and materiality.*

The purpose of the Design Review Panel is to provide expert advice on design matters to ensure that development proposals align with the City's Built Form Policy and contribute positively to the urban environment.

Site Selection Considerations:

The two potential locations were preferred due to the existing infrastructure and benefits they offer, including:

- Connectivity with Beatty Park Leisure Centre and the broader precinct.
- Opportunities for passive surveillance to enhance safety.
- Proximity to the existing playground, enabling combined community consultation with the upcoming playground renewal project.
- Accessibility, including connections to the existing path network and nearby car park.
- Availability of existing lighting infrastructure, improving visibility, safety, and cost-efficiency.

The former Alfred Spencer Pavilion site was excluded from the public consultation process due to its proximity to residential properties—particularly 1A Emmerson Street, which was constructed after the pavilion's demolition. This proposed location is approximately 10 metres from that property and others along Emmerson Street and Charles Street.



Image 1 – Demonstrates proximity to Farr Ave and Emmerson Street properties.

In comparison, Location 2—which is currently preferred—is situated approximately 50 metres from the nearest properties along Farr Avenue, offering greater separation and reduced residential interface. Although connection to services for Location 2 would involve additional construction costs, the former Alfred Spencer Pavilion Site (Emmerson Street) lacked the existing infrastructure and benefits available at the alternative sites. These would need to be carefully considered, including the feasibility of utility connections and potential impacts on the surrounding environment and infrastructure.

Given the proximity of the former pavilion site to private residences, the use of this location for a public toilet facility would likely undermine the City's Built Form Policy objective to "maintain and enhance amenity," by introducing potential impacts to visual and residential amenity that are not present at the alternative site.

Financial Implications:

Delays in the project could result in the \$100,000 Women's World Cup Legacy Funding contribution from Perth Soccer Club being withdrawn and redirected to another project to meet funding deadlines (31 December 2025). Without this contribution, the City would be responsible for the full \$300,000 project cost.

Consequently, the Alternate Motion is not supported by Administration.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2**AMENDED ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

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

That the proposed Alternative Recommendation be updated as below:

That Council:

1. ENDORSES in principle the installation of a toilet block including storeroom at Beatty Park Reserve;
2. NOTES the \$100,000 commitment from Perth Soccer Club through the Women's World Cup Legacy Funding program to partially fund this project;
- ~~3. APPROVES the allocation of up to \$40,000 for detailed design of the toilet block by a registered architect, and this cost be reflected in the total Capital Works Budget for project delivery;~~
4. REQUESTS the final location, design and budget are presented to Council for authorisation prior to construction.

CARRIED (6-3)

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

Against: Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace and Cr La Fontaine

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2

Moved: Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Hallett

That Council:

1. ENDORSES in principle the installation of a toilet block including storeroom at Beatty Park Reserve;
2. NOTES the \$100,000 commitment from Perth Soccer Club through the Women's World Cup Legacy Funding program to partially fund this project;
3. REQUESTS the final location, design and budget are presented to Council for authorisation prior to construction.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

At 8.29pm Manager Engineering left the meeting and did not return.

At 8.31pm Manager City Buildings and Asset Management left the meeting and did not return.

9.4 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 7.5.23 - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

At 8:36 pm, Cr Suzanne Worner left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest.

11.4 EVENT SPONSORSHIP 2025/26

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

At 8:39 pm, Cr Suzanne Worner returned to the meeting.

11.5 DIFFERENTIAL RATING STRATEGY 2025/26

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

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

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the Recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council:

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

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

REASON:

To act as a deterrent against landowners holding vacant residential land long term without an intention to develop.

ADMINISTRATION’S COMMENT:

Supported.

The City’s Vacant Residential differential rate is designed to encourage development of vacant properties, improving the City’s streetscape and stimulating growth and development in the Community. Increasing the rate in the dollar and minimum rate for the Vacant Residential properties further supports this intention.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5

That Council:

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

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

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

At 8.52pm Executive Manager Communications and Engagement left the meeting and did not return.

11.6 ADOPTION OF THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2025/26 - 2034/35**Attachments:** 1. Long Term Financial Plan 2026 - 2035 **RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.6**Moved:** Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace**That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED (9-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Nil

12.1 ANNUAL REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council:

1. NOTES the annual review of its delegations in accordance with Section 5.46(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, as outlined in this report; and
2. DELEGATES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the local government functions listed in the City's Council Delegated Authority Register included as Attachment 1 **and subject to Delegation 16.1.1 being amended to also include a new condition 13 as follows:**
 13. **This delegation does not extend to the approval of applications for Holiday House or Holiday Accommodation land uses where the accommodation is un-hosted (i.e. no permanent resident is present on-site), unless the development approval includes a condition that limits the duration of the approval.**

REASON:

Un-hosted short-term rental accommodation can affect the character of residential areas. They may be poorly managed and operate in ways that do not align with residential amenity. Council oversight of approvals granted in perpetuity is important to ensure these uses do not permanently change the character of Vincent's neighbourhoods.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Administration has no objection to the proposed change to the conditions of the delegation.

The City's Short Term Accommodation Policy currently notes that proposals for short-term accommodation may be subject to time-limited approvals where they do not meet the Acceptable Development criteria. The Policy however does not provide clear criteria about the application of the time-limited approval.

The current review of this Policy presents a timely opportunity to strengthen this guidance and provide greater clarity and certainty for both applicants and the community, particularly in determining the circumstances for which a time limitation is appropriate and how long it should apply.

[Impacts to Development Application Processing](#)

Between July and December 2024, Administration approved 3 Short-Term Rental Accommodation (STRA) applications, 2 of which were granted permanent approval.

Following the implementation of the State Government STRA Register on 1 January 2025, the volume of STRA applications has increased significantly.

Since 1 January 2025, Administration has approved a total of 10 STRA applications under delegated authority, with 6 granted permanent approval.

Given these trends, and with the proposed delegation changes, Council could expect approximately 1-2 additional reports per month for development applications seeking permanent approval for STRA's.

Administration currently has 21 STRA applications currently awaiting determination. There are also approximately 120 un-hosted STRA's on the register that do not require approval if operating under State Government exemptions.

AMENDMENT CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1

That Council:

1. **NOTES the annual review of its delegations in accordance with Section 5.46(2) of the Local Government Act 1995, as outlined in this report; and**
2. **DELEGATES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the local government functions listed in the City's Council Delegated Authority Register included as Attachment 1 and subject to Delegation 16.1.1 being amended to also include a new condition 13 as follows:**
 13. **This delegation does not extend to the approval of applications for Holiday House or Holiday Accommodation land uses where the accommodation is un-hosted (i.e. no permanent resident is present on-site), unless the development approval includes a condition that limits the duration of the approval.**

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

At 9.02pm A/Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

At 9.02pm A/Manager Strategic Planning left the meeting and did not return.

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - CR WOOLF AND CR WORNER - LIFEVAC DEVICES INSTALLED AT CITY OF VINCENT COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

That Council REQUESTS that:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.1

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

Nil

15 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

16 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

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

Nil

18 CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 9.12pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Ron Alexander Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Sophie Greer Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Emma Simmons Wendy Barnard	Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support

Public: Approximately one member of the public.

These Minutes were confirmed at the 17 June 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 13 May 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated: