



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

17 June 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country.....	3
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence.....	3
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	3
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice.....	9
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	19
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	19
6	Confirmation of Minutes	20
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	20
	7.1 Traditional Totems Gifted in Tribute to City's Commitment to First Nations Engagement.....	20
	7.2 Display of Historical Police Map Highlights Local Policing History	20
8	Declarations of Interest	20
	Reports	21
	Items Approved " <i>En Bloc</i> ":	21
	9.1 Advertising of Amended Planning and Building Policy Manual Appendix 20 - Refunding and Waiving Planning and Building Fees.....	22
	10.2 RFT IE426/2025 Hire of Skid Steer Loader Associated Plant (Truck) & Operator	23
	11.2 Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 April 2025 to 30 April 2025	24
	11.3 Investment Report as at 30 April 2025	25
	12.3 Information Bulletin	26
	Reports with Discussion.....	27
	10.1 Lifevac Device Installation at Community Facilities.....	27
	9.2 State Administrative Tribunal - Section 31 Reconsideration - No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley - Reconsideration of Heritage Conservation Notice	29
	9.3 Health Services - Historical Sundry Debtors 2018/19 - 2022/23 - Debt Write Off [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	33
	11.1 Financial Statements as at 30 April 2025	34
	11.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	35
	12.1 Adoption of Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 - 2028/2029 and the Four Year Capital Works Program 2025/26 – 2028/29 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	46
	12.2 Reappointment of Chairperson and Deputy Chair Audit and Risk Committee [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	47
9	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....	48
10	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion).....	48
11	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	48
12	Urgent Business	48
13	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	48
14	Closure	48

**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE
ON TUESDAY, 17 JUNE 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 (attended electronically) South Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward</p>
IN ATTENDANCE:	<p>Rhys Taylor Peter Varris Jay Naidoo Emma Simmons Dale Morrissy Karsen Reynolds Mitchell Hoad Prue Reddingius Sarah Hill Alex Harris Carrie Miller</p>	<p>A/Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Strategy & Development A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Manager Community Facilities (left at 6:43pm after Item 10.1) Manager Development & Design (left at 6:29pm before Item 10.1) Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability (left at 7:00pm after Item 9.2) Manager Public Health and Built Environment Manager Parks (left at 6:30pm before Item 10.1) Governance Officer Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer</p>
Public:	Approximately 11 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, and acknowledge that as a Council the City of Vincent has a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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 Vera Saragih of North Perth

Vera Saragih submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

I have been a City Of Vincent ratepayer for over 7 years and would like to comment on the draft Short Term Accommodation Policy . I do think that Short Term Accommodation greatly increases the profile of the City of Vincent and encourages visitors from regional WA, nationally and internationally. I think the attractions in the City of Vincent represent some of the best things about Perth – the parks and outdoor areas, the café culture, the ease of walking and biking – not to mention Beatty Park.

A property can be set up for short term, or set up for long term – it cannot be regularly used for long term then suddenly, for a weekend, be used as short term. This would attract security risks and hygiene risks – not to mention the intense effort of practical things like packing up all one’s clothes and ensuring the fridge was empty – because nobody wants to come to an unhosted short term accommodation place where the owner’s clothes are still in the cupboards and wilted lettuce in the fridge.

This is why the 90 day time limit just won’t work.

One of the things that attract me to Short Term Accommodation is the flexibility of using my property for my own purposes when I want to such as when family members come to visit at Christmas times or when friends need a place to stay for a brief period. I’m not bound by the ever restrictive requirements of the Residential Tenancy Act.

I am also passionate about ensuring that those who have had less opportunities in life get a fair go such as single mothers, those for whom English is a second language, and those who haven’t had the benefit of a formal higher education. These groups are highly represented in the short term accommodation industry as property cleaners, linen providers, delivery drivers, and other trades. I feel like the draft Policy does not represent the City of Vincent’s Access and Inclusion Plan 2022-2027, specifically of “promoting inclusive employment practices within the City”.

The draft Policy, if implemented, would deprive owners of the flexibility in using their own property offered by short term accommodation.

Question: Would the Council please consider setting up a Roundtable or Taskforce to discuss a policy on Short Term Accommodation which would:

1. Allow properties in the COV to be used as Short Term Accommodation; and
2. Minimise loss of work in the gig economy supporting the industry

3.2 Delma Davies of Perth

Delma Davies submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

To the City of Vincent

My question for the Council meeting 17th June 2025 in relation to the proposed Short-term criteria is. I have a second property in my complex, I am 64 years old, the property is on the short-term rental market under management.

I previously had the property on the long-term market and could not meet my mortgage repayment. I have no superannuation due to living overseas for 15 years and this is my retirement.

Since being on short-term I have retuned every month enough money to support both of my mortgages. With out issue or complaint. I understand not all short-terms are managed well and I’m all for governance however it would seem by the proposed criteria that the Council seeks to make it impossible for me to support myself. In addition, in the Council meeting recently the statement was made by Mayor Xamon

“Families going on holidays for a couple of weeks and wanting to put their home on Airbnb is perfectly reasonable and would fit within our criteria”

It leads me to believe that the Council has no real data about who uses short-term in the area, or who places their property on the short-term market and for what reasons and what is required to list a property.

Question: Does the Council have actual data on the number of short-term in the area and the actual real complaints or incidents that it could provide to assist me to understand the basis for proposed criteria?

Last question:

Councillor Warner stated at the Council meeting - "I'm pleased "about the proposed changes assisting "housing crisis "and "homelessness in public spaces"

Does Councillor Warner believe that homeless people would be able to afford a property that is taken from the short-term market to the long-term market, and what is being done about the 300 plus vacant properties in the City causing issues with squatters. If the Council believe this proposed policy would help the homeless, and the housing crisis can you please provide me with evidence/data for this.

The speaker further requested a roundtable discussion or consultation with the Mayor and Elected Members before the consultation period closes. They inquired about whether such a meeting would be possible.

3.3 Gabriel Kafetzis of West Perth

Gabriel Kafetzis submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

I write to introduce myself and to seek your clarification as the President of the Greek Orthodox Community of WA Inc.

We proudly boast Greek and non Greek members and have been a valuable part of the City of Vincent tapestry of life for generations. We are now required to become self-sufficient.

Many of our members I am here to represent are City taxpayers and residents.

The GOCWA has struggled to find appropriate means to raise sufficient funds to meet growing community needs and property maintenance and is looking to covert 6, one-bedroom Villa (owned by the Church) on Charles Street adjacent to the church, to short-term properties.

The City of Vincents proposed criteria for short-term would seem, if I am not mistaken, to obfuscate any application process and renders any DA application a failure.

We believe in governance and would be happy to commit to reasonable operating rules and guidelines. However, we don't see these in the proposal, rather it feels like the City is looking to effectively ban short-term which would be a severe blow to our community.

QUESTION

Can the Councillors please advise on what basis the "discretionary" approvals will be issued?

The Church and its members are valued contributors to the City of Vincent who should be able to appropriately offer and manage its assets to enable an increased revenue stream and lessen the burden on the broader community.

I respectfully ask you to reconsider and make applicable governance that fairly accesses each case, not on a discretionary basis only and does not prohibit a large community organisation, your members, the opportunity to work toward self-sufficiency.

3.4 Shae Davies-Croft of Perth

Shae Davies-Croft submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

Good afternoon, councillors of the city of Vincent. I am writing to you today to add my questions to the submission for the proposed changes to the STR policy in the city of Vincent, before the meeting this evening on the 17th of June 2025 at 244 Vincent Street in North Perth.

As some of you may know by now, I am a short term accommodation professional host and I employ directly two Australian Citizens full time, I also (through subcontracting) engage cleaners, handymen, tradies, plumbers, painters, gardeners, lawyers, insurance brokers, general labourers, locksmiths and several other industries that all benefit, and even rely on, the work that my company does. Without the professional hosts these people will have a hard time surviving.

I hope that we can work out a way to work together with all the hosts in the community to make fair and reasonable working conditions for everyone to be able to do business.

Please see below my list of questions and comments.

1. Where is the empirical data that justifies a 90-night cap?

Please provide the actual evidence or commissioned research showing the number of un-hosted STRs and their measurable impact on the long-term rental supply in Vincent. Please also then provide us with the numbers for abandoned houses in the area, derelict, or unsafe dwellings that are in the city of Vincent to compare.

2. How can Council justify a blanket restriction that ignores case-by-case merit and due process?

Isn't it fundamentally flawed to ban or limit properties without assessing individual management standards, noise history, or neighbourhood support?

3. Why has Council proceeded with policy changes that contradict the State's STR registration reforms?

The State system only took effect January 2025—shouldn't we wait to see its results before implementing restrictive local laws?

4. Isn't the real problem here a failure to enforce existing laws on party noise and misconduct?

Why punish compliant operators who never have complaints, instead of focusing on the minority who breach community standards? Can't we come up with an inclusive plan, rather than an exclusive blanket ban?

5. Why is STR signage being mandated when no such signage is required for long-term rental homes?

Isn't this an invasion of privacy and a double standard that unfairly targets one category of housing? People can see our calendars, if they know we are empty what's to stop them breaking in and squatting?

6. Can Council acknowledge that these rules disproportionately affect young business owners, carers, single parents and local entrepreneurs who rely on STR income?

Have social and financial equity impacts been assessed in this decision-making?

7. Will Council commit to pausing the vote and establishing a collaborative working group with local hosts and legal representatives before proceeding?

Why hasn't meaningful consultation taken place with us—the people actually running these properties?

8. Why is Council considering a planning regime so strict that even the planning department admitted "no one will be able to meet the criteria"?

What's the point of a policy if its effect is functionally a ban in disguise?

9. How does forcing un-hosted STRs into "commercial corridors" help anyone, when most of these corridors are back-to-back with residential areas?

Isn't this just political theatre?

10. If Council is serious about community feedback, will you publicly release how many Vincent residents support short-term rentals—not just the number of complaints?

Will you also reveal how many STR applications have been rejected without clear reason?

11. Why are Councillors pushing personal anecdotes—like "I live near a party house"—as policy justification, instead of relying on verified data?

Are we writing laws based on feelings and frustrations, or facts and fairness?

12. If hosted STRs are being allowed without restriction, how does that solve the housing crisis?

A granny flat on someone's property doesn't house a family—it houses tourists. Isn't this just political optics?

13. How does banning STRs create more long-term rental properties when many of us couldn't legally rent these homes long-term even if we wanted to?

Some properties don't meet rental compliance or insurance requirements for long-term tenancy. What then?

14. Why has Council not provided an economic impact assessment of what banning STRs will cost the local economy?

Have you considered how many cleaners, stylists, tradies, and small businesses will lose income?

15. Can Council explain how this new policy aligns with the City's own stated goal to support innovation, diversity of housing options, and small business?

Isn't this a complete contradiction of your Local Strategic Planning Statement?

16. Has Council considered the legal risk of property devaluation due to its decisions?

If a property's earning capacity is slashed by 75% overnight, will the City face class action from investors and ratepayers? I have heard owners talking about suing for the loss of future income. Is the city of Vincent prepared to fight this battle, when simply planning with the hosts can solve most of the issues you have?

17. Why hasn't Council implemented a trial permit system or a 12-month probation model like other LGAs have done?

Wouldn't that be a fairer and more balanced approach than this sudden, near-blanket exclusion?

18. Is there any evidence from Byron Bay that their day limits have improved housing availability?

Can Council show us that fewer STRs have led to more affordable rentals in those markets? I have heard they are now winding back their STR policy as it has had a negative impact on their economies.

19. Why do Councillors believe long-term tenants guarantee less noise, disruption or complaints than short-stay guests?

What data supports that belief?

20. Why weren't STR operators properly represented in the consultation phase?

Most of us only found out about these changes from other hosts—not directly from Council. Why weren't we invited to the table?

21. Does the City understand how hypocritical it is to say they "support hosted stays" when the reality is those same properties are still STRs—just with a person sleeping out the back?

It's the same usage, same guests, same impact—just different zoning.

22. Does Council accept that implementing policy based on the "feeling" of nuisance rather than measurable harm is a dangerous precedent?

What other small business sectors will be next?

23. Is the Council aware that under the WA Government's Short-Term Rental Accommodation legislation, if a strata approves short-term accommodation, then local councils have no legal authority to override that use?

If so, why is the City of Vincent proposing planning controls that would unlawfully contradict State law?

24. Has the City obtained legal advice confirming that it can override strata-approved short-term use, despite the State legislation stating otherwise?

If so, will that advice be made public?

25. Will the City now amend its policy to clearly exempt STRs with strata approval, as per State law, or does it intend to enforce planning powers it does not legally possess?

If Council moves forward with policy that violates State legislation, who will be liable for damages when operators take legal action?

26. Is the City aware that enforcing against strata-approved STRs could open the door to significant litigation, waste of ratepayer funds, and reputational damage for the Council?

What contingency is in place if this occurs?

The speaker further questioned whether, after submissions have been received, a policy could be established to allow professional hosts to collaborate with the City in developing a plan to address issues such as disruptive guests and parties.

3.5 Steve Young of Winthrop

Full details of their statement can be heard [here](#).

The speaker requested that the Council provide studies, statistics, or documentation outlining the revenue generated by short-term rentals compared to the perceived drawbacks of such accommodations.

They further inquired about the Council's intended use for these properties.

3.6 Samantha Young of Winthrop

Full details of their statement can be heard [here](#).

The speaker requested that the Council consider meeting with an Airbnb representative, as they can provide data not available to the general public. They expressed a desire to collaborate with the Council to ensure the continuation of Airbnb operations while fostering a positive relationship with local residents.

3.7 Ashley Brown of Perth

Ashley Brown submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

Councillors of the City of Vincent

I am a resident in support of short term accommodation operating in the city of Vincent and I am concerned about how the proposed legislative changes will affect properties such as the ones that my family uses when they come to stay from New Zealand.

An example of this is the proposed requirement of one car space per bedroom. It appears to lack proportionality and doesn't reflect actual guest behaviour in short-term rental use. For example, when my sister, brother-in-law, and their four children visit, they stay in a local Airbnb and arrive in a single hired vehicle. They choose a house because it offers essential residential amenities, such as a kitchen, laundry, and secure space for children, which hotels, even those 1.5 km away, cannot provide and would make their stay unaffordable.

Given that short-term rentals often accommodate family groups with fewer cars, how does council justify this uniform parking standard, especially when it may have the effect of discouraging legitimate, low-impact use that supports local tourism?

3.8 Dudley Maier – Highgate – Item 12.3

Dudley Maier submitted the below comments and questions in writing and spoke to them. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

1. In February 2005 a group of residents paid for a seat to be located in Robertson Park. As well as paying for the seat they paid for a plaque that recognised the work that Chris Hair had done in developing a plan for the park, and recording its history. This plaque was affixed to the plinth upon which the seat was fixed. With the recent work installing a new path in Robertson Park the seat has been (temporarily) set aside and the plinth removed. Has the City retained the plaque, and will it be reinstalling it when the seat is replaced in its final position?
2. The Waste Strategy 2018-2023 stated that the vision for Vincent was to have zero waste to landfill by 2028. This was mentioned ten times in the document. The latest 2023-2024 Sustainable Environment Strategy Progress Report reiterated that the target, at the time, was still zero waste to landfill by 2028 [Item 9.6 – Appendix 4 OMC 13 May 2025]. The new target for in the Draft Enhanced Environment Strategy is to reduce waste to landfill by 85% per household by 2030 compared to a 2024 baseline.
 - 2.1. Is this a recognition that the 2018-2023 target was overly ambitious and unachievable?
 - 2.2. Is the administration confident that the new target in the draft strategy is achievable by 2030, particularly given that, apart from the mandated introduction of FOGO, there do not seem to be any significant technical mechanisms for landfill reduction other than waste-to-energy?

- 2.3. Is the City investigating using waste-to-energy as a means of processing some waste?
- 2.4. If the City is relying on using waste-to-energy as a significant mechanism for reducing waste to landfill, why isn't the option mentioned at all in the Draft Enhanced Environment Strategy?
3. The Draft 4-year Capital Works Program does not seem to include the Norfolk Safe Active Street project. The Mid-Year Budget Review [Item 11.4 OMC 11 March 2025] stated that the project had been postponed and noted '*carry forward reserve portion to future years*'. Given that the draft budget shows \$125,000 for the first year and \$250,000 in subsequent years for the Bicycle Network, is that an indication that the Norfolk Street project has been abandoned?
4. The Draft 2025-26 Capital Works program has \$570,000 from Municipal Funds for the Mt Claremont Depot.
 - 4.1. What is the current state of the project?
 - 4.2. When will it come to Council for a decision, or is the Administration simply operating under delegated authority?
 - 4.3. Has the City entered into any binding agreements with regards to the project?
 - 4.4. Is the City obliged to prepare a Business Plan as per the Council decision of the OMC 21 November 2023 (Item 9.7 - Clause 2.5)?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 15 July 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

3.9 Brian Omandi of Perth – Item 10.1

Full details of their statement can be heard [here](#).

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6:23pm

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Laurie Vosnakos of North Perth – Item 10.3

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

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

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

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

However, I have a few concerns regarding the approach and the intended actions in modifying the Leak 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.

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

Council Approval

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

Comments Input/Feedback

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

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

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

1. Design does not take away the useability of the open 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.

Administration Response in italics:

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

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



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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

3. Personal preference on park aesthetics

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

Benefits

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

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

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

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

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

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

In summary

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

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

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

All current benefits and future benefits should be analysed.

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

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

Christina Hoang of Mount Lawley – Item 9.1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

Marie Slyth of West Perth – Item 9.5

My Statement/request

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

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

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

My statement/request in effort to protect my house:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

In line with the Street Tree Policy, the City carries out a scheduled street tree pruning program where trees are pruned to ensure appropriate clearances from powerlines and under pruned (if required) to ensure they are not obstructing the footpath. Trees not located under powerlines are not reduced in height and allowed to grow to maximise canopy cover.

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

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

(2) Taxi situation in Carr Street

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

The City has recently developed Parking Precinct Management Plans to guide how parking is managed throughout the City. A component of these plans is for car parking occupancy surveys to be conducted at regularly intervals to see if the appropriate parking restrictions are in place or if some restrictions need to be

reviewed/amended, including the demand for short-term (5 minute) bays or taxi rank/ride-share parking. In the meantime, Rangers will increase their parking patrols of Carr St and the surrounding streets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

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

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

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

Matthew Selby of Mt Lawley – Item 9.1

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

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

Hope you understand and do reject this proposal.

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

Dudley Maier of Highgate**Administration Response in italics:**

1. Waste

1.1. What was the total cost of the recent e-waste collection day?

Circa \$22,240, including staff wages.

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

No.

1.3. How much e-waste was collected?

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

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

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

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

2.1. What works were undertaken?

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

2.2. What was the total cost of those works?

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

2.3. Why is it described as "Smarty Grants"?

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

3. The City's Greentrack Program

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

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

In summary:

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

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

4. Underground Power

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

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

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

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

- 4.2. The assumptions in the LTFP state that they were adopted nearly two years ago (June 2023) and included that up to 70% of property owners will choose to pay over a 4-year period. The need to cater for such a high level of time-payments was used as a reason for spacing out projects in order to reduce the 'lumpiness' and magnitude of borrowed funds. The administration has also confirmed that it has twice asked Western Power to delay projects to fit in with the financial model as it stood at that time. Given that the actual initial response from the community indicated that only 30% (not the 70% that was provided for) chose to pay over-time, will the City be reviewing the financial model to determine if future projects (which have previously been delayed) can be brought forward? If not, why not?

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

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

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

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

5. Drainage Truck

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

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

Yes, other local governments have a drainage truck.

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

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

As part of addressing the premise that the existing drainage system will be capacity challenged based on climate change and density infill, the City is Implementing a drainage maintenance regime that ensures

the system (pits, pipes, gullies etc) is serviced at a near to optimum level – hence the new drainage truck and crew.

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

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

The drainage truck will be used all year round.

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

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

6. FOGO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is equivalent to a 41.63% reduction.

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

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

3.4 Linda Harris of Leederville

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

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

3.12 Stephen Beaumont of Highgate

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

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

Administration Response in italics:

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

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

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

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**LEAVE OF ABSENCE****COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved: Cr Hallett, Seconded: Cr Castle

That Cr Worner request for leave of absence from 25 August to 19 September 2025 inclusive be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0)

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Greer

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 13 May 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 TRADITIONAL TOTEMS GIFTED IN TRIBUTE TO CITY'S COMMITMENT TO FIRST NATIONS ENGAGEMENT

Two handcrafted *Sticks of Authority* have been gifted to the City of Vincent as part of the *Sounds of Warndoolier* event by Traditional Owner, Vaughn McGuire. These traditional wooden leader totems were presented in recognition of the City's ongoing work and commitment to engaging with First Nations people.

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

7.2 DISPLAY OF HISTORICAL POLICE MAP HIGHLIGHTS LOCAL POLICING HISTORY

A historical police map has been installed in the Council Chamber, sourced from the Police Museum in Highgate Hill. The map is an enlarged reproduction of an original document used by officers between 1920 and 1950, detailing night patrol routes across the City of Vincent and the City of Perth. This fascinating artifact highlights key historical landmarks, including several pubs, which were of particular interest to police at the time.

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

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1** Cr Suzanne Worner disclosed a financial interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is that her son is an employee of the North Perth Bowling Club. She is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in chambers or vote on the matter.
- 8.2** Cr Nicole Woolf declared an impartiality interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is that she is a social member of the North Perth Bowling Club and a regular attendee of the Mount Hawthorn Playgroup.
- 8.3** Mayor Alison Xamon declared an impartiality interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of her interest is she is a member of the East Perth Football Club.
- 8.4** Cr Ron Alexander declared a proximity interest in Item 7.4 Adoption of the Annual Budget 2025/26. The extent of his interest is that he resides across from Hyde Park. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or remain in chambers or vote on 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:**
Item 10.1.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Items 9.3, 11.1, 11.4, 12.1 and 12.2.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Item 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 Wallace	9.2

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

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved “En Bloc”, being:**
Items 9.1, 10.2, 11.2, 11.3 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 La Fontaine, Seconded: Cr Worner

**That the following unopposed items be adopted “En Bloc”, as recommended:
Items 9.1, 10.2, 11.2, 11.3 and 12.3.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0)

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr La Fontaine, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

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

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2

Moved: Cr La Fontaine, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

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

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

Recommendation:

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

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr La Fontaine, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 APRIL 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 30 April 25 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

Moved: Cr La Fontaine, **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 Council Meeting held on 24 April 2025 
 2. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 8 May 2025 
 3. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of May 2025 
 4. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 5. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 28 May 2025 
 6. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 7. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 8. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - June 2025 
 9. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - June 2025 
 10. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - June 2025 
 11. Council Workshop Items since 14 May 2025 
 12. Council Briefing Notes - 6 May 2025 
 13. Unrecoverable Parking Infringements Write-Off 
 14. Quarterly Street Tree Removal Information 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated June 2025.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

Moved: Cr La Fontaine, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

At 6:29pm, Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

At 6:30pm, Manager Parks left the meeting and did not return.

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

10.1 LIFEVAC DEVICE INSTALLATION AT COMMUNITY FACILITIES

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council

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

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council:

1. APPROVES LifeVac® devices to be installed at Community Facilities;
2. NOTES that \$9,000 be included in the 2025/2026 budget to purchase, install and maintain LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities; ~~and~~
3. NOTES the implementation and evaluation of the LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities to occur throughout financial year 2025/2026, ~~and~~
4. REQUESTS that an evaluation report be provided to Council by May 2026, addressing matters including:
 - Installation process and locations;
 - Usage and any device replacements;
 - Any issues arising, including vandalism;
 - Signage and staff training; and
 - Any community feedback received.

REASON:

LifeVac devices are newly being rolled out across some local governments in Western Australia. As this is an emerging initiative, an evaluation report will allow Council to monitor implementation and identify any operational issues to inform any future decisions.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

The administration supports the intent of the proposed amendment, however, suggests the evaluation report be provided to Council in May 2026 to account for any delay in acquiring then installing the LifeVac devices.

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 10.1

That Council:

- 1. APPROVES LifeVac® devices to be installed at Community Facilities;**
- 2. NOTES that \$9,000 be included in the 2025/2026 budget to purchase, install and maintain LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities;**
- 3. NOTES the implementation and evaluation of the LifeVac® devices at Community Facilities to occur throughout financial year 2025/2026, and**
- 4. REQUESTS that an evaluation report be provided to Council by May 2026, addressing matters including:**
 - **Installation process and locations;**
 - **Usage and any device replacements;**
 - **Any issues arising, including vandalism;**
 - **Signage and staff training; and**
 - **Any community feedback received.**

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 6:43pm, Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

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

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

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

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council:

1. In accordance with Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*, AFFIRMS its decision dated 23 April 2024 to issue a Heritage Conservation Notice for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley; **and**

~~2. Notwithstanding (1), RESOLVES to direct the Chief Executive Officer to withdraw the Heritage Conservation Notice for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley subject to:~~

~~2.1 Development approval being granted for the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline Program by the Western Australian Planning Commission under the provisions of the Metropolitan Region Scheme; and~~

~~2.2 The substantial commencement of the development approval referred to in 2.1 or the demolition of the dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley (whichever occurs first); and~~

~~3.~~ 2. REQUESTS that the Chief Executive Officer write to all relevant parties involved in the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment advising that:

- It does not support the demolition of the dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley;
- In any future determination of the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment the Commission is required to have due regard to the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 in accordance with Section 6(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
- The dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley, is listed on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as Category B – Conservation Recommended;
- The Statement of Significance for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley is:
The house at No. 40 Guildford Road is a rare example of a Federation era Arts and Crafts style bungalow residence along Guildford Road, Mount Lawley. The building demonstrates the original intentions and aspirations behind the early development of the Mount Lawley Area. It is an increasingly rare example of the Federation period development in the area that emerged from the population boom following the discovery of Gold in Western Australia and the development of the railroad eastward; **and**
- The dwelling should be retained, restored and integrated within the planned social housing development given this significance; **and**
- ~~The City is open to all opportunities for the retention of the dwelling, including resumption of its ownership and maintenance liabilities.~~

~~4.~~ **NOTES that:**

~~• The City would enforce the Heritage Conservation Notice within six (6) months of the date of this Council resolution if:~~

- ~~• No development application for the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment has been lodged with, or approved by the Western Australian~~

~~Planning Commission; or~~

- ~~○ The Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment has been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission but has not substantially commenced or the dwelling has not been demolished; and~~
- ~~● Enforcement could not be pursued if approval is granted and works commence, as the Notice could no longer serve its intended purpose.~~

REASON:

The Heritage Conservation Notice (HCN) was issued as the dwelling has not been properly maintained to a level that its heritage status warrants. The HCN should remain as to allow for the restoration of an important part of the local area's heritage.

The addition of a new point under Clause 2 would reinforce the City exploring all avenues to retain the dwelling. The City has improved its financial position in recent years and the use of funds to support heritage protection and adaptive reuse would be aligned with the City's strategic objectives.

Clause 3 is not necessary to be included because it relates to circumstances under which the HCN would be withdrawn.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Administration does not support this amendment overall.

Withdrawal of HCN

Administration does not support this part of the amendment.

Removing Clause 2 would mean that the HCN would continue to remain in place even if a public works approval was granted for the demolition of the existing dwelling, and the redevelopment commenced or the dwelling demolished.

At that point, it would result in the HCN applying to a building that no longer exists, making it ineffective and unable to serve its intended purpose – which is to restore the dwelling's heritage significance.

If this occurs, Council would later need to make a decision about what to do with the HCN.

Administration's recommended approach is to keep the HCN in place, but allowing for its revocation only in specific, limited circumstances - namely, if a separate public works approval is granted for the dwelling's demolition and that work commences.

This approach would ensure the HCN is in place while any public works application is being considered by the Western Australian Planning Commission. It would also avoid the need for a future Council decision in relation to the HCN that at that point would be ineffective.

Writing to Relevant Parties – City Ownership

Administration does not support this part of the amendment.

While the intent is acknowledged, the City has not undertaken the due diligence required to consider implications of becoming the property owner, land acquisition or long-term maintenance responsibilities.

This includes identifying costs for purchase, decontamination, heritage restoration, and ongoing maintenance.

This would need to be factored into the City's Long Term Financial Plan and Annual Budget process.

These costs have not been factored into the 2025/26 budget. Without a funding source this would mean that it could not be progressed until at least 2026/27.

The proponent plans to submit a redevelopment application within the next month, so it would be premature for Administration to raise the issue of ownership at this stage. Doing so could create unrealistic expectations and financial risk to the City.

Council Noting of HCN Enforcement

Administration supports this part of the amendment.

The current wording clarifies the circumstances in which the City would enforce the HCN.

If the HCN is not withdrawn, it would remain issued irrespective of whether the dwelling is demolished or redevelopment begins in accordance with any separate public works approval.

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 9.2

That Council:

1. In accordance with Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*, AFFIRMS its decision dated 23 April 2024 to issue a Heritage Conservation Notice for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley; and
2. REQUESTS that the Chief Executive Officer write to all relevant parties involved in the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment advising that:
 - It does not support the demolition of the dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley;
 - In any future determination of the Mount Lawley Housing Diversity Pipeline redevelopment the Commission is required to have due regard to the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 in accordance with Section 6(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
 - The dwelling at No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley, is listed on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as Category B – Conservation Recommended;
 - The Statement of Significance for No. 40 Guildford Road, Mount Lawley is:

The house at No. 40 Guildford Road is a rare example of a Federation era Arts and Crafts style bungalow residence along Guildford Road, Mount Lawley. The building demonstrates the original intentions and aspirations behind the early development of the Mount Lawley Area. It is an increasingly rare example of the Federation period development in the area that emerged from the population boom following the discovery of Gold in Western Australia and the development of the railroad eastward;
 - The dwelling should be retained, restored and integrated within the planned social housing development given this significance; and
 - The City is open to all opportunities for the retention of the dwelling, including resumption of its ownership and maintenance liabilities.

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 6:48pm, Mayor Alison Xamon left the meeting and vacated the Chair during discussion of item 9.2. In accordance with clause 2.1 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, Deputy Mayor Cr Castle assumed the Chair.

At 6:51pm, Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment left the meeting during discussion of item 9.2.

At 6:55pm, Mayor Alison Xamon returned to the meeting during discussion of item 9.2 and resumed the Chair.

At 6:55pm, Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment returned to the meeting during discussion of item 9.2.

At 7:00pm, Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability left the meeting during discussion of item 9.2. and did not return.

9.3 HEALTH SERVICES - HISTORICAL SUNDRY DEBTORS 2018/19 - 2022/23 - DEBT WRITE OFF**Attachments:** 1. Health Sundry Debtors - 2018-2023 **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Worner**

That the recommendation be adopted.

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

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 30 APRIL 2025

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

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

11.4 ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2025/26

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

1. BUDGET:

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

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

2. CAPITAL WORKS PLAN:

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

3. RATES:

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

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

3.1 General Rates:

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

3.2 Minimum Payments:

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

3.3 Rate Payment Options:

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

3.3.1 Pay in full:

Payment in full on 29 August 2025.

3.3.2 Four Instalments:

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

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

3.3.3 Rates Smoothing:

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

1. Weekly – 40 payments from 29/08/2025 to 29/05/2026.

2. Fortnightly – 20 payments from 29/08/2025 to 22/05/2026.
 3. Monthly – 10 payments from 29/08/2025 to 29/05/2026.
- 3.4 Instalment, Rates Smoothing And Arrangements, Administration Fees And Interest Charges:
- 3.4.1 Pursuant to Section 6.45(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 67 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS an instalment administration charge of \$8.00 per instalment for payment of rates by 4 instalments, to apply to the second, third and fourth instalment; and
 - 3.4.2 Pursuant to Section 6.45(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 68 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS an interest rate of 5.5% where the owner has elected to pay rates through an instalment option, rates smoothing or alternative payment arrangement.

3.5 Late Payment Interest On Overdue Rates And Amounts:

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

- 3.5.1 On overdue rates in accordance with Section 6.51(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 70 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, subject to Section 6.51(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and
- 3.5.2 Amounts due to the City in accordance with Section 6.13 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

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

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

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

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

4.1 SERVICE CHARGE INSTALMENT:

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

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

5. REPORTING OF BUDGET VARIANCES:

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

6. FEES AND CHARGES:

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

7. RATES WAIVER:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett

That the recommendation be adopted.

Before discussion commenced on Item 11.4 – Adoption of the Annual Budget, the Mayor noted that two Council Members had disclosed proximity and financial interests in specific projects listed in the Capital Works Program and a rates waiver. These interests had been recorded in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995*.

To allow full participation in the remaining components of the budget and to ensure compliance with the Act, the Mayor proposed that Council divide the recommendation so that the items relating to those specific projects could be considered separately.

The Mayor advised that this approach was consistent with clause 5.7 of the City's Meeting Procedures Local Law, which allows the Presiding Member or Council to order that a motion be divided.

Accordingly, the Mayor put forward the following procedural motion, which was voted on without debate.

PROCEDURAL / RESOLUTION SPLIT

That, in accordance with clause 5.7 of the City of Vincent Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, Council **DIVIDES** the recommendation for Item 11.4 into two separate resolutions to enable recommendation 1.6(b), 2 (b) and 7(b), in which Cr Alexander has disclosed a proximity interest and Cr Worner has disclosed a Financial Interest, to be considered and voted on separately.

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

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

RECOMMENDATION (PART 1):

That Council **BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:**

1. BUDGET:

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

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

2. CAPITAL WORKS PLAN:

- (a) **ADOPTS** the Capital Works Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 at Attachment 2 excluding assets for Hyde Park Playground & Softfall East/West, Hyde Park Asphalt Pathways and North Perth Bowling Club Driveway Renewal listed for 2025/26 as these will be subject to consideration in Part 2 of this recommendation

3. RATES:

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

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

(GRV);

3.1 General Rates:

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

3.2 Minimum Payments:

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

3.3 Rate Payment Options:

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

3.3.1 Pay in full:

Payment in full on 29 August 2025.

3.3.2 Four Instalments:

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

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

3.3.3 Rates Smoothing:

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

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

3. Monthly – 10 payments from 29/08/2025 to 29/05/2026.

3.4 Instalment, Rates Smoothing And Arrangements, Administration Fees And Interest Charges:

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

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

3.5 Late Payment Interest On Overdue Rates And Amounts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.1 SERVICE CHARGE INSTALMENT:

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

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

5. REPORTING OF BUDGET VARIANCES:

Pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the *Local Government (Financial Management)*

Regulations 1996, ADOPTS the monthly reporting variance for the 2023/2024 financial year of 10% or more, where that variance is also more than \$20,000;

6. FEES AND CHARGES:

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

7. RATES WAIVER:

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

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

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

65A Raglan Road MOUNT LAWLEY WA 6050	LOT 198 D/P 39921	\$1,615.00
385 Walcott Street COOLBINIA WA 6050	LOT 889 D/P 426986	\$1,615.00
471 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 201 D/P 422599	\$1,615.00
497 Fitzgerald Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 425918	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 300 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00
138 Loftus Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006	LOT 301 D/P 428786	\$1,615.00

232 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6000	LOT 888 D/P 426994	\$1,615.00
71 Bondi Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 6016	LOT 1 STR 86573	\$1,615.00
383 Walcott Street, Coolbinia WA	LOT 500 D/P 424837	\$1,615.00
5 Franklin Street, LEEDERVILLE WA 6007	LOT 300 STR 87463	\$1,615.00
16 Fairfield Street, MOUNT HAWTHORN WA 16	LOT 8800 D/P 429094	\$1,615.00
		<u>\$17,765.00</u>

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

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 7:10pm, Cr Alexander left the meeting due to a previously declared proximity interest. Cr Alexander departed prior to consideration of Recommendation Part 2 and did not participate in discussion or vote on the matter.

At 7:10pm, Cr Worner left the meeting due to a previously declared financial interest. Cr Worner departed prior to consideration of Recommendation Part 2 and did not participate in discussion or vote on the matter.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Greer

RECOMMENDATION (PART 2):

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

- 1.6 (b) APPROVES the inclusion in the 2025/26 Capital Works Program of the following projects, with a total of \$357,000 (including 2024/25 carry forward projects of \$157,000):

- Hyde Park Playground & Softfall East/West,
- Hyde Park Asphalt Pathways and
- North Perth Bowling Club Driveway Renewal.

2. CAPITAL WORKS PLAN:

- (b) ADOPTS the assets listed in 1.6(b) above and included in the Capital Works Plan

2025/26 – 2028/29 at Attachment 2; and

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

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

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (7-0)

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

Against: Nil

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

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

At 7:11 pm, Cr Worner returned to the meeting.

At 7:11 pm, Cr Alexander returned to the meeting.

12.1 ADOPTION OF CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2025/26 - 2028/2029 AND THE FOUR YEAR CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM 2025/26 – 2028/29**Attachments:** 1. Draft Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 - 2028/2029 **RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett****That the recommendation be adopted.****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

12.2 REAPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON AND DEPUTY CHAIR AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE**Attachments:** Nil**RECOMMENDATION:****That Council, by ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, formally reappoint:**

- 1. George Araj as Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the day of the Ordinary Council Elections in October 2025; and**
- 2. Cr Ron Alexander as Deputy Chairperson of the Audit and Risk Committee until the day of the Ordinary Council elections in October 2025.**

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2**Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Hallett****That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-1)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine**Against:** Cr Worner

9 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

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

Nil

11 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

12 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

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

Nil

14 CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 7:16pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Ron Alexander	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward (electronically)
	Cr Jonathan Hallett	South Ward
	Cr Ashley Wallace	South Ward
	Cr Sophie Greer	South Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	Rhys Taylor	A/Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	Prue Reddingius	Manager Public Health & Built Environment
	Emma Simmons	A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Carrie Miller	Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer
	Alex Harris	Governance Officer
Public:	Approximately 0 members of the public.	

These Minutes were confirmed at the 15 July 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council Meeting (Ordinary and Special) held on 17 June 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated