



Im **CITY OF VINCENT**

# **MINUTES**

**Ordinary Council Meeting**

**15 July 2025**



## Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country .....	4
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence .....	4
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements .....	5
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice .....	6
4	Applications for Leave of Absence .....	17
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations .....	17
6	Confirmation of Minutes .....	17
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) .....	18
7.1	Advocacy - Infrastructure .....	18
7.2	Advocacy – National General Assembly 2025.....	18
8	Declarations of Interest .....	18
	Reports .....	18
	Items Approved " <i>En Bloc</i> ": .....	19
9.1	No. 221 (Lot: 2; STR: 68676) Anzac Road, Mount Hawthorn - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Grouped Dwelling.....	21
9.4	Advertising of Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Modified Draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan.....	22
10.1	Repeal of Policy No. 2.2.6 Truncations .....	25
10.2	RFT IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade.....	26
11.1	Financial Statements as at 31 May 2025.....	27
11.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 May 2025 to 31 May 2025 .....	28
11.3	Investment Report as at 31 May 2025.....	29
12.3	Information Bulletin .....	30
	Reports with Discussion .....	31
9.2	No. 235 (Lot: 4; D/P: 1189) Brisbane Street, Perth - Change of Use from Family Day Care to Child Care Premises - Section 31 Reconsideration.....	31
9.3	No. 71 (Lot: 200; D/P: 92012) Edward Street and No. 120 (Lot: 1001; D/P: 29129) Claisebrook Road, Perth - Proposed Amendment to Conditions of Heidelberg Development Approval and State Administrative Tribunal Section 31 Reconsideration of Conditions of Holcim Development Approval .....	36
9.5	Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Art Collection Policy .....	38
12.1	Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Revised Execution of Documents Policy [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] .....	39
12.2	Disposition of Portions of Mount Claremont Municipal Depot [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	40
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....	41
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion) .....	41
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies .....	41
16	Urgent Business .....	41
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed .....	41
18	Closure .....	41

**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT  
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AS E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,  
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE  
ON TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2025 AT 6:00 PM**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>Mayor Alison Xamon</b>	<b>Presiding Member</b>
	<b>Cr Alex Castle</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ron Alexander</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Suzanne Worner</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Nicole Woolf</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashley Wallace</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Sophie Greer</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<b>David MacLennan</b>	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
	<b>Peter Varris</b>	<b>Executive Director Infrastructure &amp; Environment</b>
	<b>Rhys Taylor</b>	<b>Executive Director Community &amp; Business Services</b>
	<b>Prue Reddingius</b>	<b>A/Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development</b>
	<b>John Corbellini</b>	<b>Director Major Projects</b>
	<b>Dale Morrissy</b>	<b>Manager Community Facilities (left at 6.41pm before item 9.2)</b>
	<b>Karsen Reynolds</b>	<b>Manager Development &amp; Design (left at 7.13pm after Item 9.2)</b>
	<b>Mitchell Hoad</b>	<b>Manager Strategic Planning &amp; Sustainability</b>
	<b>Emma Simmons</b>	<b>A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance</b>
	<b>Wendy Barnard</b>	<b>Executive Assistant to the Mayor and Council Support</b>

**Public:** Approximately 16 members of the public.

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

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

“The City of Vincent would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and pay our respects to Elders past and present, acknowledging that as 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**

Cr Jonathan Hallett is an apology for this meeting.

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

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

#### **3.1 Robert Bowe of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.2 Pauline Holdaway of Perth – Item 9.3**

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

#### **3.3 Greg Eastwood of Dianella – Item 9.3**

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

#### **3.4 Tania Colli of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.5 Matt Dowell of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.6 Theo Nicholas of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.7 Sebastian Davenport-Handley of Mt Hawthorn**

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

#### **3.8 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 12.2**

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

#### **3.9 Nabil Boulos of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.10 Michael Cao of Perth – Item 9.2**

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

#### **3.11 Gary Simmons of Perth – Item 9.2**

His full statement can be found 6.27 [here](#).

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

#### **Dudley Maier of Highgate**

1. Does the City intend to hold the annual Heritage Photo competition this year? If not, why not?
2. In October 2021 I asked if the City had obtained approval from the artists of a William Street artwork, Stuart Green and Adrian Jones, before the City overpainted the 'Chinese coin' element of their artwork, as is the accepted practice before an artwork is altered. The response was that the City had not sought their permission before over-painting the artwork.

In recent months the City has, once again, over-painted the artworks. Did the City obtain approval from these artists before the most recent alteration of their artwork?

3. The City has made claims that developments that have gone through the Life Cycle Assessment stream have produced 82 percent fewer Life Cycle carbon emissions and use 65 percent less fresh water than 'the average Perth home'.
  - 3.1. Can the City identify any developments where development plans were altered as a result of the LCA process (i.e. plans were developed, the LCA process was undertaken, and the plans were revised significantly as a result of the LCA review)? If so, how many?
  - 3.2. Does the City believe that it is valid to compare contemporary applications against an historic average which reflects much larger blocks and hence greater garden watering requirements, and which reflects older, and in some cases more outdated building practices and materials?
  - 3.3. Why isn't the comparison made against other contemporary development applications which haven't gone through the LCA process in order to identify the marginal improvements from the LCA process rather than just reflect savings that everybody makes, due to contemporary practices and lot sizes, when compared to the historic average?
4. The City has budgeted \$570,000 for improvements to the 'Mt Claremont Depot' and claim that the commercial rental value of the hardstand and one building on the site is \$350,000 per year.
  - 4.1. Is the \$350,000 commercial rental valuation based solely on the property being used for municipal purposes or is it based on rental to other, non-municipal businesses?
  - 4.2. How much has the City budgeted as income from this site in the 2025-26 financial year?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 12 August 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.29pm.

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

### **Delma Davies of Perth**

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 returned 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?

The City has access to the number of short-term rental accommodation that are registered through the Department of Energy, Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DEMIRS). As of 23 June 2025 a total of 238 properties within the City are registered. This includes 78 hosted and 160 unhosted.

As of 23 June 2025 the City has received 17 complaints since November 2023 in relation to short-term rental accommodation.

The City investigates all complaints received and undertakes compliance in accordance with the Development Compliance Enforcement Policy.

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 City applies a Vacant-Residential rate to vacant, uninhabitable or undeveloped residential properties. The higher rate is intended to encourage the development of vacant properties.*

*The City has reviewed the recording of the February 2025 Council Meeting, where the proposed Short-Term Accommodation Policy was approved for advertising. We were unable to identify any comments made by Cr Worner that align with the statement referenced in this query.*

*As all Council Meetings are recorded and published on the City's website, we encourage community members to refer to these publicly available records when seeking to confirm statements or clarify context.*

### **Ashley Brown of Perth**

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?

*The minimum number of parking bays required by the draft Policy is based on the number of guests, not the number of bedrooms.*

*Where a development application is proposed that does not meet the required number of parking bays, it would be assessed against the objectives of the draft Policy. If it were to meet these objectives, it would be capable of being approved.*

## Dudley Maier of Highgate

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?

*Yes, the plaque will be reinstalled 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?

*In preparing the Enhanced Environment Strategy (EES), Administration has reviewed the City's performance against the previous targets of the Sustainable Environment Strategy including its target of net zero waste to landfill.*

*The Mindarie Regional Council (of which the City is a part of) is in the process of negotiating a waste to energy facility to receive current landfill waste flows. The 85% target set in the EES reflects this.*

- 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?

*Yes. As above, the diversion from landfill to waste to energy would be expected to achieve the targeted 85% reduction.*

- 2.3. Is the City investigating using waste-to-energy as a means of processing some waste?

*Yes.*

- 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?

*As per response to 2.1, the waste to energy is captured through the targeted 85% reduction in waste to landfill.*

*This has not been included within the draft EES as the City is finalising the details and a commencement timeframe has not been confirmed. Administration will review this along with all submissions received once consultation has concluded and make any necessary modifications before it is presented back to Council for final approval.*

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?

*The State Government has changed its funding criteria for Bicycle Network projects, prioritising projects linked to Metronet projects. Consequentially the Norfolk Street project is no longer eligible. The City will pursue components of the design through other projects and funding opportunities.*



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?

*A report on the Mount Claremont Municipal Depot is included in the 17 June 2025 Briefing Agenda.*

- 4.2. When will it come to Council for a decision, or is the Administration simply operating under delegated authority?

*A report on the Mount Claremont Municipal Depot is included in the 17 June 2025 Briefing Agenda.*

- 4.3. Has the City entered into any binding agreements with regards to the project?

*No.*

- 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)?

*No.*

### **Shae Davies-Croft of Mount Lawley**

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.

*As above, there are currently 160 properties registered for unhosted short-term accommodation with DEMIRS.*

*The Vacant-Residential rate used by the City currently applies to 382 properties.*

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?

*The draft Policy does not 'ban' the unhosted short-term rental accommodation (USTRA) land use. This land use is capable of being approved throughout the City under its Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2) where discretion is applied.*

*The draft Policy provides standards and objectives to guide when the City should exercise its discretion for a development application for USTRA.*

*Where a development application for USTRA does not meet a specific standard of the draft Policy, it would be assessed against the objectives. If it were to meet these objectives it would be capable of being approved.*

*This approach ensures that each application is considered on its individual merits and provides for flexibility where a proposal can meet the broader objectives of the Policy.*

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?

*All local governments are required to update their local planning schemes by 1 January 2026 to align with State Government-led reform for short-term rental accommodation.*

*The review of the City's existing Policy is being undertaken concurrently to ensure consistency with these changes.*

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?

*As above, the draft Policy does not 'ban' USTRA.*

*The purpose of the draft Policy is to provide clear guidance on the appropriate management and location of short-term accommodation uses and to establish the responsibilities and obligations of operators to avoid adverse impacts on the amenity of adjoining and surrounding areas.*

*The City is supportive of USTRA which is well located and operates in this manner.*

If approved, the draft Policy would not apply to operators who have a current planning approval and are operating within the terms of this.

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?

*The draft Policy sets out the use of on-site signage to provide the contact details of the property manager or owner. The intent of this is to enable neighbours to directly report any instances of anti-social behaviour to the property manager or owner to assist in timely resolution.*

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?

*The City's Local Planning Strategy acknowledges the broader economic value from tourism uses (including short-term accommodation) and identifies that these should be located near areas with established entertaining facilities and direct transport links to the City.*

*As above the purpose of the draft Policy is to provide guidance on where these uses should be located to mitigate potential impacts on residential amenity.*

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?

*Community consultation on the draft Policy was conducted over a 42-day period between 9 May 2025 and 23 June 2025.*

*As part of this, Administration wrote to operators listed on DEMIRS register as well as relevant industry associations including the Short Term Accommodation Association Australia, Australia & New Zealand Short Term Rental Association, Airbnb and Stayz.*

*Administration is reviewing all of the submissions received during community consultation to inform any proposed changes to the draft Policy.*

*This would be presented to a future Council Meeting and Council would make a decision on whether to approve the draft Policy. All submitters will be notified of the details for this Council Meeting when this is confirmed.*

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?

*The Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (Regulations) exempt AUSTRA from requiring a planning approval where it does not operate for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

*The draft Policy includes a standard which limits the cumulative use for USTRA to 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

*This means that a proposal for an USTRA that exceeded 90 nights in a 12 month period would not meet the exemption under the Regulations and the draft Policy standard, and a planning approval would be required.*

*As above, where a development application for USTRA does not meet a specific standard of the draft Policy it would be assessed against the objectives. If it were to meet these objectives, it would be capable of being approved.*

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?

*The location criteria of the draft Policy focuses USTRA toward areas with high activity and within proximity to amenities and public transport connections. This is consistent with the City's Local Planning Strategy.*

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?

*The outcomes of community consultation will be presented to a future Council Meeting. This will include the total number of submissions as well as the number which supported and objected to the draft Policy. A summary of all of the submissions received would also be provided.*

*Where development applications have not met the existing Policy and been refused, the City provides the reasons to the applicant.*

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?

*Administration’s proposed changes to the draft Policy are informed by the City’s Local Planning Strategy which sets the long-term strategic direction for the City, as well as guidance from the State Government.*

*This includes Planning for Tourism and Short-Term Rental Accommodation Guidelines, Planning Bulletin 115 – Short-Term Rental Accommodation Guide for Local Government, and Position Statement: Planning for Tourism and Short-Term Rental Accommodation.*

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?

*Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation is exempt from requiring development approval under changes by the State Government. These properties would still be required to be registered with DEMIRS.*

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?

*The City is not aware of the circumstances referenced.*

*As above, USTRA is not ‘banned’ throughout the City. It is a land use that is capable of being approved where the City exercises discretion to do so.*

*The draft Policy provides guidance to the City in assessing development applications and exercising its discretion.*

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?

*As above, the City’s Local Planning Strategy acknowledges the broader economic value from tourism uses and identifies that these should be located near areas with established entertaining facilities and direct transport links to the City.*

*The draft Policy does not ‘ban’ USTRA. Its purpose is to provide guidance on where these uses should be located to mitigate potential impacts on residential amenity.*

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?

*As above, the draft Policy aligns with the City’s Local Planning Strategy which identifies that tourism uses should be located near areas with established entertaining facilities and direct transport links to the City.*

*The draft Policy provides guidance on this through the proposed locational criteria.*

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?

*As above, the draft Policy does not 'ban' USTRA. Its purpose is to provide guidance on where these uses should be located to mitigate potential impacts on residential amenity.*

*The impact on property value is not a valid planning consideration.*

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?

The draft Policy sets out that any planning approval for USTRA would be limited to an initial period of 12 months. Following this, a further time limited approval would be at the discretion of the City.

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.

Administration is not aware of any evidence from Byron Bay which demonstrates the impact on housing availability.

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

*USTRA is a non-residential land use. The draft Policy seeks to ensure that this land use is appropriately located and managed to mitigate impacts on residential amenity.*

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?

*As above, Administration sent emails to all property managers and landowners of those registered with DEMIRS at the time consultation commenced.*

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.

*Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation is a less intensive form of short-term rental accommodation.*

*This is because the host resides on the site and can immediately respond to and manage any issues that may arise.*

*This is different to USTRA where no host is present and any response to issues would be reactive and after an amenity disturbance may have occurred.*

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?

*As above, the draft Policy is informed by the City's Local Planning Strategy which sets the long-term strategic direction for the City, as well as guidance from the State Government.*

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?

*The Regulations require planning approval for USTRA which operates for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

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?

*As above, the Regulations require planning approval for USTRA which operates for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

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?

*The draft Policy would not apply to any existing USTRA which have a valid planning approval and are operating in the terms of this.*

*New USTRA would require planning approval under the Regulations where it operates for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

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?

*As above, the Regulations require planning approval for USTRA which operates for more than 90 nights in a 12 month period.*

*The City would investigate and undertake compliance in accordance with the Development Compliance Enforcement Policy.*

### **Gabriel Kafetzis of West Perth**

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 convert 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.

*The draft Policy provides guidance to the City in assessing development applications and exercising its discretion.*

*Where a development application does not meet a standard of the draft Policy, it would be assessed against the objectives. If it were to meet these objectives, it would be capable of being approved.*

### **Vera Saragih of North Perth**

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

*Short-term accommodation uses are capable of approval where the City exercises its discretion. The draft Policy provides guidance to the City in assessing development applications and exercising its discretion.*

*As part of community consultation, Administration wrote to operators listed on DEMIRS register as well as relevant industry associations including the Short Term Accommodation Association Australia, Australia & New Zealand Short Term Rental Association, Airbnb and Stayz.*

*Administration is reviewing all of the submissions received during community consultation to inform any proposed changes to the draft Policy.*

*This would be presented to a future Council Meeting and Council would make a decision on whether to approve the draft Policy. All submitters will be notified of the details for this Council Meeting when this is confirmed.*



## **4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

### **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

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

That Cr Wallace's request for leave of absence from 6 – 27 September 2025 for personal reasons, be approved.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)**

## **5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Nil

## **6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

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

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 17 June 2025 be confirmed.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## 7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

### 7.1 ADVOCACY - INFRASTRUCTURE

Following the overflow of the sewerage pipes in metropolitan Perth, causing significant health problems and major amenity problems, and causing concern about what it means for the Swan River, we are going to have to start talking about this issue because of the City's prospective community growth targets.

One of the problems is the lack of coordination with State Government about making sure that the sewerage pipes in older suburbs, which may have pipes which are over 120 years old, are maintained at a rate commensurate with our density targets. The Perth Inner City Mayor's Group is requesting that the State Government create a forum, particularly with inner city groups, to coordinate the upgrades to critical facilities such as water, drainage and sewerage infrastructure, to enable us to coordinate our own planning.

This also highlights the problem that government entities such as the Water Corporation have, which is they are expected to provide to general revenue, instead of being able to direct that money into ongoing maintenance and upgrades of critical infrastructure. The State Government has become reliant on this income, which is at the expense of making sure we are dealing with the aging and capacity of the existing infrastructure.

### 7.2 ADVOCACY – NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2025

There are papers attached to the Item 12.3 Infobulletin arising out of the National General Assembly that you are encouraged to read. It is vital that inner city councils have a presence at the conference every year, as this is the conference which votes on the priorities for Local Government to take to Federal Government. This is critical advocacy that the City should undertake every year.

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

## 8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 Cr Ashlee La Fontaine declared an impartiality interest in item 12.2 Disposition of Portions of Mount Claremont Municipal Depot. The extent of her interest is that her partner is an employee of the Public Transport Administration.

## REPORTS

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

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**  
Items 9.2 and 9.3.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**  
Items 12.1 and 12.2.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**  
Nil

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

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

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Cr Worner	9.5

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, 9.4, 10.1, 10.2, 11.1, 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 Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That the following unopposed items be adopted “En Bloc”, as recommended:**  
**Items 9.1, 9.4, 10.1, 10.2, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 12.3**

**CARRIED (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**



**9.1 NO. 221 (LOT: 2; STR: 68676) ANZAC ROAD, MOUNT HAWTHORN - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO GROUPED DWELLING**

**Ward:** North

**Attachments:**

1. Consultation and Location Plan 
2. Development Plans 
3. Main Roads Western Australia Referral Comments 
4. Determination Advice Notes 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, APPROVES the application for and Alterations and Additions to Grouped Dwelling at No. 221 (Lot: 2; STR: 68676) Anzac Road, Mount Hawthorn, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 4:

**1. Development Plans**

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to a Grouped Dwelling as shown on the approved plans dated 10 March 2025 and 5 June 2025. No other development forms part of this approval.

**2. Colours and Materials**

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

**3. Stormwater**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1**





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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

#### **9.4 ADVERTISING OF AMENDMENT NO. 14 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 AND MODIFIED DRAFT LEEDERVILLE PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

- Attachments:**
1. Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 
  2. Draft Modified Leederville Precinct Structure Plan 
  3. SPC Modifications to Draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan 
  4. Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 - Administration Comments on Land Use Permissibility 

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council:**

1. **PREPARES** Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as included in Attachment 1 for the purposes of community consultation pursuant to section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
2. **CONSIDERS** Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to be a complex amendment pursuant to Part 5 Clause 35(2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* as it is:
  - An amendment that would have an impact that is significant relative to development in the locality. This is because it seeks to prepare and implement a community benefit framework which requires developer contributions; and
  - Not considered a basic or standard amendment;
3. **AUTHORISES** the execution of Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No.2 included in Attachment 1 accordance with the City's Execution of Documents Policy;
4. **SUBMITS** Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to the Western Australian Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Minister for Planning to approve the proposed amendment for advertising pursuant to Part 5 Clauses 37 and 37A of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
5. **REFERS** Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to the Environmental Protection Authority pursuant to Section 81 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
6. Subject to receiving approval from the Minister for Planning and advice from the Environmental Protection Authority **PROCEEDS** to advertise Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 pursuant to Part 5 Clause 38 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulations 2015*; and
7. **NOTES** that:
  - The City has been directed to modify the draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan by the Western Australian Planning Commission as included in Attachment 2 for the purposes of re-advertising. This would occur concurrently with the consultation for Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2;
  - The City would seek approval from Western Australian Planning Commission to advertise the modifications to the draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan for a period of 60 days to be consistent with Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2; and
  - Any submissions received during the advertising period for Amendment No. 14 to Local Planning Scheme No.2 and the draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan would be presented to Council for consideration.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4**

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

That the recommendation be adopted.



**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (8-0)**

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)





## 10.1 REPEAL OF POLICY NO. 2.2.6 TRUNCATIONS

- Attachments:
1. Policy No. 2.2.6 Truncations 
  2. Assessment of Policy No. 2.2.6 Truncations 

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council REPEALS Policy No. 2.2.6 Truncations at Attachment 1.

### COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (8-0)

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

**10.2 RFT IE430/2025 LITIS STADIUM FLOODLIGHTING UPGRADE**

**Attachments: 1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE 430/2025 - Confidential**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE430/2025; and**
- 2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Stiles Electrical & Communications Services Pty Ltd for Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade.**

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2**

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

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)**

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

**11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 MAY 2025**

**Attachments:** 1. Financial Statements as at 31 May 2025 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1**




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

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (8-0)**

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

## 11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 MAY 2025 TO 31 MAY 2025

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

### Recommendation:

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

EFT payments, including payroll	\$10,601,605.71
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$114,063.12
 Total payments for May 2025	 \$10,715,668.83

### COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

**11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 MAY 2025**

**Attachments:** 1. Investment Report as at 31 May 25 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3**

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

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (8-0)**

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

### 12.3 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:
1. Minutes of the Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group Meeting 13 March 2025 
  2. Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 24 April 2025 
  3. Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Special Council Meeting held on 8 May 2025 
  4. Unconfirmed Minutes of the Catalina Regional Council Meeting held on 19 June 2025 
  5. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of June 2025 
  6. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
  7. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 27 June 2025 
  8. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
  9. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
  10. Register of Petitions - Progress Report July 2025 
  11. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - July 2025 
  12. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - July 2025 
  13. Council Workshop Items since 14 May 2025 
  14. Council Briefing Notes - 10 June 2025 
  15. 2025 National General Assembly Communique 

### 16 – NATIONAL GERECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated July 2025.

### COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)













(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

At 6.41pm Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

## REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

### 9.2 NO. 235 (LOT: 4; D/P: 1189) BRISBANE STREET, PERTH - CHANGE OF USE FROM FAMILY DAY CARE TO CHILD CARE PREMISES - SECTION 31 RECONSIDERATION

Ward: South

- Attachments:
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Application Justification - Response to Reasons for Refusal 
  4. Noise Management Plan 
  5. Acoustic Report 
  6. Parking Management Plan 
  7. Waste Management Plan 
  8. 23 July 2024 Council Minutes and Refused Plans 
  9. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response 
  10. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response 
  11. Clause 67 Assessment 
  12. Determination Advice Notes 

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*, SETS ASIDE its decision dated 23 July 2024 and SUBSTITUTES a new decision to, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, APPROVE the application for Change of Use from Family Day Care to Child Care Premises at No. 235 (Lot: 4; D/P: 1189) Brisbane Street, Perth in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2 with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 12, subject to the following conditions:

#### 1. Development Approval

This approval is for a Change of Use from Family Day Care to Child Care Premises as shown on the plans dated 16 May 2024. No other development forms part of this approval.

#### 2. Use of the Premises

2.1. This approval is for Child Care Premises as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2. The use of the subject land for any other land use may require further approval from the City.

2.2. The Child Care Premises shall be limited to the following hours of operation:

- Monday to Friday: 7:00am to 6:00pm
- Saturday, Sunday and Public Holidays: Closed.

2.3. The Child Care Premises shall be limited to providing care for a maximum of seven children at any time.

2.4. The Child Care Premises shall have a maximum of two staff on site at any time.

#### 3. Amended Plans (Sightlines)

3.1. Prior to first occupation or use of the development, revised plans shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City. The revised plans shall demonstrate walls, fences and other structures truncated or reduced to no higher than 0.75 metres within 1.5 metres of where walls, fences, or other structures adjoin a vehicle access point or where a driveway meets a public street, with the exception of:

- One pier/pillar with a maximum width of 0.4 metres x 0.4 metres and a maximum height of 1.8 metres above the natural ground level with decorative capping

- permitted to 2.0 metres above the natural ground level;
- Fence slats or infill higher than 0.75 metres above natural ground level that provides a clear sight line; and
- If a gate is proposed across a vehicle access point where a driveway meets a public street, the gate must provide:

When closed: A minimum of 50 per cent unobstructed view.

When open: A clear sightline;

unless otherwise approved by the City.

The revised plans shall not result in any greater variation to the requirements of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form.

- 3.2. The works proposed in the revised plans required by Condition 3.1 above, shall be undertaken prior to first occupation or use of the development, to the satisfaction of the City.

#### 4. Landscaping

Trees within the external play area shall be maintained at the expense of the owners/operators to provide for a minimum of 30 percent of the external play area as canopy coverage at maturity, to the satisfaction of the City.

#### 5. Bicycle Parking

A minimum of two bicycle parking bays shall be provided on site prior to the commencement of the Child Care Premises use. The design and construction of the bike bays shall be in accordance with Australian Standards AS 2890.3:2015 Parking Facilities Part 3: Bicycle Parking, to the satisfaction of the City.

#### 6. Parking Management

The Parking Management Plan dated 30 May 2025, shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development and the development shall operate in accordance with this plan at all times, to the satisfaction of the City and at the expense of the owners/occupiers, unless otherwise approved by the City.

#### 7. Acoustic Report and Noise Management

7.1. The Child Care Premises shall operate in accordance with operational measures and recommendations outlined in the approved acoustic report (Gabriels Hearne Farrell Pty Ltd, dated 15 May 2025) at all times, to the satisfaction of the City.

7.2. The Child Care Premises shall at all times operate in accordance with the operational measures outlined in the approved Noise Management Plan dated 29 May 2024, to the satisfaction of the City.

#### 8. Waste Management

The Waste Management Plan dated 30 May 2025, shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development and the development shall operate in accordance with this plan at all times, to the satisfaction of the City and at the expense of the owners/occupiers, and unless otherwise approved by the City.

#### 9. Signage

All signage shall be in strict accordance with the City of Vincent Local Planning Policy: Signs and Advertising, to the satisfaction of the City, unless further development approval is obtained.



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

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

#### **AMENDMENT**

**Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Worner**

**That an additional recommendation 2 be added as below:**

#### **2. Time Limited Approval**

**This approval for a Child Care Premises is valid for a period of three (3) years from the date of occupation. After this period, the Child Care Premises shall cease to operate, unless a further approval is obtained prior to the expiration of this period; and**

**all subsequent recommendations be renumbered accordingly**

#### **REASON:**

The proposal involves introducing a commercial land use within the Residential zone, where the impact on residential amenity and land use compatibility are key considerations.

A time limited approval provides an opportunity to determine whether the proposal is capable of being managed to mitigate adverse amenity impacts and operate in a manner consistent with the Residential zone objectives. This includes assessing the effectiveness of the proposed management measures and enabling a review of those measures should modification be required.

A three year approval period is reasonable. It allows sufficient time for implementation and evaluation of the proposal, provides a level of certainty to the operator, and ensures any adverse amenity impacts are not permanently entrenched within the surrounding residential area.

#### **ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:**

Administration does not support the amended recommendation to include a time limited condition.

This is because Administration's assessment of the proposal has demonstrated that the proposed use is capable of operating on the subject site without adversely impacting on surrounding residential amenity, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

The proposed development would not operate at a greater scale or intensity than what a Family Day Care could operate on the site, without the need for development approval.

The recommended management measures which are proposed to be secured via conditions of approval, are not so onerous as to require a time limited approval period to demonstrate the compatibility of the use within its setting and to ensure there are no adverse impacts on adjoining residential development.

**CARRIED (6-2)**

**For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

**Against:** Cr Castle and Cr Alexander

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## **COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2**

### **1. Development Approval**

This approval is for a Change of Use from Family Day Care to Child Care Premises as shown on the plans dated 16 May 2024. No other development forms part of this approval.

### **2. Time Limited Approval**

This approval for a Child Care Premises is valid for a period of three (3) years from the date of occupation. After this period, the Child Care Premises shall cease to operate, unless a further approval is obtained prior to the expiration of this period.

### **3. Use of the Premises**

3.1. This approval is for Child Care Premises as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2. The use of the subject land for any other land use may require further approval from the City.

3.2. The Child Care Premises shall be limited to the following hours of operation:

- Monday to Friday: 7:00am to 6:00pm
- Saturday, Sunday and Public Holidays: Closed.

3.3. The Child Care Premises shall be limited to providing care for a maximum of seven children at any time.

3.4. The Child Care Premises shall have a maximum of two staff on site at any time.

### **4. Amended Plans (Sightlines)**

4.1. Prior to first occupation or use of the development, revised plans shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City. The revised plans shall demonstrate walls, fences and other structures truncated or reduced to no higher than 0.75 metres within 1.5 metres of where walls, fences, or other structures adjoin a vehicle access point or where a driveway meets a public street, with the exception of:

- One pier/pillar with a maximum width of 0.4 metres x 0.4 metres and a maximum height of 1.8 metres above the natural ground level with decorative capping permitted to 2.0 metres above the natural ground level;
- Fence slats or infill higher than 0.75 metres above natural ground level that provides a clear sight line; and
- If a gate is proposed across a vehicle access point where a driveway meets a public street, the gate must provide:

When closed: A minimum of 50 per cent unobstructed view.

When open: A clear sightline;

unless otherwise approved by the City.

The revised plans shall not result in any greater variation to the requirements of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form.

4.2. The works proposed in the revised plans required by Condition 3.1 above, shall be undertaken prior to first occupation or use of the development, to the satisfaction of the City.

### **5. Landscaping**

Trees within the external play area shall be maintained at the expense of the owners/operators

to provide for a minimum of 30 percent of the external play area as canopy coverage at maturity, to the satisfaction of the City.

**6. Bicycle Parking**

3A minimum of two bicycle parking bays shall be provided on site prior to the commencement of the Child Care Premises use. The design and construction of the bike bays shall be in accordance with Australian Standards AS 2890.3:2015 Parking Facilities Part 3: Bicycle Parking, to the satisfaction of the City.

**7. Parking Management**

The Parking Management Plan dated 30 May 2025, shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development and the development shall operate in accordance with this plan at all times, to the satisfaction of the City and at the expense of the owners/occupiers, unless otherwise approved by the City.

**8. Acoustic Report and Noise Management**

8.1. The Child Care Premises shall operate in accordance with operational measures and recommendations outlined in the approved acoustic report (Gabriels Hearne Farrell Pty Ltd, dated 15 May 2025) at all times, to the satisfaction of the City.

8.2. The Child Care Premises shall at all times operate in accordance with the operational measures outlined in the approved Noise Management Plan dated 29 May 2024, to the satisfaction of the City.

**9. Waste Management**

The Waste Management Plan dated 30 May 2025, shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development and the development shall operate in accordance with this plan at all times, to the satisfaction of the City and at the expense of the owners/occupiers, and unless otherwise approved by the City.

**10. Signage**

All signage shall be in strict accordance with the City of Vincent Local Planning Policy: Signs and Advertising, to the satisfaction of the City, unless further development approval is obtained.

**CARRIED (5-3)**

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

**Against:** Cr Alexander, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine




**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

At 7.13pm Executive Manager Development & Design left the meeting and did not return.

**9.3 NO. 71 (LOT: 200; D/P: 92012) EDWARD STREET AND NO. 120 (LOT: 1001; D/P: 29129) CLAISEBROOK ROAD, PERTH - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS OF HEIDELBERG DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL AND STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL SECTION 31 RECONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONS OF HOLCIM DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL**

**Ward:** South

**Attachments:**

1. Heidelberg and Holcim Existing, Proposed and Recommended Conditions 
2. Heidelberg Amended DA Additional Information 
3. Holcim S.31 Reconsideration Additional Information 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **MAKES** a submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission regarding the amended development application under Part 17C of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* for No. 71 Edward Street, Perth (SDAU-069-23-17C.1) , and the reconsideration under Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004* for No. 120 Claisebrook Road, Perth (SDAU-068-23) advising that:

- 1.1 **The City of Vincent DOES NOT SUPPORT** the proposed modifications to conditions as they are not in the public interest and are inconsistent with the planning framework in accordance with Sections 275(5) and (6) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* for the following reasons:

**No. 71 Edward Street, Perth**

- Alternative sites for the concrete batching plant to relocate to exist and are available for an orderly relocation out of Claisebrook to be achieved in accordance with the current approval (SDAU-069-23-17C.1). The proposed Transition Plan would serve no further planning purpose to the operator meeting their current obligations under Condition 1 of that existing approval.
- An increase in operating hours allowing operations to commence from 3am would have adverse amenity impacts from noise and traffic on the surrounding area which is zoned Mixed Use R160 under the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2).

The amenity disturbances of such operations would continue to increase in their impact as the area continues to redevelop with more sensitive uses over time in accordance with the areas local and State planning framework.

- The operation of the Concrete Batching Plant continues to be incompatible with the local and state planning framework. There is a clear public benefit to the site being cleared of industrial structures and contamination so as to remove this impediment to the redevelopment of the site and area in line with the vision of the local and State planning framework.

**No. 120 Claisebrook Road, Perth**

- The operation of the Concrete Batching Plant continues to be incompatible with the local and State planning framework. There is a clear public benefit to the site being cleared of industrial structures and contamination so as to remove this impediment to the redevelopment of the site and area in line with the vision of the local and State planning framework.

- 1.2 **PROVIDES** recommended conditions in Attachment 1 should the Western Australian Planning Commission be of the view to approve part or all of the respective development application/s.

- 1.3 **ENDORSES** the Mayor and/or CEO to write to the Western Australian Planning Commission to progress further planning for both the Heidelberg and Holcim sites in accordance with the respective Improvement Plans gazetted on 2 July 2024.

This could include the preparation of Improvement Schemes for and/or compulsory acquisition of both sites in accordance with Part 8 and Part 11 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* respectively.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3**

**Moved:** Cr Castle, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.





**CARRIED (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## 9.5 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED ART COLLECTION POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Amended Art Collection Policy 
  2. Local Policy No. 3.10.7 - Art Collection 
  3. Local Policy No. 3.10.8 - Public Art 
  4. Local Policy No. 3.10.9 - Public Murals 

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council pursuant to Section 2.7(2)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995* resolves to:

1. APPROVE the amended Art Collection Policy included in Attachment 1; and
2. REVOKE Policy No. 3.10.8 – Public Art included in Attachment 3, and Policy No. 3.10.9 – Public Murals included in Attachment 4.

### COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.5

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)

**12.1 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF REVISED EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS POLICY**

- Attachments:**
1. Execution of Documents Policy 
  2. Amended Delegation 2.2.18 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. Pursuant to Section 2.7(2)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995* APPROVES the amended Execution of Documents Policy included in Attachment 1; and
2. APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY amendments to the local government functions listed in the Council Delegated Authority Register included in Attachment 2, being:
  - The amendment of delegation 2.2.18; and
  - The deletion of delegation 2.2.30.

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1**

**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Woolf**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**

## **12.2 DISPOSITION OF PORTIONS OF MOUNT CLAREMONT MUNICIPAL DEPOT**

- Attachments:**
- 1. Batching Plants Relocation Plan** 
  - 2. Market Rent Valuation - Confidential**
  - 3. Recommended Proposed Changes to Delegation 2.2.18** 

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council DELEGATES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY to the Chief Executive Officer its power to lease (sub-lease or licence) portions of the Mount Claremont Municipal Depot, No. 11 John XXIII Avenue, Mount Claremont, subject to each lease (sub-lease or licence) not exceeding 24 months and that the leases would not prejudice the City's ability to relocate its Works Depot operations to the site before 2027, as set out in Attachment 3.**

### **COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2**

**Moved: Cr Wallace, Seconded: Cr Worner**

**That the recommendation be adopted.**

**CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)**

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

**Against:** Nil

**(Cr Hallett was an apology for the Meeting.)**



**13       MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil

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

Nil

**15       REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES**

Nil

**16       URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil

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

Nil

**18       CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 7.24pm with the following persons present:

<b>PRESENT:</b>	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
	Cr Ashley Wallace	South Ward
	Cr Sophie Greer	South Ward
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Prue Reddingius	A/Executive Director Strategy & Development
	John Corbellini	Director Major Projects
	Mitchell Hoad	Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability
	Emma Simmons	A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Wendy Barnard	Executive Assistant to Mayor and Council Support

These Minutes were confirmed at the 12 August 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 15 July 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated