



**CITY OF VINCENT**

# **NOTES**

**Council Briefing**

**3 March 2026**

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies / Members on Approved Leave of Absence</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> .....	<b>4</b>
	<b>Reports with Discussion</b> .....	<b>5</b>
5.2	No. 128A (Lot: 2; Plan: 80812) Harold Street, Mount Lawley - Proposed Change Of Use From Single House To Single House and Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation .....	5
5.1	Nos. 407-409 (Lot: 888 & Part Lot: 33; S/P: 82739 & D/P: 2334) Charles Street, North Perth - Proposed Multiple Dwellings - Submission on Part 11B Significant Development Application .....	7
8.1	Amendments to the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates and the Code of Conduct Behaviour Complaints Management Policy .....	12
5.3	No. 1/652 (Lot: 105; D/P: 63423) Newcastle Street, Leederville - Proposed Change of Use from Warehouse to Tavern and Alterations and Additions.....	14
5.4	Outcome of Advertising and Approval of Local Planning Policy - Construction Management .....	19
6.1	Lifevac Installation and Usage Evaluation .....	20
7.4	Approval to Advertise Amended Investment Policy - Standard Amendment .....	21
	<b>Reports without Discussion</b> .....	<b>22</b>
7.1	Financial Statements as at 31 January 2026.....	22
7.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 January 2026 to 31 January 2026 .....	23
7.3	Investment Report as at 31 January 2026 .....	24
7.5	Mid Year Budget Review .....	25
8.2	Information Bulletin .....	26
<b>9</b>	<b>Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Representation on Committees and Public Bodies</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Closure</b> .....	<b>27</b>

**NOTES OF CITY OF VINCENT  
COUNCIL BRIEFING  
HELD AT THE E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,  
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE  
ON TUESDAY, 3 MARCH 2026 AT 6:00 PM**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p><b>Mayor Alison Xamon</b>  <b>Cr Alex Castle</b>  <b>Cr Con Poulos</b>  <b>Cr Nicole Woolf</b>  <b>Cr Suzanne Worner</b>  <b>Cr Ashley Wallace</b>  <b>Cr Ashlee La Fontaine</b>  <b>Cr Reece Wheadon</b></p>	<p><b>Presiding Member</b>  <b>North Ward</b>  <b>North Ward</b>  <b>North Ward</b>  <b>North Ward</b>  <b>South Ward</b>  <b>South Ward</b>  <b>South Ward</b></p>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<p><b>David MacLennan</b>  <b>Peter Varris</b></p> <p><b>Rhys Taylor</b></p> <p><b>Jay Naidoo</b></p> <p><b>Emma Simmons</b></p> <p><b>Mitchell Hoad</b></p> <p><b>Michael Hancock</b>  <b>Dale Morrissy</b>  <b>Main Bhuiyan</b></p> <p><b>Carrie Miller</b>  <b>Alex Harris</b></p>	<p><b>Chief Executive Officer</b>  <b>Executive Director Infrastructure &amp; Environment</b>  <b>Executive Director Community &amp; Business Services</b>  <b>Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development</b>  <b>A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance</b>  <b>Manager Strategic Planning &amp; Sustainability</b>  <b>Manager Development &amp; Design</b>  <b>Manager Community Facilities</b>  <b>Manager Financial Services (arrived during Item 3.3 at 6.09pm)</b>  <b>Corporate Strategy &amp; Governance Officer</b>  <b>Governance Officer</b></p>

**Public:** Approximately 4 members of the public.

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

The Presiding Member, 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.”

## **2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Cr Suzanne Worner is on an approved leave of absence from 11 February 2026 to 11 March 2026, however she attended the Council Briefing on 3 March 2026.

Cr Sophie Greer is on an approved leave of absence from 11 February 2026 to 19 May 2026.

## **3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS**

The following is a summary of questions and submissions received and responses provided at the meeting. This is not a verbatim record of comments made at the meeting.

### **3.1 Jeremy Milne of Mt Lawley – Item 5.2**

Spoke against item 5.2. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

**3.2 Jacquie Hall of Perth – Item 5.1**

Spoke in support of item 5.1. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

**3.3 Dudley Maier of Highgate – Item 8.1**

Spoke against item 8.1. Their full statement can be heard [here](#).

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6:10pm.

**4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nil

**REPORTS**

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

**Items which Council Members wish to discuss which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment and the following was advised:**

COUNCIL MEMBER	ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED
Cr Woolf	5.4 and 6.1
Cr Worner	5.3
Cr Wallace	7.4

**REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION****5.2 NO. 128A (LOT: 2; PLAN: 80812) HAROLD STREET, MOUNT LAWLEY - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM SINGLE HOUSE TO SINGLE HOUSE AND UNHOSTED SHORT TERM RENTAL ACCOMMODATION****Ward:** South Ward

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, REFUSES the application for Change of Use from Single House to Single House and Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation at No. 128A (Lot: 2; Plan: 80812) Harold Street, Mount Lawley for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the objectives of the Residential zone of the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, and the objectives of the City's Local Planning Policy – Short Term Accommodation, the proposed development would be incompatible with its setting and would have adverse impacts on the amenity and character of the locality for the following reasons:
  - 1.1 Pursuant to 67(m) and (n) in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the site is located within a predominantly residential streetscape characterised by permanent occupation and limited ambient activity. The proposal would introduce short-stay visitor accommodation with regular guest turnover and transient occupancy patterns that are materially different from permanent residential use and are not compatible with the established character of the locality;
  - 1.2 Pursuant to the objectives of the Residential Zone in the City of Vincent's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, the proposed Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation is not compatible with, nor complimentary to, surrounding properties. The introduction of the Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation-into the predominantly residential area would generate levels of noise and activity that are inconsistent with the established residential character, resulting in an undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties; and
  - 1.3 Pursuant to the objectives of the City's Local Planning Policy – Short Term Accommodation, the proposed Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation is not appropriately located or designed to mitigate potential noise impacts on surrounding residential properties. The dwelling shares a full-length two-storey boundary wall with the adjoining residence and contains an outdoor living area that directly adjoins the major openings of the neighbouring property. These close physical interfaces increase the potential for noise transmission and disturbance, and the proposal would result in undue impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

**CR CASTLE:**

Can you outline what the status of the approved application for a pool and decking at the subject site and provide further commentary as to the potential amenity impacts if this approval was enacted concurrently with a STRA approval?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

There is a separate development approval for a pool and decking at the property that remains valid until 21 June 2026.

That approval is independent of this application. The owner could build the pool and decking whether or not Council approves the STRA use.

For the purposes of this application, Council is being asked to determine whether Unhosted STRA is an appropriate use of the site, having regard to the planning framework and potential amenity impacts.

If Council were to approve the STRA, the pool and decking if constructed could be used by guests in the same way they could be used by residents. That would increase the level of outdoor activity associated with the use.

The existence of the separate development approval does not change the planning considerations for this application. The key question remains whether the STRA use is suitable for this location, particularly given the close physical interface with neighbouring dwellings, including the shared boundary wall and the outdoor living area located near neighbouring bedroom windows.

In that context, the recommendation by Administration is based on the planning assessment that Unhosted STRA is not appropriate for this site due to its residential context and the potential amenity impacts on adjoining properties.

The officer report has also been updated in the Comments section to provide additional clarification on the separate approval for the pool and decking and how it relates to the consideration of this application.

**CR WHEADON:**

Can you outline the main difference between the subject application and the recent council item for No. 11 St Albans Avenue which went to Council recently, as this application is recommended for refusal whereas St Albans was recommended for Approval?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

The application referred to is No. 11 St Albans Avenue, Highgate, which Council considered at its December 2025 meeting.

Development applications must be assessed on its own planning merits, including the immediate interface with adjoining properties and the broader context of the surrounding locality.

In terms of the broader context, both sites are located within established residential areas in proximity to the Beaufort Street activity corridor. As such, both reports recognise they're within inner-urban neighbourhoods that are in proximity to commercial uses.

The key distinction identified in the officer assessments relates to the immediate physical relationship between each dwelling and its neighbouring properties.

For 11 St Albans Avenue, the dwelling's outdoor living area faces the street and adjoining outdoor areas and major openings are generally orientated away from the subject site or separated by fencing and distance. These characteristics reduce the potential for direct noise impacts on neighbouring residential areas.

In the case of No. 11 St Albans Avenue, the officer report identified that the dwelling's outdoor living area is orientated toward the street rather than neighbouring rear outdoor areas, and adjoining dwellings are either separated by distance, fencing or orientation of major openings. This layout reduces the likelihood of noise or activity directly affecting neighbouring properties.

In contrast, the dwelling at No. 128A Harold Street has a closer interface with neighbouring dwellings, including a shared boundary wall and outdoor living areas located directly adjacent to neighbouring habitable room openings. These site characteristics increase the likelihood that activity associated with short-term accommodation would unduly affect neighbouring residents and that operational management measures would not adequately mitigate those impacts.

For these reasons, when assessed against both the immediate interface with neighbouring properties and the broader locality context, the subject application for No. 128A Harold Street presents a greater risk of adverse amenity impacts and has led to a different planning conclusion that it should be refused.

**5.1 NOS. 407-409 (LOT: 888 & PART LOT: 33; S/P: 82739 & D/P: 2334) CHARLES STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED MULTIPLE DWELLINGS - SUBMISSION ON PART 11B SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**

**Ward:** North

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Recommended Conditions 
  3. Clause 67 Assessment 
  4. Development Plans 
  5. Design Review Comments - First Review 
  6. Design Review Comments - Second Review 
  7. Applicant Planning Report 
  8. Design Report 
  9. Landscaping Plans 
  10. Acoustic Report 
  11. Arborist Report 
  12. Sustainability Strategy 
  13. Transport Impact Statement 
  14. Waste Management Plan 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **MAKES** a submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission regarding the development application made to the State Government under Part 11B of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, for 52 Multiple Dwellings at Nos. 407A, B, C and D, 409 (Lots: 1-4, 888 and Part Lot: 33, S/P: 82739 and D/P: 2334) Charles Street, North Perth (application reference SDAU-049-25); and
2. **ADVISES** the Western Australian Planning Commission that the City of Vincent:
  - 2.1 **SUPPORTS** the development application, subject to the Western Australian Planning Commission being satisfied that the following matters are appropriately addressed prior to determination or incorporated into any approval:
    - 2.1.1 **Western Interface**

Revised development plans are provided demonstrating a materially improved upper-level transition to the western interface, including a clearly articulated transition to the adjoining R20 residential properties through stepped height form, increased fourth floor setback or equivalent design modification that achieves an appropriate interface having regard to the lower density and built form context of the adjoining properties.
    - 2.1.2 **Car Parking**

The proposed car parking provision is increased (resident and visitor) to 45 resident and 8 visitor car parking bays or, alternatively, the Applicant provides further evidence and parking management details demonstrating that the proposed shortfall satisfies the relevant Element Objectives of Element 3.9 – Car and Bicycle Parking of the Residential Design Codes Volume 2, including an assessment of available on-street parking capacity and proposed measures to manage resident and visitor parking demand;
    - 2.1.3 **Social Housing Details**

Additional information is provided by the Applicant regarding the intended housing model described as ‘social housing’ in the Applicant’s Report, including the proposed tenancy model, operational details, site management arrangements and

complaint handling procedures, to the extent that this information is relied upon to justify discretionary planning outcomes or informs operational and amenity considerations, such as parking demand and site management;

#### 2.1.4 Tree Retention and Landscaping Justification

Additional information is provided by the Applicant regarding the proposed removal of the centrally located mature tree, including detailed Arboricultural analysis and design justification demonstrating that retention is not practicable or, alternatively, modification of the development design to facilitate its retention; and

#### 2.1.5 Applicable Density Provisions and Planning Control Area Works

Confirmation that the associated application for works within Planning Control Area 167 is approved, enabling the Planning Control Area land to be considered as part of the development site for density assessment purposes under Clause 26(3) of Local Planning Scheme No. 2, such that the development site area exceeds 2,000 square metres and can be assessed against the R100 density provisions and

### 2.2 PROVIDES recommended conditions and advice notes contained in Attachment 2 should the Western Australian Planning Commission be of the view to approve the application.

#### CR WOOLF:

I was wondering whether Administration would consider a minor amendment just for clarity, not for substance, being that the City of Vincent supports the application subject to the WAPC being satisfied that all of the following matters are addressed.

My read is that this shouldn't change any substance because we do have "and" between that list of outstanding matters, but I thought that wording might help clarify that.

#### MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

*Yes. The amendment is administrative in nature and does not change the planning intent of the recommendation.*

*Administration supports clarifying the wording so it clearly communicates that the City's support is conditional on the outstanding matters being addressed.*

*The recommendation has been updated to reflect this minor wording change.*

#### CR WHEADON:

I note the report mentions the high-frequency bus transit and that there is a bus stop directly outside the site. I was wondering if you would have information on the number of buses a day, average wait times, and the number of people who transit, because obviously the community have raised concerns that people don't actually catch the bus.

So I wonder if you had the stats on how many people actually do catch the bus down Charles Street. They are actually online. It's about 16,000 people a day from when they built the bus overpass.

#### MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

*The development proposes a reduced on site resident and visitor car parking provision. The Element Objectives relating to car parking of the Residential Design Codes Volume 2 (R-Codes) require adequate on site parking or the demonstration of satisfactory alternative transport options.*

*The subject site, along Charles Street, has access to several bus routes, including routes 384, 386, 388, 389, 386X, 970 and 970X. During the morning peak toward Perth there is a bus every 2 – 3 minutes on average.*

*The subject site is also within close proximity to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and amenities, such as the shopping precinct at the intersection of Charles Street and Scarborough Beach Road.*

*In addition, the applicant has provided justification that the occupants of the development will be through a social housing provider and therefore unlikely to have the same level of vehicle ownership as other tenure*

arrangements.

*Administration accounted for these factors in its assessment and did not consider sufficient justification had been provided to support a reduction in the provision of on site car parking.*

**CR CASTLE:**

Can you outline what the status of this report is to the WAPC and what regard they should have to it?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*The WAPC must provide an opportunity for the local government to make a submission on a Significant Development Application.*

*In determining the application, the WAPC must have due regard to the City's submission along with the broader planning framework.*

*This includes relevant planning instruments such as the City's Local Planning Scheme, local planning policies, and submissions received during consultation.*

*The Planning and Development Act 2005 also allows the WAPC to determine an application inconsistently with a local planning instrument where it considers the proposal raises issues of State or regional importance, is in the public interest, or the variation is minor and consistent with the intent of the planning framework.*

*While planning considerations are central to the assessment, the Act also allows the WAPC to consider any other matters it considers relevant when determining the application.*

**CR CASTLE:**

Do the WAPC receive recommendations from anywhere else? Does DPLH prepare a report for them to assist their decision making, or anyone else?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*Yes, for Significant Development Applications under Part 11B of the Planning and Development Act, the State Development Assessment Unit (SDAU) within the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage coordinates the assessment on behalf of the WAPC.*

*Relevant agencies and authorities are invited to provide submissions, including the local government. The SDAU prepares an assessment report and recommendation for the WAPC.*

*The City's submission forms part of that report and is included as a non-confidential attachment for the WAPC's consideration.*

**CR CASTLE:**

Consultation for this application is being run by the DPLH, with responses being sent directly to them. Does Council have any visibility of the responses now, or not until the report to the WAPC?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*Consultation is managed by the SDAU on behalf of the WAPC and the City does not have visibility of submission responses until the report is made public.*

*The community is involved in the decision making process through formal consultation undertaken by the SDAU. Submissions are sent directly to the SDAU and are dealt with in their report. The SDAU also includes a summary of submissions as an attachment to their report.*

*Members of the community may also request the opportunity to make a deputation to the WAPC when the application is considered.*

**CR CASTLE:**

A number of elements of the subject application rely on development within the PCA as part of another application. If approved, does that protect that area from future road widening, or is there a possibility that if both this application and the PCA application are approved, then in the future if road widening occurs the development within the PCA is removed?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*Yes, it is possible that works within the Primary Control Area (PCA) could be removed in the future if road widening were required.*

*Approval of development within the PCA does not prevent future road widening.*

*Works proposed within the PCA include elements such as the vehicle crossover, eight visitor bicycle parking bays and deep soil areas.*

*Importantly, these elements were not relied upon to meet the development's core requirements for deep soil area or bicycle parking. This means it would not result in a reduction in the deep soil area or bicycle parking considered as part of this application. As a result, if those elements were removed in the future, it would not critically compromise the function of the development.*

**CR WALLACE:**

A large amount of site area is dedicated to car parking. The Built Form Policy requires a higher level of canopy coverage across car parks. Can you please advise if that is applicable to this site?

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*The Built Form Policy includes a standard that open-air car parking areas be landscaped at a minimum rate of one tree per four car bays.*

*This provision has been approved by Council but not by the WAPC, which means it does not have the same weight as other policy standards.*

*The proposal includes 36 car parking bays, some of which are not open air. The landscaping plan shows 15 trees around the perimeter of the car parking area, which would meet and exceed the policy provision relating to canopy in open air car parking.*

**MAYOR XAMON:**

We are receiving feedback from the community. I've noted that a number of members of the community think this is a sensible use of land on Charles Street, but there are also concerns from immediate neighbours on a number of issues which have been picked up in the recommendation.

My question is about the nature of the recommendation we need to put forward. Is it possible for us to take a more agnostic approach to this?

Rather than saying we support it, but want to see certain issues addressed, is it possible to simply say our feedback is that we would like to see these elements considered before the proposal moves forward?

Because it strikes me that there are a number of outstanding issues in areas that either contravene our own policies or where we have not received all the information that we would ordinarily require to make a decision.

So my question is about the process and whether it is possible for us to provide feedback that is more agnostic in relation to support or otherwise.

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*Yes, Council can determine how it wishes to frame its submission.*

*The State Development Assessment Unit [Application Guide](#) states that local government submissions should include the final comments from technical officers and without-prejudice conditions, and may include a recommendation on planning grounds.*

*This means Council is able to provide comments on the proposal without necessarily expressing a definitive position of support or not support.*

*In practice, the clearer Council is about its planning position, the easier it is for the SDAU and WAPC to understand what Council is asking for and how important the requested changes are.*

*If Council adopts an agnostic position, it can still provide a strong submission by being very explicit about the*

*issues Council considers critical, the changes Council is seeking, and whether those changes are required before the proposal could be supported.*

*However, if those matters are not expressed clearly, or if the submission does not clearly articulate Council's planning position, it may reduce the clarity and weight of the City's feedback to the WAPC. This may result in the requested changes currently captured in 2.1.1 – 2.1.5 in the officer recommendation being interpreted as having less urgency and importance in the overall assessment.*

## 8.1 AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR COUNCIL MEMBERS, COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND CANDIDATES AND THE CODE OF CONDUCT BEHAVIOUR COMPLAINTS MANAGEMENT POLICY

- Attachments:**
1. Nominated Members Code (clean) 
  2. Nominated Members Code (tracked) 
  3. Amended Delegation - 2.2.31 Appointing External Complaints Officer (clean) 
  4. Amended Delegation - 2.2.31 Appointing External Complaints Officer (tracked) 
  5. Amended Delegation - 2.1.2 Behaviour Complaints Committee (clean) 
  6. Amended Delegation - 2.1.2 Behaviour Complaints Committee (tracked) 
  7. Code of Conduct Behaviour Complaints Management Policy (clean) 
  8. Code of Conduct Behaviour Complaints Management Policy (tracked) 
  9. Behaviour Complaints Committee - Terms of Reference (clean) 
  10. Behaviour Complaints Committee - Terms of Reference (tracked) 
  11. Behaviour Complaint Form (clean) 
  12. Behaviour Complaint Form (tracked) 

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** by **ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**:
  - 1.1 the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates (Nominated Members Code), at Attachment 1,
  - 1.2 updated delegation 2.2.31 – Appointing External Complaints Officer at Attachment 3,
  - 1.3 updated delegation 2.1.2 – Behaviour Complaints Committee at Attachment 5,
2. **ADOPTS** the updated:
  - 2.1 Code of Conduct Behaviour Complaints Management Policy at Attachment 7,
  - 2.2 Terms of Reference for the Behaviour Complaints Committee at Attachment 9; and
  - 2.3 Behaviour Complaint Form at Attachment 11

#### **CR WALLACE:**

When will the Code of Conduct next be reviewed, and will there be an opportunity to undertake a broader review outside of the current legislative amendments?

#### **A/EXECUTIVE MANAGER CORPORATE STRATEGY & GOVERNANCE:**

*The amendments presented in this report are required to incorporate recent legislative changes to the Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021 and must be adopted by 1 April 2026 to ensure compliance with section 5.104(2) of the Local Government Act 1995. As such, these amendments have not been advertised as they are limited to those prescribed changes.*

*The Model Code itself is prescribed legislation, which limits the extent to which the behavioural provisions can be amended by a local government.*

*The City's Code of Conduct Behaviour Complaints Management Policy was adopted in 2022 and scheduled for review in 2026 as part of the City's standard policy review cycle. Given the recent legislative reforms and the anticipated release of updated sector guidance and templates from the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety and WALGA, this review will be deferred until that guidance becomes available to ensure the City's framework aligns with the latest sector advice.*

*If Council wishes to include broader principles or policy statements relating to the management of behavioural complaints, these would more appropriately be considered through the Behaviour Complaints Management Policy rather than the prescribed Model Code.*

**5.3 NO. 1/652 (LOT: 105; D/P: 63423) NEWCASTLE STREET, LEEDERVILLE - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM WAREHOUSE TO TAVERN AND ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS****Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
  2. Development Plans 
  3. Acoustic Report 
  4. Venue Management Plan 
  5. Traffic Impact Statement 
  6. Parking Management Plan 
  7. Waste Management Plan 
  8. Clause 67 Assessment 
  9. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
  10. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
  11. 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 a proposed Change of Use from Warehouse to Tavern and Additions and Alterations at No. 1/652 (Lot: 105; D/P: 63423) Newcastle Street, Leederville in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 11:

**1. Development Approval**

This approval relates to a Change of Use from Warehouse to Tavern including Additions and Alterations as shown on the approved plans dated 17 November 2025 and 20 February 2026. No other development forms part of this approval;

**2. Use of Premises**

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

**2.2** The hours of operation of the Tavern shall be limited to:

- 7:00am to 12:00am Monday to Sunday.
- The alfresco seating area facing Carr Place is to be closed from 10:00pm.

**2.3** The Tavern shall be limited to a maximum of 200 patrons at any one time;

**3. Building Design**

**3.1** Prior to the issue of a building permit, a detailed schedule of external finishes (including materials, colour schemes and details) shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The development shall be finished in accordance with the approved schedule prior to the use or occupation of the development, to the satisfaction of the City;

**3.2** Prior to the issue of a building permit, amended plans are to be submitted to and approved by the City, demonstrating a low-level wall and roof structure enclosing the bin store, consistent in height and design with the proposed boundary fence, to the satisfaction of the City;

**3.3** All external fixtures and building plant, including air conditioning units, piping, ducting and water tanks, shall be located so as to minimise any visual and noise impact on surrounding landowners, and screened from view from the street, and surrounding properties to the satisfaction of the City; and

- 3.4 The roof of the proposed addition shall have a maximum solar absorptance rating of 0.4, to the satisfaction of the City;

#### 4. Façade Design

- 4.1 Doors and windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Newcastle Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with the street, with exception of the faux window to the toilet facilities, to the satisfaction of the City;
- 4.2 Glazing and/or tinting shall have a minimum of 70 percent visible light transmission to provide unobscured visibility between the street and the interior of the tenancy, to the satisfaction of the City; and
- 4.3 Internal security and privacy treatments shall be located and installed internally behind the glazing line or recessed, and shall be transparent and visually permeable to allow views inside the building and enable internal light sources to be seen from the street, to the satisfaction of the City;

#### 5. Landscaping

- 5.1 Prior to the lodgement of a building permit, a detailed landscape and reticulation plan for the development site and the adjoining road verge, shall be lodged with and approved by the City.

The plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100, be generally in accordance with the landscaping plans dated 20 February 2026, and shall show the following to the satisfaction of the City:

- The location and type of proposed trees and plants;
- Areas to be irrigated or reticulated;
- The provision on-site of a minimum of three trees with connection to deep soil and on-structure planting areas provided; and
- The provision of three trees to the Carr Place verge.

- 5.2 All works shown in the approved landscape and reticulation plan as identified in Condition 5.1 shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to the City's satisfaction, prior to occupancy or use of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

#### 6. Access and Bicycle Facilities

- 6.1 Prior to occupancy or use of the development, redundant or "blind" crossovers to Carr Place and Newcastle Street shall be removed and the verge and kerb made good to the satisfaction of the City, at the applicant/owner's full expense;
- 6.2 All pedestrian access levels shall match into existing verge and footpath levels, to the satisfaction of the City; and
- 6.3 Six bicycle parking spaces shall be provided on-site in accordance with Australian Standard AS2890.3 prior to the occupation or use of the development, to the satisfaction of the City;

#### 7. 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;

#### 8. Waste Management

- 8.1 The Waste Management Plan dated 17 November 2025 shall be implemented at all times

to the satisfaction of the City;

8.2 Waste collection shall be limited to between 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Saturday; and

8.3 Waste and refuse generated on the site by the development shall be collected by a private contractor at the expense of the applicant/landowner;

9. Acoustic Report

9.1 All operational measures, recommendations and construction specifications outlined in the approved Acoustic Report (prepared by Stantec, dated 2 December 2025) shall be implemented prior to the occupation or use of the development the subject of this approval, and maintained thereafter, to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers; and

9.2 The Tavern shall operate in accordance with operational scenarios and recommendations of the approved Acoustic Report at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

10. Venue Management

The premises shall operate in accordance with the approved Venue Management Plan dated 20 February 2026, at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

11. Construction Management Plan

Prior to the issue of a Building Permit, a Construction Management Plan that details how the construction of the development will be managed to minimise the impact on the surrounding (including demolition and/or forward works). The Construction Management Plan is required to address the following matters that relate to any works to take place on the site:

- Public safety, amenity and site security;
- Contact details of essential site personnel;
- Construction operating hours;
- Noise control and vibration management;
- Air, sand and dust management;
- Stormwater and sediment control;
- Soil excavation method;
- Waste management and materials re-use;
- Traffic and access management;
- Parking arrangements for contractors and subcontractors;
- Consultation plan with nearby properties; and
- Compliance with AS4970-2009 relating to the protection of trees on the verge adjacent to the development site; and

12. Public Art Contribution

12.1 In accordance with City's Local Planning Policy - Percent for Art the application is required to make a public art contribution of \$20,000 being one percent of the \$2 million cost of development.

To comply with the Policy, the owner(s) or applicant, on behalf of the owner(s) shall submit a statutory declaration prior to the issue of a building permit stipulating the choice of:

Option 1: Owner/Applicant chooses to co-ordinate the Public Art project themselves or by engaging an art consultant

OR

Option 2: Owner/Applicant chooses to pay cash-in-lieu. Owner/Applicants who choose

Option 2 will receive a 15 percent discount on the Percent for Art contribution; and

12.2 The owner(s), or the applicant on behalf of the owner(s), shall comply with the City of Vincent Percent for Public Art Policy No. 7.5.13 in conjunction with the above chosen option:

Option 1:

Prior to the issue of a building permit for the development, obtain approval for the Public Art Project and associated Artist; and

Prior to the occupation or use of the development, install the approved public art project, and thereafter maintain the art work;

OR

Option 2:

Prior to the occupation or use of the development pay the above cash-in-lieu contribution amount.

**CR WHEADON:**

If we're installing those on-street car parking and delivery bays, are we able to charge cash in lieu for the construction of those two bays?

**COORDINATOR DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:**

*Yes, Council could impose a cash-in-lieu contribution under the City's Non-Residential Parking Policy. Administration does not support doing so in this case because that Policy should not be the primary parking framework applied to this proposal.*

*For development in the Leederville Town Centre, substantial weight should instead be given to the Draft Leederville Precinct Structure Plan (LPSP). The Draft LPSP is a seriously entertained planning instrument endorsed by Council and progressed through WAPC consideration, and it represents the City's current strategic planning framework for the precinct.*

*Consistent with the approach taken throughout the assessment of this application, the officer report applies greater weight to the Draft LPSP where it provides more specific guidance for development in the Leederville Town Centre.*

*Under the Draft LPSP, development within the town centre is not required to provide on-site car parking. This is because the strategy for the precinct is to rely on consolidated public parking supply and increased use of walking, cycling and public transport.*

*Because the Draft LPSP does not require parking to be provided on site, the proposal does not generate a parking shortfall. This means there is no planning basis to require a cash-in-lieu contribution.*

*While the City's broader Non-Residential Parking Policy would ordinarily prescribe a parking requirement and could give rise to a cash-in-lieu payment, the officer report concludes that greater weight should be given to the Draft LPSP as the more recent precinct-specific framework for Leederville.*

*On that basis, the Policy should not be relied upon to justify a cash-in-lieu contribution in this instance.*

*If Council were to pursue a cash-in-lieu contribution under the Policy, the City's Payment in Lieu of Parking Plan sets out how those funds can be used.*

*Under that Payment in Lieu of Parking Plan, the funds must be applied to public parking improvements within the area. This can include works that improve how on-street parking operates or how it is managed. Examples include line-marking bays, reconfiguring on-street parking layouts, installing or updating parking*

*signage, introducing parking controls, and other operational changes that improve the use and management of public parking.*

**5.4 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND APPROVAL OF LOCAL PLANNING POLICY - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT**

- Attachments:
1. Draft Local Planning Policy: Construction Management 
  2. Consultation Theme & Administration Comment 
  3. Schedule of Modifications 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. **PROCEEDS** with amendments to Local Planning Policy: Construction Management, with modifications included in Attachment 1, pursuant of Schedule 2, Clause 5(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
2. **NOTES** that Administration will publish a notice in accordance with Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

**6.1 LIFEVAC INSTALLATION AND USAGE EVALUATION**

**Attachments: Nil**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

- 1. NOTES the update on the implementation of LifeVac® airway clearance devices across City of Vincent community facilities, including-**
  - **that installation has been completed at identified priority staffed locations.**
  - **that staff training and resources have been implemented and will be embedded into ongoing staff induction processes.**
  - **that further expansion of device installation will be investigated following evaluation of the current installations.**

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

**7.4 APPROVAL TO ADVERTISE AMENDED INVESTMENT POLICY - STANDARD AMENDMENT**

**Attachments:**           1.    **Draft Investment Policy** 

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

**REPORTS WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**7.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 JANUARY 2026**

**Attachments:** 1. Financial Statements as at 31 Jan 2026 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **RECEIVES** the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 January 2026 as shown in Attachment 1.

**NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**7.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 JANUARY 2026 TO 31 JANUARY 2026**

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

**Recommendation:**

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 January 2026 to 31 January 2026 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$ 5,400,991.02
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$ 167,970.76
Total payment for January 2026	\$ 5,568,961.78

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

**7.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 JANUARY 2026**

**Attachments:** 1. Investment Report as at 31 January 2026 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **NOTES** the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 January 2026 as detailed in Attachment 1.

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

**7.5 MID YEAR BUDGET REVIEW**

- Attachments:**
1. **Statement of Financial Activity 2025-26** 
  2. **Net Current Assets 2025-26** 
  3. **Cash Backed Reserves Budget 2025-26** 
  4. **Capital Expenditure Budget 2025-26** 
  5. **Operating Budget Analysis 2025-26** 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY APPROVES the following amendments to the 2025/26 Annual Budget:**

1. **A net increase in the Operating result of \$2,652,008 as per Attachment 1;**
2. **A net increase in Cash Backed Reserves totalling \$2,669,617 as per Attachments 3;**
3. **A net decrease in proceeds from new borrowings totalling \$332,872 as per Attachments 1;**
4. **A net increase in the closing surplus of \$912,935, resulting in a forecasted year end surplus at 30 June 2026 of \$1,308,989 as per Attachment 1;**
5. **A net decrease in the Capital Expenditure Budget of \$1,383,216 as per Attachment 4; and**
6. **Additional loan payment of \$400,000 towards Beatty Park Loan 10.**

<b>NO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE</b>
-------------------------------

## 8.2 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. **Unconfirmed Minutes of the Catalina Regional Council Meeting held on 15 February 2026** 
  2. **Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of January 2026** 
  3. **Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential**
  4. **Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 23 February 2026** 
  5. **Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current** 
  6. **Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current** 
  7. **Register of Petitions - Progress Report March 2026** 
  8. **Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - December 2026** 
  9. **Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - March 2026** 
  10. **Council Workshop Items since 10 February 2026** 
  11. **Council Briefing Notes - 3 February 2026** 

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the Information Bulletin dated March 2026.

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Statistics for Development Services Applications for the month of February have now been included. The following Registers have been updated as follows:

#### State Administrative Tribunal Register

- Nos. 41-43 & 45 Angove Street – Formal orders issued by the SAT confirming dates.
- No. 11 St Albans Avenue, Highgate – The mediation scheduled for 10 March 2026 is being rescheduled.

#### Development Assessment Panel Register

- No. 114 Hobart Street – Application approved at the meeting held 24 February 2026.
- Nos. 139 and 141 Lake Street – Further information received, seeking stop the clock extension of time request from applicant.
- No. 292 Beaufort Street – Application accepted, RAR due 11 May 2026.
- No. 129 Loftus Street – Application has been withdrawn by the applicant and to be determined under delegation.
- No. 19 Lincoln Street – Application considered by DRP on 4 March 2026.

#### Design Review Panel Register

- Nos. 581 & 583 Beaufort Street and No. 2 & 4 Vincent Street – Preliminary review of concept plans.
- No. 391 Lord Street – Pre-lodgement referral to the DRP.
- No. 19 Lincoln Street – DRP referral for lodged application.

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

Nil

**10 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES**

Nil

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

Nil

**12 CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 6.56pm.