



Hy **CITY OF VINCENT**

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

16 June 2026

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 | 4 |
| (B) | Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice | 13 |
| 4 | Applications for Leave of Absence | 22 |
| 5 | The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations | 22 |
| 6 | Confirmation of Minutes | 23 |
| 7 | Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion) | 23 |
| 7.1 | Highgate and North Perth Traffic Studies | 23 |
| 8 | Declarations of Interest | 24 |
| | REPORTS | 24 |
| | Items Approved "En Bloc": | 25 |
| 9.1 | No. 29 (Lot: 1; D/P: 11538) Green Street, Mount Hawthorn - Proposed Three Grouped Dwellings..... | 26 |
| 9.3 | Outcomes of Advertising of Draft Local Planning Policy: Trees of Significance, and Advertising of Proposed Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Draft Local Planning Policy: Regulated & Significant Trees | 29 |
| 10.2 | Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Verge Treatment Policy | 31 |
| 10.3 | Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Policy Rights of Way | 32 |
| 11.2 | Investment Report as at 30 April 2026 | 33 |
| 11.3 | Financial Statements as at 30 April 2026 | 34 |
| 11.4 | Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 April 2026 to 30 April 2026 | 35 |
| 11.6 | Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy | 36 |
| 12.5 | Information Bulletin | 37 |
| | Reports with Discussion..... | 38 |
| 11.1 | Adoption of the Annual Budget 2026/27 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 38 |
| 9.2 | No. 5/288 (Lot: 5; STR: 67450) Lord Street, Perth - Proposed Change of Use from Multiple Dwelling to Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation | 42 |
| 9.4 | The Globe Public Artwork Commission | 44 |
| 10.1 | Loftus Recreation Centre - Review of Operational and Financial Performance | 45 |
| 11.5 | Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group - Appointment of Council Members and Community Representatives..... | 46 |
| 12.1 | Annual Review of Council Delegations [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 48 |
| 12.2 | Adoption of Corporate Business Plan 2026/27 - 2029/30 and the Four Year Capital Works Program 2026/27 - 2029/2030 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 49 |
| 12.3 | Outcome of Advertising and Adoption of Amended Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 50 |
| 12.4 | Formal Establishment of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee and Appointment of Deputy of the Presiding Member [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED] | 52 |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 13 | Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given..... | 54 |
| 13.1 | Notice of Motion - Mayor Alison Xamon - Use of Perth Parking Levy Funds in Vincent | 54 |
| 13.2 | Notice of Motion - Cr Alison Xamon - Draft Mindarie Regional Council Works | 55 |
| 14 | Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion) | 56 |
| 15 | Representation on Committees and Public Bodies | 56 |
| 16 | Urgent Business | 56 |
| 17 | Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed | 56 |
| 18 | Closure | 56 |

**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, 16 JUNE 2026 AT 6:00 PM**

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PRESENT: | <p>Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Con Poulos Cr Ashley Wallace</p> <p>Cr Sophie Greer Cr Reece Wheadon</p> | <p>Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward (arrived at 6.05pm, during Item 3(A)) South Ward South Ward (attended electronically)</p> |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | <p>David MacLennan Rhys Taylor</p> <p>Jay Naidoo</p> <p>Mitchell Hoad</p> <p>Michael Hancock</p> <p>Luke McGuirk Main Bhuiyan Dale Morrissy Lisa Williams</p> <p>Joslin Colli</p> <p>Alex Harris Carrie Miller</p> | <p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability Manager Development & Design Sarah Hill Manager Parks (attended electronically) Manager Engineering Manager Financial Services Manager Community Facilities Executive Manager Communications and Engagement Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Governance Officer Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer</p> |
| Public: | Approximately four 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. We also want to acknowledge that 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 Ashlee La Fontaine on approved leave of absence from 01 June 2026 to 28 June 2026.

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 at the meeting.

3.1 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn – Item 11.1

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

At 6.05pm Cr Wallace arrived.

3.2 Robert Bowe of Perth – Item 11.1

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

3.3 Donelle Phillips of Bayswater

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

3.4 Nicholas O'Reilly of Como – Item 9.2

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

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.12pm.

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

Marc Catania of North Perth

I write as a resident and parent within the City of Vincent to raise concerns regarding the ongoing use of glyphosate based herbicides in public parks, playgrounds, and streetscapes within our community. Firstly, I acknowledge that the City has taken steps toward reducing chemical weed control and that glyphosate is applied in accordance with Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) guidelines. However, I believe the current approach warrants review in light of a growing and significant body of independent scientific evidence.

In 2015, the World Health Organisation's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified glyphosate as a Group 2A probable human carcinogen. Since then, peer-reviewed research has linked glyphosate exposure to non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, liver and kidney disease, disruption of the gut microbiome, and adverse reproductive and neurodevelopmental outcomes in children. A 2023 study from the University of California, Berkeley found that childhood exposure to glyphosate is associated with liver inflammation and metabolic disorder in early adulthood, with potential downstream risks including liver cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease.

Children are particularly vulnerable. Research published in Environmental Health confirms that glyphosate levels detected in children's urine exceed those of adults, owing to their smaller body mass, hand-to-mouth behaviour, proximity to the ground, and time spent in parks and playgrounds. A January 2026 study by the Pesticide Action Network UK found glyphosate residues, including on swings and slides, in 8 out of 13 playgrounds tested, none of which were near agricultural land, suggesting council maintenance as the likely source.

Further, Professor Michael Antoniou of King's College London, a contributor to the Global Glyphosate Study, has stated that a definitively safe dose of glyphosate for children has not been established, and that all unnecessary routes of exposure, particularly for children, should be eliminated.

While I am aware that this was discussed at the 2021-22 Council Annual Meeting, it seemed that budgetary factors were the predominant reason for maintaining glyphosate use in the City, while potential health risks were not adequately discussed. One particular point I feel stood out were comments from that meeting made by Cr Ashley Wallace: "The concentrations observed the day after application, they're of no danger to humans unless you're ingesting literally kilograms of soil." While technically true of acute, single dose exposure, this framing does not reflect how glyphosate actually harms human health. The scientific concern is not accidental ingestion of large amounts, it is the cumulative effect of repeated low level exposure over time.

Peer reviewed research published in Pubmed Research Central confirms that acute toxicity is now considered less relevant than chronic exposure to lower concentrations, noting that glyphosate residues may accumulate and become a risk to human health precisely because people are exposed to them continuously through food, water, and the environment.

Critically, glyphosate does not simply pass through the body. Studies show that following exposure it concentrates primarily in bone and other slow turnover tissues where it persists far longer than blood half-life figures suggest. A 2025 cross-sectional study of 2,710 Americans found a significant negative association between urinary glyphosate levels and bone mineral density across the general population.

Each new exposure from food residues, treated footpaths, or park maintenance adds to that background load before the previous dose has cleared. It is this stacking effect, not acute poisoning, that independent researchers have identified as the real risk to residents and particularly to children who regularly use our public spaces.

In closing, I recognise that the City is constrained by APVMA approvals and that alternatives such as steam weeding and pelargonic acid carry higher costs.

I am not asking for an immediate blanket ban. Rather, I respectfully request that Council consider the following:

1. Establish a formal exclusion zone for glyphosate use within a defined buffer around all children's playground equipment and play areas.
2. Commit to publishing the specific parks, reserves, and dates on which glyphosate is applied, so that residents and parents can make informed decisions.
3. Commission a formal review of weed management practices with a target timeline for transitioning high use public spaces to non-chemical methods.

These are modest, practical steps that a number of progressive councils in Australia and internationally have already taken. They would reflect well on the City of Vincent's stated commitment to community health and environmental sustainability.

John Stevenson of North Perth

I am a resident and ratepayer of the City of Vincent and request that the following matters and suggestion be placed on the agenda, for consideration and inclusion at this evening's Council meeting.

- 1: The footpath outside the vacant block at 158 Alma Rd , Nth Perth, has been closed for a number of years. When will it be repaired and opened ?
- 2: The footpaths outside 156 Alma Rd have also been closed for a number of years. When will those footpaths (Alma & Leake) be repaired and reopened? Please note, the owners at 156 Alma Rd have moved in to their new residence.
- 3: Why hasn't a lowered curb been made in Leake St at the north west side of the intersection of Leake St and Alma Rd?
- 4: Has permission been given by the Council for the vacant land at 156 Alma Rd, to be used as a storage site and for commercial purposes? If so, why haven't signs been erected to that effect?
- 5: What progress, if any, has been made to remove and eradicate fountain grass in the City of Vincent? Fountain grass is an invasive and declared weed in WA.
- 6: What provision, if any, has the City of Vincent made for the parking of worker's vehicles in the City of Vincent, whose owners are employed on the Alma Square building?
- 7: In other jurisdictions where I have lived, Councils have been active in liaising with residents and ratepayers on a face to face basis. Not everyone is able to attend City of Vincent Council meetings, briefings and/or read emails and social media.

Can Councillors be rostered on a monthly basis at Nth Perth Common on a Saturday morning to meet and listen to residents and ratepayers concerns and issues?

Dudley Maier of Highgate – Items 9.3, 11.1, 11.6, 12.2, 12.3

Before I get down to individual items, let me once again express my disappointment and disgust at the way the administration simply summarise community submissions without even having the courtesy to respond to the issues raised in any meaningful way.

Just read the Introduction section to the Engagement Policy on this agenda – it's only four short sentences - and ask yourself if the current practices encourage the participation of all community members. In my mind those sentiments are just hollow words. I also point to the first objective in that policy about 'evidence-based decision making' – again, just the standard feel-good words that are not backed by practice.

Don't believe me – read the responses to the community engagement policy on this agenda, and no, I did not make either comment. To quote two: "*Can Vincent please actually respect the 'consultation process' and not go through the motions to be seen to be consulting when in fact the outcome has been determined before the process even starts*" and "*I previously wasted a whole morning and evening attending a workshop and community meeting for the most recent iterations of the 'Policy' only to later discover very little, if any, of the feedback collected at these events went toward the final version of the 'policy'.*"

Those two community members are not alone – I have heard similar comments from a number of community members in the last couple of years. People who wanted to contribute, probably had good ideas, but won't be participating in the future because of the appalling, dismissive, and I think, arrogant way they have been treated.

What the Administration needs to realise, as does the Council, is that in practically every endeavour that local government is involved in, there are people with far greater knowledge, understanding and experience in the community. This extends to fields like finance, communications, marketing, planning, governance – you name it, there will be people in the community who know more about a particular issue. They are the people who you should be engaging with, but they are the people who are turned off by the way the City relates to the community.

I suppose one of my big beefs is that there is a statement that in the engagement policy - '*verbatim submissions may be included where appropriate, but the focus remains on clarity, evidence and reasons for decisions*'. I spend time providing evidence to support my assertions – evidence that I feel often highlights the weak arguments that the administration present, but the staff do not provide any reason as to whether they support or reject what I say. It is all wasted effort.

Here are some comments on the following agenda items – information that I provided in submissions but which, for all intents and purposes, seem to be ignored/dismissed without any feedback, or without council being aware of.

Item 11.1 – Budget – Vacant Land and Short Term Rental Accommodation

I object to the rates differentials for vacant residential and un-hosted short term rental accommodation (STRA), partly on principle, in that the increases have not been adequately justified, but mostly on the grounds that they will not achieve what they are intended to do, namely a change in property use, and therefore are just a form of punishment of respective owners.

The proposed changes are symbolic, populist reactions that will play to the masses but will only be an irritant to the owners involved, rather than providing a financial incentive to owners – not that I am advocating that the differentials be increased in order to provide a more meaningful incentive. The proposals will appeal to some in the community who want action, but only look at the issue at a superficial level, devoid of any commercial reality.

The proposals have been poorly justified, with no empirical evidence to back some of the claims that have been made, mostly about extra costs to the community of both vacant lots and STRA properties. When tested, the Administration have been unable to provide verifiable statistics. I've asked for figures to justify the claims that these sort of activities cost more but none have been forthcoming – just vague assertions. This exposes the lack of analytical capacity of both the administration and council, and a lack of political will to be open about the issue.

Rather than just say it wants to curtail these activities in order to increase housing availability, the City is coming up with flimsy reasoning in a dog-whistle attempt to appease a certain segment of the community. And this is when the Engagement Policy says that an objective is to have evidence-based decision making – again, hollow words!

Item 11.1 – Budget – Vacant Land

The following table compares this year with next year. The fact that it is proposed to lump residential and commercial vacant land into one group next year makes an accurate comparison impossible. Assuming, for argument’s sake, that the average non-minimum vacant residential rates payment goes up by 40.9%, it shows that the average non-minimal vacant residential rate goes up by about roughly \$900 to \$1000.

| | 2025/26 | Proposed 2026/27 | Increase |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| Normal Res Minimum | \$1,517 | \$1,686 | \$169 |
| Vacant Res Minimum | \$1, 615 | \$1,795 | \$180 |
| Avg Residential Normal | \$1,981 | \$2,096 | \$115 |
| Avg Resident Vacant Normal * | \$2,599 | \$3,662 | \$1,063 |
| Avg Residential Vacant – All ** | \$2,126 | \$2,996 | \$870 |

* \$509,000 rates paid by 196 properties

** \$802,000 paid by 377 properties

Interestingly, the proportion of properties paying the minimal rate is much lower next year, which indicates to me that the calculation of the minimum rate wasn’t done as harshly/rigorously as this year (i.e. 17% next year compared to 44% this year).

While this is a significant impost on the owners of those properties, it probably is not sufficient to shift property use – the market and personal aspirations will determine that. And there are two reasons for this. Firstly, when viewed against the potential value of the vacant land, and the potential increased returns, it is not significant. Secondly, it is highly likely that owners will recognise that they may pay significantly higher rates if they redevelop, assuming what they build reflects the capital value of the land.

An example of the first point is a vacant lot in Mary Street, Highgate. This year the property owner paid about \$2,700 in rates. The property was purchase for \$2,000,000 about 3 years ago, and has a DA approved in the last year or so for a development with an estimated cost of \$5,000,0000. It is hard to believe that an owner would even consider a \$1,000 increase in rates as a determinant for a property with a potential value of \$7 million.

So, I do not believe that the proposed rate increase will influence anybody’s development decision. It is simply a desperate attempt to play to the masses, in order to be seen to be doing something.

Statistics based on DAs for residential properties that were vacant a year ago reinforce my assertion that the changes to rates levels last year have not impacted development decisions significantly, if at all. That’s right, only 7 of the 368 vacant residential properties which were vacant on 1 July 2025, have submitted DAs in the first 11 months of this financial year. Admittedly, there could be a lag involved in that plans cannot be developed overnight.

Justification for higher rates for vacant land.

One of the reasons given for the rate increase is to offset ‘*additional costs associated with managing vacant land*’. The reality is that the rates for vacant land have already covered those costs, and probably more. Setting aside dumping of waste (for which the owner is not responsible), vacant lots do not produce waste – bins are not collected each week. Vacant lots do not have any people who use City services like the library, public open space, local roads and footpaths etc.. A fairly good case could probably be mounted to say that rates paid by owners of vacant land should be significantly lower.

So this argument that there are extra costs associated with vacant land sounds like something that is voiced without too much thinking or asking for justification.

My requests for actual breakdowns of these supposed extra costs has failed to get a response. Where’s the evidence-based decision making when it is not convenient?

Alternative approaches

If the Council is serious about trying to address potential problems with vacant blocks, they should first recognise what the problems are. I'd suggest the main problem is simply visual. I note that one of the submissions in support of increasing the rate said that it would encourage more efficient land use. If more efficient land use is your goal, you should not force owners to provide on-site parking at a rate greater than their needs – providing car parking is not an efficient use of land.

As previously suggested: one solution is to apply conditions on demolitions that require the owner to 'make good' a lot if they do not significantly commence development within a specified time. By 'make good' I'd suggest planting a garden (to the satisfaction of the City) and covered by a bond that would be used by the City if the owner fails to do it. The City of Perth used to have a similar approach which seemed to work. Vincent did try this approach at one time, but the staff did not buy in and did not enforce the conditions adequately.

Of course, this would need to be investigated to ensure that the City still has the legal powers etc. An alternative approach is to offer the owners of vacant properties discounted rates (yes, reward them rather than punish them) if the vacant land is used for a community purpose such as a garden of some sort. This could work if sufficient community members are prepared to use the land for some form of garden, whether it be ornamental or food producing, with the proviso that the owner will eventually get it back in order to develop the land. This also needs investigation – things like who pays for the water, how do make sure that community members buy-in and don't lose interest. I am realistic enough that this will never get off the ground with the current Administration (without creating yet more placemaker positions).

They are just two suggestions that might result in an outcome that addresses the real problem, rather than the current ineffective, feel-good approach.

Verifying if extra rates have an effect

I would also suggest that one course of action is to actually ask owners of formerly vacant properties if paying a slightly higher rate had any impact on their decision to redevelop.

I'd suggest the questions should not be leading. Simple questions like: '*were you aware that vacant properties paid a higher rate*'; and, '*on a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 is 'did not play any part' and 9 is 'was the most important factor' how would you rate the fact that vacant properties pay a higher rates influence your decision to redevelop your lot*'.

There are only 7 such applications in the last 11 months so it isn't onerous. That's the true measure of whether the proposal actually has an impact or not. Again, it must not be based on leading questions.

Item 11.1 – Budget – Short Term Rental Accommodation

Like vacant residential, this is just a symbolic, populist reaction that will play to the masses but will only be an irritant to the owners involved. It won't drive any change.

The Administration have made assertions that there are significant costs to the City of having STRAs but have failed to provide any empirical evidence when tested.

I asked questions at the May Briefing and May council meeting seeking actual evidence, but none has been forthcoming. Its all assertions without proof.

There have been claims that STRAs place a greater demand on infrastructure and services due to higher occupancy turnover. What justification is there for such a statement? Given that STRAs are probably not actually occupied 365 days of the year, it would seem that an owner-occupied or rental property would place more of a demand on infrastructure etc.

Then there is the claim that STRAs result in more waste generation. When pressed the staff could not back this up. I'd suggest that families with small children (babies in particular) put a greater strain on the waste services. This is certainly the argument I have heard from parents with babies when the fortnightly red bin system came in.

Then there is the claim that there is increased pressure on parking. These are properties where there is no on-site host. The amount of parking available is the same as if it was owner occupied or rented. The question is then about how many cars would the STRA users have. I'd suggest that a lot would have no cars, or one at the most. That is the nature of STRAs unlike other forms of rental accommodation (e.g. share houses).

Then there is the claim that they result in extra planning and other compliance costs. The claim about planning is a furphy. A DA for a STRA would rarely involve any technical assessments like verifying setbacks, open space requirements etc. It is a normal planning application process, albeit without some of the technicalities, with advertising and response assessment, for which the applicant presumably pays a fee. Then there was the claim that there are extra costs associated with SAT appeals. This is only valid if the City wins the appeals. In any case, such appeals are a basic community right, and if there are appeals, it could indicate that the decision making is not consistent or has not been based on strong arguments.

So, the argument that this is cost based is rubbish. The argument therefore may be about amenity, but that is a planning issue and should be dealt with within the planning framework, and not as an excuse to impose a blanket financial penalty. If noise is an issue, put in place planning conditions like 'three proven strikes and you lose your licence'. I'd also suggest that owners are probably more concerned about the type of cliental that they get, for obvious reasons.

While I have an appreciation of the argument that such housing may be better as long term accommodation, there is also a counter argument that such accommodation actually supports local businesses as people who stay in such places tend to use local cafes etc. They also provide employment in some cases – local cleaners, gardeners etc are employed. Plus, the properties tend to be presented to a high level, maintaining the streetscape – they are generally not derelict hovels.

The reality is that here are only 27 such places out of 17,300 in Vincent and it isn't a Barcelona situation with 'lock-boxes' at every property frontage.

The use is a permitted use; it provides a service (otherwise they would go broke); it doesn't result in inordinate costs to the City that wouldn't be incurred by other groups (I'd suggest the costs associated with dog ownership may be greater than the costs associated with STRAs).

Charging a few hundred dollars extra (it might only be \$165 if the property is on a minimum rate) will not drive any owner to revert to long term rental – the market and level of service are the only things that will do that, short of State level restrictions.

Item 9.3 Significant Trees Policy

It is a sad reflection on the council and administration in that it has taken 18 months since this issue came to Council, and there has been no progress – you are basically back to square one. That is not to say that nothing has happened. The previous ill-considered policy resulted in at least one significant tree being removed because the owner was not prepared to risk it in case the policy was adopted. Not to mention that other local governments were agile enough to be able to have provisions in place based on the 'WALGA Model', so much so that they have resulted in successful prosecutions.

While I am a tree-hugger, and definitely in the incentive camp rather than punishment camp, it puzzled me why the administration did not initially simply suggest that these so called 'regulated trees' were not simply added to the Trees of Significance Inventory. This provided a stronger head of power (the LPS) than a simple Planning Policy. The actual arguments presented at the time (December 2024) were confused or confusing. All that was required was confirmation whether these trees needed to be listed explicitly or if they could be included as a broad category – the LPS is silent on this.

In a way the community is lucky in that it dodged a bullet by not going down that simple route (i.e. adding the trees to the inventory). However, it goes part of the way to explain why the City is so far behind other local governments on this issue.

The whole approach of the policy was one of imposing restrictions on people, rather than providing meaningful incentives. I made that observation at the December 2024 Council meeting, and am heartened to see that 92 % of respondents supported providing annual funding to assist in tree maintenance and retention.

At the time I suggested an incentive scheme with annual payments, using an arbitrary figure of \$100 per tree/property, and showing the likely net impact on tree owners and others, particularly as the number of trees increases. I notice that the [City of Canning](#) has since instituted such a policy based on an annual payment of \$200 and one free professional arborist's inspection a year.

That's the way to go, an approach that celebrates the trees, rewards the owners, and encourages more trees to be planted. It is a much better way to go than this potentially punitive approach that won't actually encourage more trees and may actually encourage owners to remove trees 'just in case'.

Item 12.2 – Corporate Business Plan

As I have previously pointed out to council members, this item rings a lot of alarm bells.

My only interest was to see if there was any progress on providing an improved e-waste collection service. The 2024/25 CBP had an 'operating initiative' to investigate the suitability of a small e-waste collection hub. The 2025/26 CBP had a similar item to be completed this financial year. I checked the relevant section and all there was a vague description of what the section does, albeit mentioning an e-waste hub. While it is supposed to be a plan, there was nothing to indicate what might actually be delivered.

I looked at the actual report to council and saw the following: "*As part of this review, the service area pages have been updated to remove reference to operating initiatives and instead incorporates information collected during the 2025 Annual Service Delivery Review Program. The operating initiatives were removed as they were **not well understood, differed from operational delivery and were not being tracked.***" [the emphasis is mine].

This is truly a WTF moment! They were "*not well understood*" – but these were developed by the staff!; they "*differed from operational delivery*" - but the whole purpose is that they were supposed to guide operational delivery!; and they "*were not being tracked*" – but the framework of documents indicate that the CBP is part of the tracking process.

That the Council will probably accept this is no credit to the current council, particularly in their oversight role. I have noticed a progressive move over the years to make less and less publicly available, and to shun any public review of what was actually delivered. Two such areas that immediately spring to mine are the Reconciliation Plans and the Waste Strategy. A new one is adopted but no review/report is developed showing what was actually delivered by the old plan. There were obvious gaps in both, but that doesn't fit with the general mode of operation which is based on making warm fuzzy statements to cheer up the comrades, but actually failing to deliver.

This gradual erosion of oversight is a bit like putting a frog in a pan of water and gently increasing the heat, almost imperceptibly. In the end you just end up with a poached frog. And in this case, the council is the frog!

12.3 Council Member Professional Development

I did put in a submission on this, as did one other person. Of course, there is just a vague summary of the submissions, so I'll flesh it out. No details of what I actually said are provided, and certainly no justification as to why the changes to the policy remain.

My main beef was around the proposal to allow up to two council members a year to pursue some 'high level' training program. This is of course code for undertaking the Australian Institute of Company Directors course which has become popular in recent years.

The crux of my argument was that this isn't really a benefit to the community who are paying for it, but rather, is mostly a benefit to the attendees who then can add the post-nominal GAICD to their names. Earlier this year I noticed that the City (i.e. ratepayers) were funding such courses, so I asked some questions. I wonder if this issue would have come to light if I hadn't asked questions and there was a realisation that it wasn't covered by policy.

My argument is that, given the expensive nature of these courses, and the lack of a direct link to the actual duties of a council member, the attendees should pay for these courses, or at least a significant proportion. Of course, the council members who have attended will say that the course is directly related to issues of governance – but they would say that wouldn't they.

As I put in my submission the response to this is: *"name at least one decision that was made at Council after attending the course that was different to way you would have decided before attending the course?"*

I believe that this is another example of 'snouts in the trough', and I don't believe it would pass the pub test. I mentioned it to a person who works in the state public service, and whom I think has a very reasonable and fair view of such matters.

Apparently, it is common in the state public service (i.e. the GAICD lark), and worse (Harvard etc). I even saw that it is an issue in NSW where a local government executive admitted that they just used AI to complete the assessment portion of the course.

If the issues raised in such a course are so valuable the administration should arrange for relevant presentations to be given to all elected members as part of the ongoing council development program. It may be good, but it is too expensive, and should be funded by the main beneficiaries, the council members.

Dudley Maier of Highgate – Items 11.1, 12.2, 13.1

1. The 2026/27 Budget includes \$431,000 for the Mt Claremont depot, with a further \$96,000 to be spent in future years. Has the City received any income from the Mt Claremont Depot this year, and does it expect to receive any income in the coming year? If so, you much?
2. The 2026/27 Budget shows employee costs for the Major Projects section increasing from \$162,000 to \$627,00 – a 287% increase. How many FTEs are there in the section in the current year, and how many will this increase to next year? What is, and what will be, the mix of FTEs (e.g. 1 x 0.5FTE, 2 x 1.0 FTE)?
3. The 2024/25 and 2025/26 Corporate Business Plans had an item concerning the investigation/implementation of convenient e-waste hubs. Has any progress been made? What are the reasons for delays in what is a relatively easy project? When is the community likely to actually see a trial or implementation of such hubs?
4. The 2025/26 Budget shows the number of vacant residential properties and vacant commercial properties separately. The 2026/27 Budget aggregates them making an accurate comparison between years impossible. However, the report to council does give a breakup of the vacant residential and commercial GRVs (see page 97).

For 2026/27 what is the total GRV and number of vacant residential properties that will pay the standard vacant property rate, and what is total GRV and number of vacant residential properties that will pay the minimum rate?

5. Were owners of vacant residential properties explicitly notified with their 2025/26 rates notices that their rates were higher than occupied land, or was it expected that they would work it out through the press/social media?
6. The mayor has suggested that the City write to the Minister of Transport to use the funds from the Perth Parking Levy fund for things like an east-west bus and extending the Blue Cat. Are there any risks that the Minister will agree to having a bus route down Vincent Street by expanding the PPMA to include that area of Vincent? If that was the case, what would the likely financial impact be on the City (as the owner of parking places) or on any businesses who may have parking bays available to the public?

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 21 July 2026 Ordinary Council Meeting.

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**Dudley Maier of Highgate – Items 11.4, 10.1 and 10.2****1. Differential Rates – Item 11.4**

- 1.1. The City significantly increased the relative rate for vacant properties in the 2025/2026 rates. How many of the vacant properties that were charged the higher rate in 2025/2026 have been subject to a development application since June 2025, both in absolute numbers and in terms of percentage of vacant properties?

As at 1 July 2025, the City rated 368 residential properties as vacant.

Between 1 July 2025 and 30 May 2026, the City received 7 applications for development approval for residential properties rated as vacant. This figure is lower than the number of applications determined during the same period because some determined applications were submitted before 1 July 2025.

- 1.2. How many properties will be affected by the new “Short Term Rental Accommodation” (STRA) category? How many of these are ‘hosted’ accommodation, and how many are un-hosted?

The proposed STRA differential rate applies to approved unhosted STRA operating for more than 90 nights in a 12-month period.

Based on current approvals, 27 properties would be affected.

Hosted STRA properties are not affected by the proposed STRA differential rate category.

- 1.3. Given the relatively small number of STRA properties, and given that the proposal is to significantly increase their rates, will the City be individually notifying owners of these properties of the proposed rates increase, and also providing the justification for the increase?

The City will include information on the new STRA differential rate with the rates notices. Further information on the justification of the STRA differential rate can be found in the Objects & Reasons.

- 1.4. For the Briefing of 12 May I asked whether the City had any empirical evidence to back up claims that STRA properties generated more waste than non-STRA properties. The response was that “*high level estimates indicate that waste generation and contamination rates are higher with STRA properties*”.

What exactly is meant by “**high level estimates**”? Are there any facts to back up these so-called estimates? If so, what are the estimated increases in waste produced? Specifically:

- what sort of estimate is there of the amount or general waste produced by non-STRA properties;
- what is the estimated level of waste produced by hosted STRAs;
- what is the estimated level of waste produced by un-hosted STRAs;

These estimates are informed by research-based benchmarks, academic research, and the City’s operational experience.

Academic and industry literature indicates that tourism activities can contribute disproportionately to municipal waste generation due to transient populations and more intensive consumption patterns. Currently there is no data available which isolates waste generation from Short Term Rental Accommodation (STRA).

In the absence of STRA specific datasets, the City has reasonably applied research-based benchmarks alongside operational observations to estimate STRA waste impacts.

The City does not currently collect waste data by property type, as kerbside collection systems are not configured to measure waste generation at that level. However, operational experience, including increased overflowing bins, higher levels of contamination, and more service requests, indicates that STRA properties place greater demand on waste services than long term residential properties.

While precise increases cannot currently be quantified, these observations provide a reasonable basis for the City's assessment. Further targeted data collection would improve accuracy over time.

- 1.5. In answer to my questions, the Briefing Notes state that the administration claim that “the City currently incurs costs related to STRA properties that are materially higher than the increase proposed in the new STRA differential rates”. It must be noted that the response simply says the costs relate to STRA properties, and does not claim that they are extra costs specifically related to the nature of the use.

- What categories do these costs fall into (e.g. planning, enforcement etc)?

The costs mainly fall into planning, compliance, customer service, waste and administration.

This includes assessing unhosted STRA applications, advertising proposals to neighbours, reviewing submissions, responding to enquiries, investigating complaints, investigating unauthorised unhosted STRA, and checking compliance with approval conditions where concerns are raised.

There is also administration involved in recording and monitoring time-limited approvals.

Unhosted STRA matters also result in legal costs and resourcing where planning decisions are appealed to the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) for review. There are two appeals for unhosted STRA applications in the SAT for review currently.

The comment regarding costs being materially higher are in the context of the small increase in revenue for STRA properties which is estimated to be approximately \$10k. The costs are not material in the context of all ratepayers across the City.

- What is the total 'extra' cost for each of these categories in terms of an STRA use as opposed to a normal residential use?

The extra cost is associated with unhosted STRA creating additional regulatory work that does not arise for a home used for long-term residential purposes.

That additional work includes responding to complaints, investigating unauthorised STRA, checking compliance with approval conditions where concerns are raised, recording and monitoring time-limited approvals, and managing any SAT review if a planning decision is appealed.

In addition the City estimates additional costs for waste services.

The City has estimated at a high level that additional staff time and costs across all those functions are higher than the additional rates revenue of approximately \$10k. Detailed costings by each area are not available.

- If it is the case that incurred costs exceed the rates that will be raised, does the City agree that this means that non-STRA properties are subsidising STRA properties?

The additional costs not recovered from the STRA differential rate are not estimated to have a material impact on all ratepayers.

- 1.6. In answer to my questions, the Briefing Notes state that the administration claim that “*Significant time is spent by Administration, particularly in relation to planning assessments and regulatory compliance*”.

- Aren't planning issues more of a one-off cost rather than an annual cost?

The initial development application assessment is a one-off process and cost. Regulatory compliance is not.

Unhosted STRA can create ongoing work through complaints, investigating unauthorised STRA, checking compliance with approval conditions where concerns are raised, and recording and monitoring time-limited approvals so the City can identify when an approval has expired and whether a further approval is required if the use continues.

- If they are one-off costs, why is the City proposing on on-going recovery of costs rather than a one-off charge?

A planning application fee is a one-off charge for the initial development application process. That fee goes toward the assessment, advertising, review of submissions and decision-making for the application.

Ongoing cost recovery relates to regulatory work that continues after an approval is issued.

For unhosted STRA, that includes responding to complaints, investigating unauthorised STRA, checking compliance with approval conditions where concerns are raised, and recording and monitoring time-limited approvals so the City can identify when an approval has expired and whether a further approval is required if the use continues.

- Do many of the applications for STRAs actually involve any development work that needs to be assessed against the R-Codes and City Policies?

Most unhosted STRA applications are change of use applications and do not involve major physical works.

Every unhosted STRA application requires assessment against the City's Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation and the relevant matters under clause 67 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.

Where physical works are proposed, those works are also assessed against the relevant built form requirements under the R-Codes and the City's Policy 7.1.1: Built Form.

- Isn't the majority of 'planning' work simply notifying neighbours and assessing responses?

No, neighbour consultation and reviewing submissions is only one part of the planning process.

The planning assessment considers matters such as the location and site context, compatibility with surrounding land uses, amenity impacts, parking, management arrangements, and submissions received during community consultation.

This planning assessment is required for every unhosted STRA application against the City's Local Planning Policy: Short Term Accommodation and the relevant matters under clause 67 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.

- 1.7. The Statement of Financial Activity shows that the revenue from “Service Charges” drops from \$7million in 2025/26 to zero in 2026/27. These Service Charges represent revenue from property owners in areas having the power put underground. In September 2024 the City’s web site used to indicate that Area 2 (North Perth/ Mt Lawley) was supposed to commence in late 2025 and that this was changed to “TBC” (To Be Confirmed) by September 2025. Area 3 (Perth/Highgate) is currently being shown as commencing in January 2027.

When Council initially approved the financial model for underground power on 20 June 2023, the Service Levies for Areas 2 and 3 were intended to be charged in July 2024 and July 2025 respectively, and projects in those two areas were proposed to start in October 2024 and August 2025!

- Given that no provision has been made in the 2026/27 budget to collect costs from either Areas 2 or 3, can we assume that these projects have been, once again, delayed?

Yes, the design stage for both project areas experienced a delay.

- If this is the case, who initiated the delay this time – Western Power or the City?

The delay was not initiated by either party but caused by design complexities combined with a shortage of electrical engineers available to do the design work.

- Can you confirm that the delay in Service Charges for Area 2 is (at least) three years?

Yes we originally intended to issue service charges for project area 2 (North Perth/Mt Lawley) in July 2025, it now looks likely to be 2028. Project area 3 (Perth/Highgate) service charges are expected to be issued in July 2027).

- Given the significant variation to the financial model presented to Council in June 2023, will the Administration be presenting a revised financial model to Council and the community?

Yes after updated project timings are provided by Western Power these will be reflected in the Underground Power Financial Model and the Long Term Financial Plan.

2. Local Area Traffic Management – Item 10.1

- 2.1. At the bottom of page 6 of the Road Safety Management Plan (Appendix 2) it shows that at 50km/h, two out of ten persons survive a collision, and that at 40km/h, six out of ten persons survive a collision.

In answer to my questions, the Briefing Notes state that at “30km/h it is generally recognised that approximately 9 out of 10 pedestrians are likely to survive a collision”. Crudely put, this is a 50 percent improvement over the 6 out of 10 who would survive a collision at 40km/h.

Additionally, the very first recommendation of the consultant’s report evaluating the 40 km/h trial was to “**Implement area wide 30km/h speed zones for all local access and some distributor residential streets throughout the City of Vincent**”. [OMC 14 February 2023, Item 10.1, Attachment 6, page 36]

On page 2 of the proposed LATM Policy it shows that the recommended operating speed on Access Roads is 30-40km/h (i.e. it gives a30km/h as an alternative).

Given that the City acknowledges that a 30km/h collision roughly represents a 50% increase in survivability for pedestrians over a 40km/h collision, and given that the professional evaluation of the results of the 40km/h trial was to recommend the move to 30km/h, why does the City’s administration continue to focus on 40km/h rather than the internationally accepted target of 30km/h (or 20 mph)?

The City acknowledges the internationally recognised road safety evidence that lower vehicle speeds improve survivability outcomes for vulnerable road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. As noted in the Road Safety Management Plan and supporting technical literature, survivability outcomes improve significantly as vehicle speeds reduce from 50km/h to 40km/h and further again at 30km/h.

The City's proposed Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) Policy has therefore been structured to support lower operating speeds on local roads over time, including identifying a desirable operating speed environment of 30–40km/h for Local Access Roads. This reflects the Safe System approach adopted nationally and internationally, which recognises that humans are vulnerable to serious injury at higher impact speeds.

However, the implementation of posted speed limit reductions is not solely determined by the City. Under Western Australian legislation and governance arrangements, Main Roads WA is the approving authority for speed zoning on public roads. Any reduction to 30km/h requires detailed technical assessment, demonstrated road environment suitability, community support, network considerations, and formal approval from Main Roads WA. Historically, Main Roads WA has generally supported 40km/h area-wide precinct treatments as the current practical and deliverable baseline across metropolitan local governments.

The City has been progressively advocating for lower speed environments and has successfully achieved several reductions in recent years, including along sections of Vincent Street and within neighbourhood precincts. The City also continues to investigate additional traffic calming infrastructure, raised platforms, intersection treatments, streetscape modifications and precinct-wide traffic studies, all of which are important components in achieving lower operating speeds in practice, noting that signed speed limits alone do not necessarily result in driver behavioural change.

In relation to the consultant's recommendation referenced from the 40km/h trial evaluation, the City notes that this recommendation forms part of broader strategic advocacy and long-term planning considerations. The City continues to work collaboratively with Main Roads WA, the Road Safety Commission and other agencies regarding future opportunities for lower speed environment, supported by evidence, funding pathways, road function, network hierarchy and community consultation outcomes.

Accordingly, the City's current focus on 40km/h reflects both the present regulatory framework within Western Australia and a staged, evidence-based approach toward safer neighbourhood streets, while continuing to advocate for further improvements where feasible and supported by the relevant approving authorities.

3. Safe trading site – Item 10.2

At the 9 December 2025 Council meeting the Council passed a motion moved by Cr Woolf requesting that the CEO present a report to Council about a model for a safe trading site within the City. Council asked that the report be presented within 3 months (i.e. by 9 March 2026).

The requested report has finally been presented to council, over 5 months after the initial request. Given that the actual decision making (where have we got CCTV) and implementation actions (create appropriately worded signage and advertising material) is relatively simple, if not trivial, and that given wording can be based on the Stirling model, why has it taken so long for the administration to respond to council?

Council were presented information on the proposed location at a Workshop held 31st March 2026. Council were satisfied with Administration proceeding with the proposed location, which has since been formally provided to Council at the May meeting.

What is actually intended by authorising the CEO to “enforce the operation of the site”?

The intention is for the CEO to initiate the site, and manage how it works moving forward, whilst also ensuring appropriate signage and protocols are in place.

STATEMENT (submitted as a statement, but includes questions)**Item 10.1 - Local Area Traffic Management Policy**

For a document that is supposed to “*replace legacy practices and ensure a modern, consistent, and transparent approach to local area traffic management*”, this document is a soggy lettuce.

What actually is new that replaces ‘legacy practices’? The warrant system has been around for a long time. It’s good that it is made more public, and there seems to be some sort of commitment to adhere to it, but the reality is that will just become a tool to justify inaction.

The City used to have a Local Area Traffic Management Advisory Group. It was initiated by Cr Ian Ker, a transport planner, and was probably the only advisory group the City has ever had that consistently achieved positive community-driven outcomes, as opposed to the usual bureaucratic claptrap that mires most advisory groups.

The key element of its success was that it actually engaged with residents who felt they were subject to adverse traffic impacts. Community members would come to the group meeting and present their case, then the group would discuss the issues while the community members were there. If further data was required, the staff would provide it. It allowed the consideration of objective and subjective data. One of the biggest positives was that the community members could see a process, and could see that other community members, who were part of the advisory group, were involved – it just wasn’t staff members or council members.

In reality, all the proposed policy is doing is formalising a decision tree, it is not setting any tangible targets for improvement – it just contains vague statements like ‘speed zoning and reduction of speeds are actively pursued’.

As to possible targets: The attached Road Safety Management Plan (Attachment 2) has a chart about crash survivability (page 5). It only shows 40km/h and 50km/h data. At the Briefing I asked for comparable data for 30km/h crashes. The response in the Briefing Notes shows that at “*30km/h it is generally recognised that approximately 9 out of 10 pedestrians are likely to survive a collision*”. Crudely put, this is a 50 percent improvement over the 6 out of 10 who would survive a collision at 40km/h.

Additionally, the very first recommendation of the consultant’s report which evaluated the 40 km/h trial was to “**Implement area wide 30km/h speed zones for all local access and some distributor residential streets throughout the City of Vincent**”. [OMC 14 February 2023, Item 10.1, Attachment 6, page 36]. This recommendation wasn’t even commented on by the Administration.

I am currently in Austria. The posted speed in residential streets in Vienna, large cities and villages is 30km/h. In the City of London, the posted speed is 20mph (32 km/h) for 100% of streets, and 52% of streets in the greater London area are at 20m/h.

30 km/h is the norm in Europe and has been for some time!

The policy document should be setting this target as part of the City’s policy - a target of 30k/h on access roads, leaving the distributors to carry the faster traffic, just as the road hierarchy was intended to reflect. None of this is new – it has been the issue since before the 40km/h trial. So the obvious question is ‘why?’ And I’m sorry to say that the answer is just as obvious – the City, both administration and council, lacks the courage or capacity to mount a cogent argument to make real change. It is far easier to sit back and just do the easy stuff like the 40km/h change that realistically sounded good, cost quite a lot, provided photo opportunities, but made no real difference to driver behaviour – the speeds were already pretty close to 40km/h anyway, and most people know that it isn’t enforced.

So, with respect, here’s your chance to do something practical, rather than sitting there, ticking a box but doing nothing significant.

And as another point: Action 1.6 says that ensuring most [why not all?] development projects that involve a permanent change to the road environment are Road Safety Audited at design stage. Sounds good, but the target is July 2028 – why isn’t it happening now?

The proposed Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) Policy has been developed to formalise and modernise how the City assesses, prioritises and responds to traffic management requests across the local road network. While elements such as warrant-based assessment methodologies have existed previously, the Policy introduces a clearer governance framework, formal assessment pathways, prioritisation criteria, evidence requirements and decision-making consistency that were not previously consolidated within a single endorsed policy document.

Importantly, the Policy also introduces additional considerations beyond traditional traffic warrants, including broader Safe System principles, contextual safety considerations, community context considerations and technical safety intelligence. This is intended to ensure the City can consider both quantitative traffic data and qualitative community concerns in a more transparent and structured manner.

In relation to the former LATM Advisory Group, the City acknowledges the positive contribution that community-based advisory processes have historically provided. However, the current approach seeks to ensure consistency, equity and transparency across all precincts and requests city-wide. Community engagement remains an important component of the City's approach through precinct traffic studies, consultation processes, petitions, deputations, Council meetings, engagement portals and direct resident feedback processes.

The implementation of posted speed limit reductions within Western Australia is subject to approval by Main Roads WA, which is the responsible statutory authority for speed zoning. The City cannot unilaterally introduce area-wide 30km/h speed limits. Any such proposal requires detailed technical assessment, network analysis, community consultation and approval from Main Roads WA.

The City's current approach has therefore focused on progressively achieving lower speed environments through a staged and evidence-based process. This has included:

- advocating for and implementing 40km/h precinct speed reductions;*
- progressing intersection upgrades and traffic calming treatments;*
- delivering raised wombat crossings and pedestrian infrastructure;*
- undertaking precinct-wide road safety studies; and*
- continuing advocacy with Main Roads WA regarding further speed environment improvements where appropriate.*

The City also notes that achieving lower operating speeds requires more than regulatory signage alone. International best practice demonstrates that road environment changes, traffic calming infrastructure, intersection design, landscaping, lane widths and place-based street design are all critical in influencing actual driver behaviour and compliance.

In relation to the comment regarding the effectiveness of the 40km/h trial, post-trial evaluations identified measurable reductions in operating speeds and supported the continuation of lower speed environments. While behavioural change can take time and requires complementary infrastructure and enforcement measures, the City considers the program an important step within a broader Safe System approach.

Regarding Action 1.6 within the Road Safety Management Plan, the July 2028 target reflects the timeframe for full implementation, standardisation and embedding of formalised Road Safety Audit processes across applicable projects and delivery programs. Road Safety Audits are already undertaken on many projects where appropriate, particularly for higher-risk or more complex infrastructure works. The action seeks to ensure this process becomes consistently embedded across the organisation and project lifecycle moving forward, rather than commencing only from 2028.

Item 11.4 – Differential Rates – Short Term Residential Accommodation

The justification for introducing the new Short Term Residential Accommodation (STRA) is extremely weak. This clearly is just a mechanism to try and punish owners of such properties in the attempt to 'encourage' them to change the use of the property. The so-called reasons are not clearly proven, and the increase is unlikely to drive any change. Admittedly, it will go down well with the anti-STRA believers.

The very first obvious 'mistake' is that the recommendation for approval refers to "Short Term Rental Accommodation" yet the report then refers to just targeting un-hosted STRAs. So who is the intended target – un-hosted or all STRAs?

The argument is that un-hosted STRAs typically place greater demand on local infrastructure and services due to higher occupant turnover, including increased waste generation, use of public amenities, and pressure on parking and local amenities.

The demands on local infrastructure are hard to work out. Probably the claim about extra waste is the one that can most easily be demonstrated and validated. I therefore asked at the Briefing if the City had any empirical data to support the claim about waste. And the answer was an (implied) NO, and that they simply were relying on “*high level estimates which indicate that waste generation and contamination rates are higher for STRAs*” – whatever “high level estimates” are. That’s like me saying my mate Greg, knows a bloke whose brother reckons they produce more waste.

I would suggest that the reality is probably different. My first person observation (I’m not relying on a mate of a mate) as a person who has used a lot of such properties in the last few years suggests that users of un-hosted STRA users fall into two camps – those that choose the STRA so that they can prepare meals themselves, and those that predominantly use local restaurants and cafes.

Vincent has a high occupancy for STRAs part of which is explained by the popularity with business visitors to the CBD, a group that usually relies on local businesses to keep them fed. This cohort supports local business and is likely to produce less general waste.

I’d also point out that the Administration claim that “*the City currently incurs costs related to STRA properties that are materially higher than the increase proposed in the new STRA differential rates*”. It must be noted that the response simply says the costs relate to STRA properties, and does not claim that they are extra costs specifically related to the nature of the use. If this statement is true, then the Administration are claiming that non-STRA property owners are subsidising STRA owners. Is that what you intend as a Council – that the rest of the community subsidises STRA owners?

And finally, given that there are a small number of STRA owners, are you as a Council going to request that each owner in the new group be notified directly of the proposed change. After all, if the arguments are so compelling, and the data supports the move, it will be a piece of cake.

Responses to these questions have been included in the responses to questions above.

Andrew Main of North Perth Street Tree Pruning

In 2025, and most recently on 12 May 2026, Western Power carried out pruning on street trees on Alfonso Street. In addition, the City’s contractors also pruned these same trees in the second half of 2025. In response to communication I initiated with Western Power this month, it advised that a notice was sent to the City of Vincent advising that the trees required pruning, and because this was not done, Western Power undertook emergency pruning.

Questions:

1. Are the City’s contractors not pruning street trees in accordance with Western Power’s clearance requirements, resulting in Western Power having to undertake additional emergency pruning.

The City’s contractors undertake tree pruning in accordance with Western Power clearance requirements. Western Power usually issues the City with a 90-day notice detailing any required tree pruning works. These are addressed as part of the City’s annual tree pruning program. In 2026, Western Power has only issued one 90-day notice to the City (on 1 May). All other pruning carried out by Western Power this year has been done without any prior notification to the City.

The City is in communication with Western Power to try and improve these processes to enable the City’s contractors to carry out the works, rather than Western Power contractors, who are not qualified arborists.

2. If so, does this mean that ratepayers are effectively funding the pruning of the same trees twice a year, when only one pruning cycle should be required.

The City is in discussions with Western Power regarding the payment of tree pruning works carried out without any notification to the City. These discussions are ongoing.

Street Tree Policy – Planting Statistics The City's Street Tree Policy – Guidelines and Procedures, in place since June 2024, includes a commitment for the City to:

“Achieve an annual target of 75% new planting across City owned or managed land being native tree species, with a preference for Australian native species where appropriate.”

Questions:

1. Since this guideline became operational, can the City provide data on the total number of trees planted, and how many were native and how many were exotic species.

*In the 2024/25 financial year, a total of 450 new trees were planted. 90% of these trees were Australian native with 68% being native to Western Australia.
This financial year (2025/26) we will be planting 499 new trees. 94% of these will be Australian native with 60% being native to Western Australia.*

2. How many of this total were street trees, and of those, how many were native species and how many were exotic species.

*In 2024/25, there was minimal tree planting in parks as the previous year (prior to adoption of the new Street Tree Policy), the City undertook a Parks Tree Planting project, and as such no further tree planting in parks was required.
Therefore, in 2024/25 a total of 450 new street trees we planted with 90% of these being Australian native.
This financial year (2025/26) we will be planting 421 new street trees with 93% of these being Australian native.*

3. In the quoted commitment from the City guideline, it refers to “native” and “Australian native” species. Can the City advise what the difference is.

*This is a typo which should read Western Australian in accordance with policy clause 1 (v) which states:
Tree species selection will be determined by the City taking into account the following –
• Preference of Australian native species to achieve an annual target of 75% new planting across City owned or managed land being native tree species, with a preference to Western Australian native species where appropriate.
This typo will be rectified accordingly to reflect the policy.*

Robertson Park – Narrowed Path

In the Robertson Park Improvement Plan drawings published on the City's website in 2025, the native garden bed and shared path along the western side of the tennis courts were shown as remaining in place. However, once development occurred, the garden bed was removed and the path was narrowed to around 1.5 m - narrower than other recently constructed paths in Robertson Park, nearby reserves, and street footpaths.

The City has stated that the path cannot be widened on the western side due to the presence of trees located approximately 2.5 m west of the path.

Questions:

1. Why was the path narrowed and the garden bed removed.

*The path along Fitzgerald Street is identified as a Shared Path within both the City's and State Government's movement hierarchy. The minimum compliant width for a Shared Path is 1.5 metres, and the constructed path meets this minimum requirement.
During detailed design and construction of the renewed tennis courts, additional space was required to accommodate the renewed tennis courts. The small gap shown between the path and courts in the Development Plan concept drawings was foregone and the adjoining path width was reduced to the minimum compliant shared path width, in order to accommodate the necessary space.*

2. Why weren't residents and users advised of this major change.

The removal of the garden bed and reduction in path width in line with the minimum Shared Path requirements was not a major change and did not require further community engagement.

3. Given the narrower width of the path and that it now runs immediately alongside a mesh fence with two gate openings, what assessment did the City undertake of the usability and safety implications for people walking and riding.

The City considered the classification of the path, being a Shared Path with a minimum compliant width of 1.5 metres, and the gate openings being setback away from the path and concluded that the path was safe and usable in line with its Shared Path classification.

4. Why is the City stating that the presence of trees prevents the path from being widened when the City regularly permits crossovers to be constructed on public verges throughout the district that are often closer to street trees than at Robertson Park.

The City assesses verge works, crossovers and path construction on a case-by-case basis, having regard to factors such as the species, size and health of trees, likely root impacts, available verge width, engineering requirements, drainage, safety, service locations and the extent of excavation required.

Vehicle crossovers are generally considered essential infrastructure to enable safe and practical access to private properties from the public road network. In many cases, some level of impact within the verge area is unavoidable to facilitate that access, although designs are still assessed to minimise impacts on street trees wherever possible.

By comparison, the Robertson Park shared path already achieves the minimum width requirements for a Shared Path and widening it further was not considered essential to the operation of the facility. As a result, the City determined that it was preferable to avoid potential impacts to the adjacent verge trees and retain the current alignment and width of the path.

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 A Petition Against the Proposed 40.9% Increase in Vacant Residential Property Rates

Lesley Florey of Mount Hawthorn submitted a petition with 80 signatures requesting that Council withdraw, reject or substantially reduce the proposed 40.9% increase in vacant residential property rates for the 2026/2027 financial year.

PETITION

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the petition be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Poulios, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 19 May 2026 be confirmed.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

7.1 HIGHGATE AND NORTH PERTH TRAFFIC STUDIES

I have some brief announcements about the upcoming Highgate and North Perth traffic studies that the City has been undertaking for some time.

Over the past 12 months the City has been doing a significant amount of work to better understand the traffic and road safety issues that we have been hearing from our community for quite a long time, particularly around North Perth and Highgate at the moment. So these studies are a really important shift for the Council in how we are looking at road safety and transport issues across the City.

What the work has brought together is the data that we already have, particularly around crash history and traffic information, but also new modelling and technical analysis and a broader look at how our local road network actually functions.

Traditionally we have looked at traffic calming measures on a street by street basis. Someone brings up a concern about traffic or safety and we look at that one location in isolation. What this work has clearly shown is that this is not very helpful when you're trying to determine big picture transport issues.

We saw this particularly when we had the debates around the measures for Harold Street, that a change on one street will simply shift traffic somewhere else, unless you have looked at it holistically and come up with ways to address this.

It does affect nearby residents, businesses, pedestrians, people who are on scooters and bikes, and public transport users, in ways that we might not immediately see. So, we've changed the way that we are looking at this by taking a precinct-wide approach and looking at how an entire neighbourhood moves in a particular area. The studies are ultimately about making sure that we're reducing the likelihood and severity of any crashes across entire neighbourhoods, not just responding to the individual requests as they arise.

We finally do have an evidence-based approach to how we need to prioritise where we're going to put our road calming measures. The next step is that we need to take this data and get feedback from the community, so we are also capturing that lived experience about the way that traffic works within our local communities.

What these studies are now doing is they are allowing us to have an informed conversation about why are treatments being proposed and where it's going to fit in the broader network and what the benefit is going to be for the whole community because we can't just look at these individual measures in isolation. It is not about restricting movement across the city, it's about balancing movement with safety. So we are going to be putting this out for public feedback and hearing from the community in the coming weeks and that will give people the opportunity to share their local knowledge and to highlight their responses to what is being proposed.

Once we've got that local knowledge, it'll be considered alongside the objective data and the technical evidence, before anything moves forward. This is about the Council taking the lead in terms of providing a more strategic, transparent and evidence-based way of planning our road network. Ultimately, we're hoping that this is going to ensure we have safer streets and safer intersections and that our neighbourhoods are going to be safe for people to be able to easily get around.

That has been an enormous amount of work and it's important that we flag for our residents that this is something they're going to be able to be having input into very same

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

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 8.1 Mayor Alison Xamon declared a proximity interest in Item 9.2 No. 5/288 (Lot: 5; STR: 67450) Lord Street, Perth - Proposed Change of Use from Multiple Dwelling to Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation. The extent of her interest is that the above location is in proximity to her residential property. She did not seek approval to participate in the debate or to remain in chambers to vote on the matter
- 8.2 Cr Suzanne Worner declared an impartiality interest in item 11.5 Disability Access & Inclusion Advisory Group - Appointment of Council Members and Community Representatives. The extent of her interest is that she is friends with an applicant nominating to be a community representative of the advisory group.

REPORTS

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

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**
Items 11.1 and 9.2.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Items 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, and 12.4.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Item 9.2.

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

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

| COUNCIL MEMBER | ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| Cr Castle | 13.2 |
| Cr Worner | 9.4 |
| Cr Woolf | 10.1 |
| Cr Greer | 11.5 and 13.1 |

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

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved “En Bloc”, being:**
Items 9.1, 9.3, 10.2, 10.3, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.6 and 12.5
- (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 Woolf

That the following unopposed items be adopted “En Bloc”, as recommended:

Items 9.1, 9.3, 10.2, 10.3, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.6 and 12.5









CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

9.1 NO. 29 (LOT: 1; D/P: 11538) GREEN STREET, MOUNT HAWTHORN - PROPOSED THREE GROUPED DWELLINGS**Ward:** North Ward

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Applicant Supporting Information 
 4. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
 5. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 
 6. Life Cycle Assessment 
 7. Clause 67 Assessment 
 8. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, APPROVES the application for Three Grouped Dwellings at No. 29 (Lot: 1, D/P: 11538) Green Street, Mount Hawthorn in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 8:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Three Grouped Dwellings as shown on the approved plans dated 5 May 2026. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennas, satellite dishes, solar panels, external hot water heaters, air conditioners, and the like, shall not be visible from the street(s), are designed integrally with the building, and be located so as not to be visually obtrusive, to the satisfaction of the City;

3. Colour and Materials

The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with annotations shown on the approved plans and the schedule of finishes which forms part of this approval, unless otherwise approved by the City;

4. Visual Privacy

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, all privacy screening shown on the approved plans, including the addition of screening on the southern elevation of the Lot 1 courtyard area, shall be installed. The screening shall be visually impermeable and comply in all respects with the requirements of Clause 3.10 (Visual Privacy) of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 deemed-to-comply provisions, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Landscaping

Prior to the occupation or use of the development, all works shown in the approved landscaping plan shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to the satisfaction of the City, and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City, at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

6. Car Parking and Pedestrian Access

6.1 All vehicle parking, manoeuvring and access areas shall be constructed, paved and drained in accordance with the approved plans and are to comply with the requirements of Australian Standard AS2890.1, to the satisfaction of the City;

- 6.2 A 1 metre wide easement in accordance with Section 136C of the *Transfer of Land Act 1893* is to be created to ensure reciprocal rights of access over Lots 1 to 4; and
- 6.3 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, the pedestrian access leg is to be constructed and drained at the landowner/applicant cost;

7. Building Design

- 7.1 The surface finish of boundary walls facing an adjoining property shall be of a good and clean condition, prior to the occupation or use of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City. The finish of boundary walls is to be fully rendered or face brick; or material as otherwise approved; to the satisfaction of the City;
- 7.2 Prior to the occupation or use of the development Functional Utilities, as defined by the Residential Design Codes, excluding solar collectors, shall:
- 7.2.1 Be located behind the street setback areas and not visible from Pembroke Lane;
- 7.2.2 Designed to integrate with the development; and
- 7.2.3 Are located and/or screened so they are not visually obtrusive and minimise impacts to habitable rooms and private open space on the subject site and adjoining properties;
- to the satisfaction of the City;
- 7.3 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, Service Utilities, as defined by the Residential Design Codes, excluding letterboxes, shall be integrated into the design of the development and/or screened from view of the streets, to the satisfaction of the City. Where attached to a wall, meter boxes shall be painted the same colour as the wall to which they are attached, to the satisfaction of the City; and
- 7.4 At least one window to each habitable room shall be operable in design, to the satisfaction of the City;

8. 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; and

9. Construction Management

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

- The delivery of and delivery times for materials and equipment to the site;
- Parking arrangements for contractors and sub-contractors;
- Notification to affected landowners;
- Management of noise, dust and waste;
- Erection of temporary fencing;
- Public communication and complaint handling procedures;
- Construction times; and
- Tree Management Measures.

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1








Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

9.3 OUTCOMES OF ADVERTISING OF DRAFT LOCAL PLANNING POLICY: TREES OF SIGNIFICANCE, AND ADVERTISING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 15 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 AND DRAFT LOCAL PLANNING POLICY: REGULATED & SIGNIFICANT TREES

- Attachments:
1. Advertised Local Planning Policy: Trees of Significance 
 2. Amendment No. 15 to LPS2 
 3. Draft Local Planning Policy: Regulated & Significant Trees 
 4. Summary of Submissions Draft Local Planning Policy: Trees of Significance 
 5. Decision-Making Considerations Since February 2025 
 6. Overview of Local Planning Policy - Regulated & Significant Trees 
 7. Example Tree Pathways 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **RESOLVES** not to proceed with draft Local Planning Policy: Trees of Significance as included in Attachment 1, pursuant to Clause 4(3)(b)(iii) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
2. **PREPARES** Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 as included in Attachment 2 for the purposes of community consultation, pursuant to section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*;
3. **CONSIDERS** Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 to be a standard amendment pursuant to Clause 35(2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* as the amendment:
 - Would not result in significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area; and
 - Is not considered a complex or basic amendment;
4. **AUTHORISES** the execution of Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 included in Attachment 2 in accordance with the City's Execution of Documents Policy;
5. **SUBMITS** Amendment No. 15 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 Clauses 46A and 46B of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
6. Subject to receiving approval from the Minister for Planning **PROCEEDS** to advertise Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 pursuant to Clause 47 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulations 2015*;
7. **PREPARES** a notice of amendments for draft Local Planning Policy: Regulated & Significant Trees included in Attachment 3 for the purpose of community consultation, in accordance with Clauses 5 and 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and
8. **NOTES** that:
 - In accordance with Section 81(2) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 is not required to be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority.

This is because Amendment No. 15 modifies an existing provision relating to the administration of Local Planning Scheme No. 2 so that development approval is required for works to, or the removal of, regulated trees on private land identified through a local

planning policy, in addition to trees listed on the City's Significant Tree Inventory;

- Public notice of Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and Local Planning Policy: Regulated & Significant Trees will be undertaken concurrently;
- Any submissions received during the advertising period would be presented to Council for consideration; and
- Local Planning Policy: Regulated & Significant Trees would not be implemented until Council has considered any submissions and approved it following advertising, and Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 2 has been approved by the Minister for Planning following advertising and gazetted.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY "EN BLOC" (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

10.2 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED VERGE TREATMENT POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Verge Treatment Policy 
 2. Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautifications 2.2.4 
 3. Verge Treatment Policy - Survey Results 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

ADOPTS the Verge Treatment Policy at Attachment 1, which replaces Policy Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautification 2.2.4 at Attachment 2.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.2

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

10.3 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED POLICY RIGHTS OF WAY

- Attachments:
1. Rights of Way Policy 
 2. Policy Laneways and Rights of Way 2.2.8 
 3. Rights of Way Policy - Survey Results 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ADOPTS** the Rights of Way Policy at Attachment 1, which replaces Policy Laneways and Rights of Way 2.2.8 at Attachment 2.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.3

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

11.2 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 APRIL 2026

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 30 April 2026 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 30 April 2026 as detailed in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

11.3 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 30 APRIL 2026

Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 30 Apr 2026 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 30 April 2026 as shown in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3





Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

11.4 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 1 APRIL 2026 TO 30 APRIL 2026

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

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 April 2026 to 30 April 2026 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as summarised below:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| EFT payments, including payroll | 3307-3316 | \$ 8,817,707.28 |
| Direct debits, including credit cards | | \$ 715,231.76 |
| Cheques | 82820 | \$ 317.90 |
| | | |
| Total payment for April 2026 | | \$ 9,533,256.94 |

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.4


Moved: Cr Castle, Seconded: Cr Woolf

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

11.6 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Draft Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy 
 2. Draft Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy with tracked changes 
 3. Community and Stakeholder Engagement Framework 
 4. Community Feedback Report 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ADOPTS** the amended Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy at Attachment 1

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.6

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

12.5 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. **Confirmed Minutes Sustainability Advisory Group on 11 February 2026** 
 2. **Confirmed Minutes Sustainability Advisory Group on 13 May 2026** 
 3. **Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council Meeting held on 30 April 2026** 
 4. **Unconfirmed Minutes of the Mindarie Regional Special Council Meeting held on 30 April 2026** 
 5. **Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of May 2026** 
 6. **Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential**
 7. **Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 11 June 2026** 
 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 June 2026** 
 11. **Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - June 2026** 
 12. **Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - June 2026** 
 13. **Council Workshop Items since 19 May 2026** 
 14. **Council Briefing Notes - 12 May 2026** 

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.5

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








That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (8-0)

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

11.1 ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

- Attachments:
1. Statutory Annual Budget for year ended 30 June 2027 
 2. 4 Year Capital Works Plan 2026/27 - 2029/30 
 3. Summary of Income and Expenditure by Service Area 2026/27 
 4. Proposed Fees and Charges 2026/27 
 5. Objects and Reasons Differential Minimum Payments 2026/27 
 6. Workforce Plan 2026/27 
 7. Differential Rates Submissions Summary 2026/27 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

1. BUDGET:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 6.2(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Part 3 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS the City of Vincent Annual Budget as detailed in Attachment 1 for the year ended 30 June 2027, which includes:

- 1.1 Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature or Type showing a net result for the year of \$11,001,826;
- 1.2 Statement of Cash Flows showing a net cash provided by operations of \$12,454,623 and a net increase in cash held of \$501,565
- 1.3 Statement of Financial Activity showing an amount required to be raised from rates of \$49,212,115;
- 1.4 Transfers to/from Reserves as detailed on the Cash Backed Reserves Statement showing a 30 June 2027 closing balance of \$43,310,376; and
- 1.5 Notes to and forming part of the Budget; and
- 1.6 Capital Works Program showing a total of \$25,391,319 (including 2025/26 carry forward projects of \$3,606,362.

2. CAPITAL WORKS PLAN:

ADOPTS the Capital Works Plan 2026/27– 2029/30 at Attachment 2.

3. RATES:

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

3.1 General Rates:

| Differential General Rate | Cents in the dollar |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Residential | 6.477315 |
| Vacant | 12.90000 |
| Other (Commercial and Industrial) | 7.146508 |
| Short Term Rental Accommodation | 7.772778 |

3.2 Minimum Payments:

| Differential General Rate | Minimum Payment on GRV |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Residential | \$1,685.55 |
| Vacant | \$1,794.97 |
| Other (Commercial and Industrial) | \$1,700.00 |
| Short Term Rental Accommodation | \$1,850.00 |

3.3 Rate Payment Options:

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

3.3.1 Pay in full:

Payment in full on 28 August 2026.

3.3.2 Four Instalments:

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

| Instalment | Date |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| First instalment | 28 August 2026 |
| Second instalment | 30 October 2026 |
| Third instalment | 8 January 2027 |
| Fourth instalment | 12 March 2027 |

3.3.3 Rates Smoothing Flexible Payment:

The rates smoothing flexible payment option allows ratepayers to spread their payments across weekly, fortnightly, or monthly instalments. To participate in this program, ratepayers must register a Direct Debit Request and Service Agreement through the new direct debit online portal. The direct debit end date is 31 May 2027.

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

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

3.4.2 Pursuant to Section 6.45(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulation 68 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS an interest rate of 5.5% where the owner

has elected to pay rates through an instalment option, rates smoothing or alternative payment arrangement.

3.5 Late Payment Interest on Overdue Rates and Amounts:

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

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

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

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

4. REPORTING OF BUDGET VARIANCES:

Pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, ADOPTS the monthly reporting variance for the 2026/27 financial year of 10% or more, where that variance is also more than \$20,000;

5. FEES AND CHARGES:

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

6. RATES WAIVER:

6.1 Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2026/27 local government rates for the following groups:

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| Azzurri Bocce Club | Dorrien Gardens | \$5,213.38 |
| Earlybirds Playgroup | 87 The Boulevarde | \$1,700.00 |
| East Perth Football Club | Leederville Oval | \$14,257.26 |
| Floreat Athena Soccer Club | Litis Stadium | \$11,973.97 |
| Forrest Park Croquet Club | Forrest Park | \$5,920.88 |
| Gymnastics Western Australia Inc. | Loftus Centre | \$14,889.75 |
| Highgate Forrest Park Playgroup | Forrest Park | \$2,341.91 |
| Leederville Tennis Club | Richmond Street Leederville | \$3,455.34 |
| Leederville Toy Library | Loftus Community Centre | \$1,700.00 |
| Loton Park Tennis Club | Loton Park | \$4,345.08 |
| Mount Hawthorn Playgroup | Mt Hawthorn Community Centre | \$1,700.00 |
| Mount Hawthorn Toy Library | Mt Hawthorn Community Centre | \$1,700.00 |
| North Perth Bowling Club | Woodville Reserve | \$4,680.96 |
| North Perth Community Garden Inc | Woodville Reserve | \$1,700.00 |
| North Perth Tennis Club | Woodville Reserve | \$4,555.90 |
| Perth Junior Soccer Club Inc | Forrest Park | \$2,054.62 |
| Perth Soccer Club | Dorrien Gardens | \$19,874.44 |
| Rainbow Futures WA Ltd | 4 View Street | \$4,573.77 |
| Subiaco Football Club | Leederville Oval | \$12,208.14 |

| | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Tennis West | Robertson Park | \$10,001.54 |
| Tools n Things | Britannia Reserve | \$1,700.00 |
| Town Team Movement | 245 Vincent Street | \$1,700.00 |
| Vincent Men's Shed | Woodville Reserve | \$1,715.16 |
| Volleyball WA | Royal Park | \$4,320.06 |
| | | <u>\$138,282.16</u> |

- 6.2 Pursuant to Section 6.47 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, WAIVES the 2026/27 local government rates for the following properties reserved for future road widening:

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 65A Raglan Road MOUNT LAWLEY WA 6050 | LOT 198 D/P 39921 | \$1,794.97 |
| 385 Walcott Street COOLBINIA WA 6050 | LOT 889 D/P 426986 | \$1,794.97 |
| 471 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006 | LOT 201 D/P 422599 | \$1,794.97 |
| 497 Fitzgerald Street NORTH PERTH WA 6006 | LOT 300 D/P 425918 | \$1,794.97 |
| 232 Charles Street NORTH PERTH WA 6000 | LOT 888 D/P 426994 | \$1,794.97 |
| | | <u>\$8,974.85</u> |

7. NOTES a provision of \$50,000 within the budget that will be used to assist ratepayers in financial hardship, up to a maximum of \$500 per property;
8. That Council APPROVES a concession of 30% on rates levied on non-minimum rated vacant residential properties where:
- The property is classified as vacant residential as at 1 July 2026; and
 - At the time of rating, the property must have been classified as vacant residential for less than two continuous years.
9. That Council APPROVES a concession of 30% on rates levied on non-minimum rated vacant residential properties where:
- The property is classified as vacant residential as at 1 July 2026; and
 - At the time of rating, the property must have been classified as vacant residential for less than three continuous years with an active approved Building Permit.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

At 6.23pm, Manager Parks left the meeting and did not return.

At 6.39pm, Mayor Alison Xamon left the meeting due to her previously declared proximity interest, and Deputy Mayor Cr Alex Castle assumed the Chair.

9.2 NO. 5/288 (LOT: 5; STR: 67450) LORD STREET, PERTH - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM MULTIPLE DWELLING TO UNHOSTED SHORT TERM RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Ward: South Ward

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Operations Management Plan & Code of Conduct 
 4. Complaints Management Procedure 
 5. Applicant Justification Letter 
 6. Previous Planning Approval 
 7. Approved Construction Plans 
 8. Clause 67 Assessment 
 9. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response 
 10. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, REFUSES the application for Change of Use from Multiple Dwelling to Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation at No. 5/288 (Lot: 5; STR: 67450) Lord Street, Perth for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to 67(m) and (n) in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the subject dwelling is orientated away from the Lord Street commercial frontage and toward Windsor Street, Aria Lane and adjoining dwellings, where the prevailing character is residential with permanent occupation and is lower in 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;
2. Pursuant to the objectives of the Commercial zone in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, the proposed Unhosted Short Term Rental Accommodation would be detrimental to the amenity of adjoining owners and residential properties in the locality. The subject dwelling is orientated away from the Lord Street commercial frontage and toward Windsor Street, Aria Lane, and adjoining dwellings. In this location, the proposal would introduce guest turnover, irregular arrivals and departures, and activity patterns that are not compatible with the residential amenity of adjoining dwellings, residents within the development and the Windsor Street residential interface; and
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 and amenity impacts on surrounding residential properties, and residents within the same multiple dwelling development. The subject dwelling is not orientated to Lord Street and is not directly adjacent to non-residential land uses. It contains outdoor living areas that directly interface with Windsor Street, neighbouring apartments and the communal garden area. The proposal would also introduce short-stay guest turnover and movement through shared communal areas of the development. These characteristics would increase the potential for noise and disturbance, and the proposal would result in undue impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (7-0)


For: Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Poulios, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr Wheadon

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

At 6.43pm, Mayor Alison Xamon returned to the meeting at the conclusion of the discussion and assumed the Chair.

9.4 THE GLOBE PUBLIC ARTWORK COMMISSION

- Attachments:**
1. The Globe - Location Plan 
 2. The Globe - Design Development - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** Edward Street, Perth (Attachment 1) as the new location for the Globe public artwork;
2. **NOTES** the 2026/27 Annual Budget will include provision of \$60,000 for the contract variation.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.4

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

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

At 6.45pm, Manager Financial Services left the meeting and did not return.

10.1 LOFTUS RECREATION CENTRE - REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Attachments: 1. Loftus Recreation Centre - Operational and Financial Performance FY 2025/26 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the review of operational and financial performance of Belgravia Health and Leisure Group Ltd Pty in respect of Loftus Recreation Centre.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 10.1

Moved: Cr Woolf, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.


CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

11.5 DISABILITY ACCESS AND INCLUSION ADVISORY GROUP - APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

- Attachments:
1. Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group - Terms of Reference 
 2. Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group - Nominations - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the Terms of reference for the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group, as at Attachment 1;
2. **APPOINTS** the following Council Members as Council's representatives to the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group for a term expiring on 16 October 2027;

Members:

1. _____;
2. _____;
3. _____; and

the Chair of the Advisory Group will be Cr _____; and

3. **APPOINTS** the following community members to the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group, as detailed in Confidential Attachment 2;
 1. Applicant 1;
 2. Applicant 2;
 3. Applicant 3;
 4. Applicant 4;
 5. Applicant 5;
 6. Applicant 6;
 7. Applicant 7;
 8. Applicant 8.

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, advised that there had been three nominations for the position of Member to Disability Access and Inclusion Group and then called for further nominations.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.5**Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Poulios**

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the Terms of reference for the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group, as at Attachment 1;
2. **APPOINTS** the following Council Members as Council's representatives to the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group for a term expiring on 16 October 2027;


Members:

1. Cr Suzanne Worner;
2. Cr Sophie Greer;
3. Mayor Alison Xamon; and

the Chair of the Advisory Group will be Cr Greer; and

3. **APPOINTS** the following community members to the Disability Access and Inclusion Advisory Group, as detailed in Confidential Attachment 2;
 1. Applicant 1;
 2. Applicant 2;
 3. Applicant 3;
 4. Applicant 4;
 5. Applicant 5;
 6. Applicant 6;
 7. Applicant 7;
 8. Applicant 8.

CARRIED (8-0)**For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Poulios, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr Wheadon**Against:** Nil**(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)**

12.1 ANNUAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL DELEGATIONS**Attachments:** 1. Review of Register of Council Delegations **RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

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

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1**Moved:** Cr Wallace, **Seconded:** Cr Castle**That the recommendation be adopted.****CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)****For:** Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Poulos, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr Wheadon**Against:** Nil**(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)**

At 6.55pm, Manager Community Facilities left the meeting and did not return.

12.2 ADOPTION OF CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2026/27 - 2029/30 AND THE FOUR YEAR CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM 2026/27 - 2029/2030

Attachments: 1. Draft Corporate Business Plan 2026/27 - 2029/2030 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the City of Vincent Corporate Business Plan 2026/27 – 2029/30 at Attachment 1, including the Four Year Capital Works Program 2026/27 – 2029/30; and
2. **NOTES that:**
 - 2.1 **Financials in the Corporate Business Plan 2026/27 – 2029/30 are subject to change based on the figures adopted in the City’s Annual Budget 2026/27 and Long Term Financial Plan; and**
 - 2.2 **The Four Year Capital Works Program 2026/27 – 2029/30 will be included in the Corporate Business Plan 2026/27 – 2029/30 after adoption in the City’s Annual Budget 2026/27 and Long Term Financial Plan; and**
 - 2.3 **Final editorial, design and formatting of these documents will be determined by the Chief Executive Officer prior to publication.**

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

Moved: Cr Poulios, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)




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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

At 6.56pm, Executive Manager Communications and Engagement left the meeting and did not return.

12.3 OUTCOME OF ADVERTISING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED COUNCIL MEMBERS CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

- Attachments:
1. Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy - 2026 review (clean) 
 2. Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy - 2026 review (tracked) 
 3. Community Consultation Submissions - Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy at Attachment 1.

Moved: Cr Poulios, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Poulios, Seconded: Cr Worner

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

That Council **ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy at Attachment 1 **subject to the following amendment:**

6. High Level Training Programs

Subject to budget availability, up to two Council Members per financial year may be supported to undertake a recognised governance qualification with a course duration of five (5) days or more.

*Where a membership-based pricing structure applies, Council Members will be required to purchase the relevant membership at their own cost where this results in a reduced course fee for the City **as well as a 10% co-contribution to the course cost. The purchase of the membership, which enables access to the reduced member rate, will be considered an equitable cocontribution by the Council Member.***

REASON:

This preserves the intent of the extra education to improve the levels of governance at the City, however in addition to paying the membership fee shows to the ratepayers that the individuals acknowledge that they also gain a personal qualification which they hold throughout their life and also shows a co-contribution and small acknowledgment and thanks to the City for the opportunity to do this course.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT:

Supported. The proposed modification acknowledges that additional training comes at a higher cost to the City and that where this contributes to ongoing professional development it is reasonable to expect Elected Members would contribute towards this cost.

AMENDMENT LOST (1-7)

For: Cr Poulios

Against: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr Wheadon

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.3

That Council ADOPTS BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the Council Members Continuing Professional Development Policy at Attachment 1.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

12.4 FORMAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AUDIT, RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY OF THE PRESIDING MEMBER

- Attachments:
1. Deputy of the Presiding Member ARIC - Application 1 - Confidential
 2. Evaluation Matrix - Confidential

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

1. ESTABLISHES the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee in accordance with sections 5.8 and 7.1A of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
2. APPOINTS the following members to the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee for the term commencing 16 June 2026 and expiring on 16 October 2027:

Council Members:

- 2.1 Mayor Alison Xamon
- 2.2 Cr Alex Castle
- 2.3 Cr Reece Wheadon
- 2.4 Cr Ashlee La Fontaine

External Independent Members:

- 2.5 George Araj (Presiding Member)
- 2.6 Conley Manifis (Deputy Presiding Member)
- 2.7 Baptiste Isambert

3. APPOINTS Richard Thomas as the independent Deputy of the Presiding Member of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee in accordance with sections 7.1B and 5.11A of the *Local Government Act 1995*, for the term commencing 16 June 2026 and expiring on 16 October 2027.
4. NOTES that:
 - 4.1 the Deputy of the Presiding Member is not a standing member of the Committee and attends meetings only when deputising;
 - 4.2 the Deputy Presiding Member remains a standing committee member and may preside only where both the Presiding Member and the Deputy of the Presiding Member are unavailable.
 - 4.3 That these resolutions give effect to the formal re-establishment of a compliant Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee prior to 30 June 2026.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.4

Moved: Cr Greer, Seconded: Cr Wheadon

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - MAYOR ALISON XAMON - USE OF PERTH PARKING LEVY FUNDS IN VINCENT**

That Council REQUESTS the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to write to the Minister for Transport to request the use of the Perth Parking Levy to fund pedestrian and public transport improvements within Vincent including:

- Pedestrian upgrades to East Parade including the installation of an interim signalised pedestrian crossing in the short-term, and the commencement of detailed planning for a future pedestrian overpass in the longer-term;
- The extension of the existing Blue CAT, including within the existing PPMA boundary of Vincent, to connect to the Leederville Town Centre; and
- The establishment of an east-west bus route to connect the Leederville Town Centre and the Claisebrook area that utilises Vincent Street as a principal corridor.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.1

Moved: Mayor Xamon, Seconded: Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

13.2 NOTICE OF MOTION - CR ALISON XAMON - DRAFT MINDARIE REGIONAL COUNCIL WORKS

That Council:

1. **NOTES** that Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) owns and operates the Tamala Park landfill site (the site) and that the City of Vincent is one of the seven member local governments that comprise the MRC;
2. **NOTES** that the operational life of the site is expected to cease before 2030 and the MRC, and consequently its member local governments, is responsible for the post-closure management, rehabilitation and long-term environmental monitoring and remediation of the site;
3. **NOTES** that MRC has applied for approval from the State Government Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) to undertake necessary works to mitigate leachate from the site, including the installation of a piggy-back liner and leachate treatment, these works having been part of the MRC's long term closure plans for the site and ongoing regulatory reporting to DWER;
4. **NOTES** that failure to undertake the abovementioned works may constitute a significantly increased environmental and financial risk to the MRC, and consequently its member local governments; and
5. **REQUESTS** the Mayor and CEO to meet with the Minister for Environment and/or the Director General of DWER seeking the expedited approval of MRC's abovementioned planned works.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 13.2

Moved: Mayor Xamon, Seconded: Cr Castle

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-0)

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

Against: Nil

(Cr La Fontaine was on approved leave of absence for the Meeting.)

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 7.23pm with the following persons present:

| | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PRESENT: | Mayor Alison Xamon Cr Alex Castle Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Nicole Woolf Cr Con Poulos Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Sophie Greer Cr Reece Wheadon | Presiding Member North Ward North Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward South Ward South Ward (attended electronically) |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | David MacLennan Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Mitchell Hoad Joslin Colli Luke McQuirk Alex Harris Carrie Miller | Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Community & Business Services Executive Director Strategy & Development Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Manager Engineering Governance Officer Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer |

Public: No members of the public.

These Minutes were confirmed at the 21 July 2026 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Council Meeting held on 16 June 2026.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated: 21 July 2026