



CITY OF VINCENT

NOTES

Council Briefing

9 November 2021

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country	5
2	Apologies / Members on Approved Leave of Absence	5
3	Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements 6.01	5
4	Declarations of Interest	11
5	Strategy & Development	13
5.1	No. 110 Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn (Lot: 228 D/P: 2503; Lot: 229 D/P: 2503) - Proposed Three Grouped Dwellings (Amendment to Approved)	13
5.2	No. 17 (Lot: 11; D/P: 2447) St Albans Avenue, Highgate - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Single House.....	15
5.3	No. 17-19 (Lots: 33 & 51, D/P: 1554 & 72073) Brisbane Street, Perth - Proposed Alterations and Additions to Service Station.....	21
5.4	Place Plan Minor Annual Review.....	30
5.5	Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan.....	33
5.6	Final Adoption of Local Government Property Local Law 2021 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED]	37
5.7	Governance Framework Review 2021	41
5.8	Policy Document Register and Review Plan - Progress Update and Implementation Review	42
5.9	Climate Emergency Australia Joint Statement: Australian Councils Call for Energy-Efficient and Climate Resilient Homes via the National Construction Code.....	43
6	Infrastructure & Environment	44
6.1	Review of Memorials in Parks and Public Reserves (2.1.5).....	44
6.2	Asset Management and Sustainability Strategy - Outcomes of Advertising	46
6.3	Halverson Hall - Condition and Compliance Assessment	47
7	Community & Business Services	48
7.1	Tender CB133-2021 Supply and Install Gym Equipment at Beatty Park Leisure Centre	48
7.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 September 2021 to 30 September 2021	49
7.3	Financial Statements as at 30 September 2021 8.10pm.....	50
7.4	Investment Report as at 30 September 2021	51
7.5	First Quarter Budget Review 2021-2022 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	52
8	Chief Executive Officer	54
8.1	Underground Power Update	54
8.2	Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024 Progress Update	56
8.3	Council Briefing and Ordinary Meeting of Council dates for 2021.....	57
8.4	Appointment of Council Members to Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Panel.....	58
8.5	Appointment of Council Members to the Metro West Joint Development Assessment Panel.....	59
8.6	Appointment of Council Members and Community Members to the City of Vincent Audit Committee and amendment of Terms of Reference [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	60
8.7	Appointment of Council Members and Community Representatives to Advisory Groups	61

8.8 Information Bulletin64

9 Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given.....65

10 Representation on Committees and Public Bodies65

11 Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed65

**NOTES OF CITY OF VINCENT
COUNCIL BRIEFING
HELD AT THE
ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE
ON TUESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 6.00PM**

PRESENT:	<p>Mayor Emma Cole Cr Susan Gontaszewski Cr Alex Castle Cr Joanne Fotakis Cr Jonathan Hallett Cr Dan Loden Cr Ashley Wallace Cr Suzanne Worner Cr Ron Alexander Cr Ross Ioppolo</p>	<p>Presiding Member South Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward North Ward South Ward North Ward North Ward South Ward</p>
IN ATTENDANCE:	<p>David MacLennan Andrew Murphy Virginia Miltrup John Corbellini Peter Varris Rhys Taylor Jay Naidoo Dale Morrissy Elizabeth Bentley Tara Gloster Wendy Barnard</p>	<p>Chief Executive Officer Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment Executive Director Community & Business Executive Director Strategy and Development Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance Executive Manager Financial Services Manager Development & Design Manager Beatty Park Leisure Centre Coordinator Health and Fitness Manager Policy and Place Council Liaison Officer</p>

Public: Approximately eight members of the public.

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, 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, present and emerging.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS

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

3.1 Con Poulos of Mt Hawthorn – Item 5.5

- Stated that he is the President of Floreat Athena
- Mentioned that the Club has been working with the City to improve the stadium
- Stated that the Club has 420 members
- Stated that the ground has been shortlisted for the FIFA Women’s World Cup 2023 tournament

- Stated that data shows that if this takes place it will increase usage of the club
- Listed many activities held at the club
- Stated that they are looking forward to the project commencing.

The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Poullos for his comments.

3.2 Phil Brown of Noth Perth – Item 5.5

- Representative of Tools N Things Library
- Queried if there are any implications for the current tenants to the action in the report under financial implications “repurpose turnstile building” for 75K.
- Stated that vehicle access to the building does not appear possible.
- Queried if there would be disruption to normal operations while development is in progress?
- Mentioned that installing a notice that public is welcome would be less expensive than removing part of all of the bund, which would leave the bund as part of the topographical profile, which is of historical interest
- Mentioned that the map contains no cardinal reference points

The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Mr Brown for his comments.

3.3 Ashlee La Fontaine of North Perth

In June I submitted the Forrest street Traffic Calming Petition, which was supported by 120 signatories. I also spoke, along with five other residents of Forrest Street about our ongoing issues and concerns regarding the current lack of safety, amenity and accessibility due to the excessive speed and volume of traffic on our street. The City of Vincent recorded over twelve and a half thousand motorists using our local residential street every week, and the Main Roads heatmap shows an 85 percentile speed exceeding the 50km/hr speed limit.

A couple of months ago, this council voted on the proposed traffic calming and parking changes to be installed subject to community consultation submissions, being in favour of the respective proposals. The City of Vincent recently conducted its consultation, but we had concerns it was broad.

We, the concerned residents and ratepayers of Forrest Street conducted our own accountable consultation, between Fitzgerald Street and Norfolk Street only.

For the record, 47 responses from 30 properties on the street, show that:

- 94% of us support the placement of three speed bumps between Fitzgerald Street and Norfolk Street.

- 96% support one or two hour parking restrictions to be applied seven days a week.

- 100% refused staggered parking because it is dangerous and confusing to residents.

I await the outcome of the wider City of Vincent community consultation to gauge their reaction in comparison to the directly affected residents who live on Forrest Street between Fitzgerald Street and Norfolk Street.

We would appreciate a quick response to our request as the traffic intensifies towards Christmas and the narrow street gets clogged with parked shoppers. The Presiding Member, Emma Cole, thanked Ms La Fontaine for her comments and Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment advised consultation closed on Friday and results are being collated now. If there is support the speed bumps could be installed before Christmas. If there is no support the report will come back to Council.

The following are the questions and submissions received in writing prior to the meeting.

3.4 Michelle Grundy of Perth – Item 5.3

My questions are, why do you think a petrol station is needed at this location when there are already three petrol stations within a 650m radius, two of which are already 24 hour businesses? Also why do you think it is appropriate to have a petrol station adjacent to a roundabout that is already dangerous with many barely avoided accidents occurring every day? Increasing traffic in and out of this area will make collisions at that roundabout more likely and make the area less pedestrian friendly. It is already difficult at certain times to cross Bulwer Street at the roundabout.

A new service station is not being proposed as part of the application. The service station is existing in this location, having been approved by the City of Perth in 1986. The application is seeking to upgrade the existing service station. The existing approval did not include any specified operating hours or restrictions on operating hours and is capable of operating 24/7. The number of similar service station facilities operating in the area is also not a relevant planning consideration in the determination of this application.

The applicant submitted a transport impact statement (TIS) that sets out that compared to the existing service station there is not expected to be a significant increase in traffic. It states that as the number of refuelling positions is staying the same as the existing service station, the trip generation is expected to be similar. The TIS makes a conservative assumption that due to the improved facilities proposed that the traffic generation would be at most 25 per cent more than the existing service station. This would result in an additional trip generation of approximately 206 daily trips and 13 and 14 vehicles per hour during the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour.

This increase is well within the threshold of 100 vehicles per hour specified in the Western Australian Planning Commission's Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines for Developments (2016) for increases in traffic which would not normally have a material impact on any section of road. The TIS concludes the proposal would have an insignificant impact on the traffic operations of the surrounding road network. The TIS has been reviewed by the City's Engineering team and is acceptable. The application would not result in an adverse impact on the vehicle and pedestrian environment surrounding the subject site, including at the roundabout.

3.5 Peter and Suzette Herkenhoff of Highgate – Item 5.2

OBJECTION RE: No. 17 St Alban's Avenue, Highgate. (Lot: 11; D/P: 2447)
PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SINGLE HOUSE

We note the City of Vincent 'Report Recommendation' to approve the development proposal, as amended, incorporates dismissive statements as they relate to neighbour concerns.

This dismissive approach is reflective of the City's cursory approach to consultation, which creates barriers to deliberation by affected parties and places severe, undemocratic time restrictions on those impacted by development proposals.

We contend this approach is not only wasteful of the City's limited resources, but also the antithesis of the claim within the Report Recommendation that Vincent is:
"... open and accountable to an engaged community..."

However, as Vincent has provided us a last-minute opportunity to iterate our objections and rationale, we focus on our most pressing concern, which relates to the proponent's efforts to seek variation to Residential Design Codes Volume 1 Clause 5.4.1 – Visual Privacy.

We note the proposed mitigation to Visual Privacy concerns now involves provision of 1.6-metre screening on the eastern boundary of the proposed 3rd floor roof terrace.

As is clearly depicted with the red cross-hatching in the amended proposal, the proposed mitigation does NOT resolve the Visual Privacy imposition on properties east – or west for that matter -- of the proposed development.

- At 1.6-metres in height, the proposed visual screening is 15cm lower than the height of an average male in Australia (source: ABS 2013 DATA)
- Further, no attempt has been made to verify the amended viewsheds from this significantly elevated, 3rd storey observation point.

We contend this privacy imposition not only impacts our neighbour at number 15, but also our property at 11a St Albans Avenue.

While the 'Report Recommendation' contends visual privacy impositions of the amended proposal are 'adequately screened', we challenge this assessment.

We also challenge the assessment that privacy concerns related to upper floor windows are inconsequential because the windows form part of 'non-habitable' rooms. Since when did a 'nonhabitable room' classification become a visual privacy impact mitigation?

Notably, the 'Report Recommendation' incorporates the following rationale:

There is an approved dwelling that is under construction at No. 9 St Albans Avenue that is a two-storey building within the St Albans Avenue Guideline area. This property is also a non-contributing building with the same design objectives as the subject site. There is also a three-storey apartment building located across the ROW to the rear of the subject site. The proposed development would not be inconsistent with the bulk and scale of these nearby developments.

NOTE: The development at 9 St Albans Avenue is a two-storey building, which does not incorporate a 3rd storey observation point and associated viewsheds.

NOTE: The three-story apartment building located across the ROW to the rear of the subject site is zoned R80 - not R50 - and incorporates significant setback to mitigate overlooking concerns.

As the proposed three-storey development is on land zoned R50, we contend the aforementioned rationale incorporates irrelevant, inconsistent comparisons to dismiss neighbour concerns.

While the proponents' efforts to maximise the size, amenity and privacy of their proposed development are appreciated, we have the following questions:

QUESTION 1: Is it equitable for the proponents to achieve these objectives while concurrently eroding the enjoyment and privacy of neighbouring properties?

QUESTION 2: Is it equitable for Council to approve a proposal that incorporates visual privacy impositions on neighbouring properties?

We vehemently oppose the amended proposal and trust Council will give due consideration to our ongoing concerns.

Right-of-Way access during any construction phase is also a concern, based on our experience with other ongoing developments in the vicinity.

The applicant is responsible for managing construction of approved development so as to minimise disruption in the area.

Following Council's Briefing Session, Administration has added a new condition 11 to its recommendation to require the submission of a construction management plan. The condition would read as follows: A Construction Management Plan shall be lodged with and approved by the City prior to the issue of a building permit. This plan is to detail how construction 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;*
- *Storage of materials and equipment on site;*
- *Parking arrangements for contractors and sub-contractors;*
- *The impact on traffic movement;*
- *Notification to affected landowners; and*
- *Construction times.*

The approved management plan shall be complied with for the duration of the construction of the development.

3.6 Sarah Yukich of Highgate – Item 5.2

RE: No. 17 St Alban's Avenue, Highgate. (Lot: 11; D/P: 2447)
PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SINGLE HOUSE

It is unreasonable to expect neighbours to satisfactorily address the amendments proposed by the City of Vincent for this proposed building application. We do not believe less than two working days to consider this 40 page amended proposal is either fair or appropriate. (We note 14 days is the minimum comment period stated in Appendix 2, City of Vincent, Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy).

With little time afforded to consider the proposal, there appears to be inadequate scope for consideration of due process for existing neighbours. We do not believe there has been any attempt to consider the objections made by the neighbours and community from the first consultation submission.

The proposed build appears to be already approved prior to community engagement. It is disappointing to see the applicant's obvious disregard for neighbour enjoyment of one's properties and outdoor living spaces, with resolute indifference to neighbour's privacy and safety of their properties in the amended proposal.

Further to the proposed building opposition, we have valid concerns during the building process in regards to maintaining the integrity of our property's boundary which do not appear to be addressed in the proposal. Adequate safety and security must be maintained to our adjoining boundary and access to our property during the building process.

Our property will be vulnerable and compromised and susceptible to trespass. We already have existing issues with homeless people who sleep in our street and ROW and sleep in vehicles in our street, who use the current building site, (No. 9 St Alban's Avenue) as both toilet and meeting area, and use the site as a meeting point and thoroughfare from the Avenue and ROW. Repeat of this behaviour is an unacceptable outcome. Secure and safe boundary provisions to our property must be implemented and maintained throughout the process.

Comments in response to the City of Vincent RECOMMENDATION section

2. Amended Plans – OPPOSE

- i. We can see nothing changed in the alleged extending of the privacy screening on the south eastern edge.
- ii. The privacy screening has decreased as opposed to being raised. This proposed height enables clear visual access from standing height.
- iii. The gaps within the material for the privacy screening (ref: Advice Notes 13) make the privacy screen redundant if the occupants can see through it, and provides no privacy (and in turn safety) for surrounding properties and neighbours.
Furthermore, the reference is not coherent in regards to this screening.
It would be helpful to define the source of the definition.
- iv. According to City of Vincent's Policy No. 7.1.1 – the building height for a two storey residential area is 8m to the top of a skillion roof. The proposed development still exceeds by 1.42 metres.
And bottom of skillion roof is 0.2 metres above City's policy.
The height of the build, regardless of purpose, still exceeds acceptable policy, and remains clear that the impact will still be evident in acoustic disruption, visual privacy (including safety of neighbouring occupants), light and ventilation.

4. External Fixtures

There is no indication on the proposed plans for solar panels, air conditioner units, water heaters and other external fixtures. Additional to the street frontage opposition by the City of Vincent, these additions should not be visually obstructive, act as noise irritates (outside bedroom windows for example) or create reflection or glare to our property. These additions should have been investigated prior to planning approval and building submission for a fair and just response by neighbouring properties.

Adequate provision has been made to accommodate external fixtures.

Administration's recommendation includes condition 4 relating to the placement of external fixtures as follows:

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, 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;

The placement of external fixtures would be required to comply with this condition.

6. Visual Privacy

As with previous note (Amended Plans 2) the privacy screenings must be installed and visually impermeable to ensure the safety of neighbouring properties.

Detailed Assessment Section: Building Height.

It is clear that statements in this proposal which deem that there is no adverse impact on adjoining properties in regards to the building height and solar access is completely subjective and misleading. The building height will affect the enjoyment of our outdoor living space and lifestyle. My comment is based on our living in this house for many decades and understanding the solar, wind and shading on this site within existing the build environment.

The applicant openly states that the solar access will affect the planting areas and existing trees on our property. We consider this to be unquestionably an adverse impact on existing plants and trees, including grapevines that have been on the site for over 100 years.

The deemed-to-comply standard of the R Codes relating to solar access for adjoining properties outlines that a shadow of 50 percent of the adjoining property's site area for properties coded R50 is acceptable. The buildings on the site would cast a shadow over 14.7 percent of the adjoining property to the south east. This means that the application satisfies the provisions in the R Codes relating to solar access and acceptable amounts of overshadowing.

3.7 James Bishop of Perth – Item 5.3

This site was previously operated as a service station, but it was a small family operation with limited opening hours (and only a very small shop). From an outsiders view it was predominantly a mechanical workshop.

We understand the current proposal is to continue to operate the small service station with the additional use (appears will be the predominant use) of a large convenience store.

We do not object to a service station continuing to operate even with the predominant use of the site appearing to change (mechanical workshop to convenience store).

We object to the business at this site being open 24 hours a day.

As all levels of government know, there has been a significant increase in rough sleepers and homelessness in Perth. The site is located around residential homes that have endured significant social problems over the last 4-5 years with rough sleepers, which has included significant and obvious drug use.

The problems in our street have not gone away, but following renovation of a derelict house we have seen theft and drug use problems decline. The introduction of a 24 hour convenience store selling food / drinks all night, we feel, will increase the social problems and rough sleeping in the area.

We understand there has been a requirement for a social policy, but regardless of this we consider the introduction of a large convenience store operating 24 hours will detrimentally effect the residents in the area and our security. In this respect we note the ongoing problems at Weld Square with a 24 hour McDonalds closely located to the park (similar to HBF Park next to this site). The gardens around HBF Park are heritage listed and are already used by rough sleepers with some tents erected in the park.

There are existing 24 hour services in close proximity to this site (e.g. McDonalds (Beaufort Street), BP service station (Beaufort Street), Ampol service station (Lord Street)) all of which are located on main roads.

There should be weight to the objections of the residents, which from discussions with our neighbours we understand there were multiple.

We understand that we have chosen to live in the City and with that there will be commercial business and services around us, but together with the City's commitment to local industry / business there should be a commitment to the local residents and families living in the City.

We consider that, in the circumstances, our objection is reasonable as it only relates to the proposed opening hours.

3.8 Marie Slyth of West Perth – Item 6.2

Having worked my way through the summary and results for the draft Asset Management and Sustainability Strategy, I wish to make the following comment -

It is to Council's detriment that our Precinct ratepayer groups no longer exist, since the feedback Council received from these community groups saved Council so much unnecessary expenditure in hiring contractors to find out what the needs of the communities were. The precinct groups (which council gave minimal annual funding to), knew at grass roots level, just what ratepayers were struggling with in each of their particular areas.

A detailed account of how effective these groups have been can be found in Vincent Library. The groundwork then was already underway, thus rarely requiring Council briefings – again saving Council additional expenditure and time.

With the ability to be able to use Zoom for so many meetings today, I suggest that Council once again consider a new version of its original highly effective Precinct ratepayer groups or different categories of groups – thus saving Council a fortune and enhancing necessary sustainability.

I found some of the suggestions put forward to Council on how to now save money for other important sustainability, like Beatty Park pool upkeep etc, to be threatening, for example, like cutting money back (so precious little money has ever been spent on preserving history, heritage and character, in the City of Vincent, whilst monstrous amounts of money have been and are still spent on (what in some cases) can hardly be called Art or Art works.

I recommend that large portions of that funding go towards the upkeep of Beatty Park pool instead and before it becomes too late (sadly it already is) a chunk of money devoted to what is left of the precious character areas of Vincent.

With regard to the delayed efforts Council has put into supposedly attempting to preserve bits of our history and the Character of some areas, it appears the latest prescriptive requirements for retaining Character areas are now undermining these efforts, since home owners are backing away after first being keen to keep such areas. How can this be overcome??

The City is committed to preserving its history and the character of its high quality streets. The latest draft guidelines for the Cleaver Precinct reflect our commitment by proposing provisions around setbacks, fencing styles and garage location.

Planning policies, or any type of controls, can be unfamiliar to land owners. The character guidelines have specifically been drafted with a large amount of flexibility and discretion to accommodate many different circumstances. Administration have spent significant time engaging with community members to explain what the policy means, how it works, and what its benefits are. The results of the latest community engagement will be released with the Council Briefing agenda in December 2021.

My last comment, is regarding the frightening suggestion I noted about letting parts of Vincent with the same postcode as adjoining Councils, be given to those Councils.

This indicates a view to supporting Council Amalgamation, which will ultimately wipe out Vincent Council.

So much for loyalty to our Council. I hope this suggestion is wiped out.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6.10pm.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

8.1 Cr Dan Loden declared an impartiality interest in Item 5.5 Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan. The extent of his interest is that one of Tools 'N Things Library Inc's organising committee members is a family member and other members of the committee supported his local government election campaign.

He also plays indoor soccer with people who are members of the Floreat Athena club and executive.

- 8.2 David MacLennan declared an impartiality interest in Item 5.5 Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan. The extent of his interest is that his niece is one of the girls referred to by the Club President referred to as playing in the Floreat Athena Club.
- 8.3 Mayor Emma Cole declared an impartiality interest in Item 5.5 Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan. The extent of her interest is that her son is a junior player of Floreat Athena Football Club during the winter season.

5 STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT

5.1 NO. 110 COOGEE STREET MOUNT HAWTHORN (LOT: 228 D/P: 2503; LOT: 229 D/P: 2503) - PROPOSED THREE GROUPED DWELLINGS (AMENDMENT TO APPROVED)

Ward: North

- Attachments:
1. Consultation and Location Map
 2. Development Plans
 3. Development Plans - Approved by Council on 23 July 2019
 4. Development Plans - Approved under Delegated Authority on 10 June 2020
 5. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response
 6. Summary of Submissions - Applicant'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, APPROVES the application for Three Grouped Dwellings (Amendment to Approved) at No. 110 Coogee Street (Lot: 228 & 229, D/P: 2503), Mount Hawthorn, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions, requirements and advice notes detailed on development approvals 5.2018.472.1 granted on 23 July 2019 and 5.2020.183.1 granted on 10 June 2020 continue to apply to this approval, except as follows:
 - 1.1 Condition 1 is modified to read as follows:
 1. This approval is for three grouped dwellings as shown on the approved plans dated 13 October 2021. No other development forms part of this approval;
 - 1.2 Condition 5 is modified to read as follows:
 5. External Fixtures
 - 5.1 All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, 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;
 - 5.2 The meter boxes are to be painted the same colour as the fence or wall to which they are attached so as to not be visually obtrusive, to the satisfaction of the City;
 - 1.3 Condition 8 is modified to read as follows:
 8. The solid portion of street walls and fences to the Woodstock Street elevation of Units 1, 2 and 3 are not to exceed the height of those shown on the approved plans. Fencing infill panels above the approved solid portions of fence or wall shall be visually permeable in accordance with the State Planning Policy 7.3: Residential Design Codes Volume 1, to the satisfaction of the City;
 - 1.4 A new Advice Note 19 is added to read as follows:
 19. With reference to Condition 8, the applicant is advised that this condition is imposed to ensure that views to and from the dwelling remain unobstructed due to the ground level of the front yards being lower than the adjacent footpath.

NO QUESTIONS

5.2 NO. 17 (LOT: 11; D/P: 2447) ST ALBANS AVENUE, HIGHGATE - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SINGLE HOUSE**Ward:** South Ward

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map
 2. Development Plans
 3. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response
 4. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response
 5. Applicant Justification
 6. 3D Perspectives
 7. 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 Alterations and Additions to Single House at No. 17 (Lot: 11; D/P: 2447) St Albans Avenue, Highgate, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 7:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to a Single House as shown on the approved plans dated 27 October 2021. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Amended Plans

Prior to the issue of a Building Permit, revised plans shall be submitted and approved demonstrating the following, as marked in red on the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the City:

Privacy screening shall be extended for the full length south eastern edge of the roof terrace. The privacy screening shall have a height of 1.6 metres above the floor level of the roof terrace to satisfy the deemed-to-comply provisions of the Residential Design Codes Clause 5.4.1 – Visual Privacy in relation to the property to the south east (refer to advice note 13).

The revised plans shall not result in any greater variation to the requirements of the Residential Design Codes, the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form or the City's Character Retention Areas and Heritage Areas Policy - Appendix 1: St Albans Avenue Guidelines;

3. Boundary Walls

The surface finish of boundary walls facing an adjoining property shall be of a good and clean condition, prior to the practical completion of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City. The finish of boundary walls is to be fully rendered, face brick or material as otherwise approved, to the satisfaction of the City (refer to advice note 12);

4. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, 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;

5. Roof Terrace Planter Boxes

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, the roof terrace planter boxes shall be installed, to the satisfaction of the City. The roof terrace planter boxes shall not be removed unless the further approval of the City is obtained or privacy screening with a height of 1.6 metres above the finished floor level of the roof terrace is installed to ensure compliance with the deemed-to-comply requirements of the Residential Design Codes Clause 5.4.1 - Visual Privacy in relation

to the properties to the north west, to the satisfaction of the City;

6. Visual Privacy

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, all privacy screening shown on the approved plans shall be installed and shall be visually impermeable and is to comply in all respects with the requirements of Clause 5.4.1 of the Residential Design Codes (Visual Privacy) deemed to comply provisions, to the satisfaction of the City;

7. Colours and Materials

Prior to first occupation or use of the development, the colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with the details and annotations as indicated on the approved plans which forms part of this approval, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City;

8. Landscaping

All landscaping works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans dated 27 October 2021, prior to the occupancy or use of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

9. Front Fence

The gate and/or fencing infill panels above the approved solid portions of wall shall be a minimum of 50 percent visually permeable in accordance with Clause 2.5 of the City's Character Retention Areas and Heritage Areas Policy - Appendix 1: St Albans Avenue Guidelines, to the satisfaction of the City (refer to advice note 13); and

10. 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 (refer to advice note 14).

MAYOR COLE:

Could we please provide further detail on how rooftop terraces are assessed within the planning policy framework?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Rooftop terraces for homes are assessed against provisions of the City's Built Form Policy and Residential Design Codes Volume 1 (R Codes).

Rooftop terraces are defined as 'unenclosed active habitable space' under the R Codes.

Provisions in the Built Form Policy and R Codes applicable in the assessment rooftop terraces relate to Street Setbacks, Lot Boundary Setbacks, Building Height, Visual Privacy and Solar Access for Adjoining Properties.

Rooftop terraces are unenclosed outdoor active habitable spaces under the R Codes and this is specifically referred to in the Visual Privacy section of the R Codes. Where a rooftop terrace overlooks any other residential property behind the street setback, the deemed-to-comply standards for an R50 coded lot or lower requires a 7.5 metre setback from the lot boundary to the adjoining property (6 metres setback for areas coded higher than R50). Alternatively, the deemed-to-comply standard requires the provision of a permanent 1.6 metre high screening device to restrict views.

MAYOR COLE:

How do the St Albans Avenue Guidelines relate to the visual impact of the second storey to the rear? Does the skillion roof have to be that high for clearance or is it a design feature?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The St Albans Avenue Design Guidelines prescribes a two storey permitted building height. It does not set

out street setback standards for upper floors.

Upper floor setback standards are set out under the City's Built Form Policy, being 2 metres behind the ground floor predominant building line.

The proposed stairwell would be setback 25.6 metres from the St Albans Avenue street boundary and 23.3 metres from the front façade of the existing dwelling. The proposed stairwell would be predominantly screened as viewed from St Albans Avenue by the roofline of the existing dwelling.

The applicant has provided 3D rendered images included below to demonstrate how the proposed stairwell would look from the opposite side of St Albans Avenue. These renders are included as Attachment 6 in Administration's report to Council.

The applicant has advised that the bottom of the skillion roof is required to be at 7.2 metres high in order to provide sufficient clearance for the occupants when using the staircase. The applicant has also advised that the top of the skillion roof is proposed to be 9.2 metres high as an architectural feature with a 25 degree roof pitch that follows a similar roof pitch as the existing dwelling.



PROPOSED



PROPOSED

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

Which fences that are non-compliant have been approved since the St Albans Avenue Guidelines were adopted?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The St Albans Avenue Guidelines were originally adopted by Council on 22 September 2015.

The City approved fencing with a height of 1.8 metres within the street at No. 9 St Albans Avenue on 21 September 2020. The fence will be constructed from recycled red face brick with visually permeable steel infill panels.

All other existing fences at Nos. 7, 11, 12 and 18 as referred to in Administration's report to Council were constructed prior to the adoption of the Guidelines. The City has no record of any approvals for these fences.

CR CASTLE:

Can we please have a copy of the St Albans Avenue Guidelines that have been used in the assessment?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The St Albans Avenue Design Guidelines form part of the City's Character Retention Areas and Heritage Areas Policy which can be found [here](#). Refer to pages 5-8 of the Policy.

CR CASTLE:

How much does the roof top terrace contribute to planting area?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The rooftop terrace planter boxes contribute a total of 9.7 square meters of planting areas. This is 41.3 percent of the total planting areas proposed.

CR WALLACE:

The rooftop terrace includes a pergola with a bench top and sink underneath. Does this constitute a storey?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The rooftop terrace does not constitute a storey.

"Storey" is defined in the Residential Design Codes Volume 2 – Apartments as follows:

Storey – the portion of a building which is situated between the top of any floor and the top of the floor next above it and if there is no floor above it, that portion between the top of the floor and the ceiling above it but

does not include:

- A basement
- A space that contains only a lift shaft, stairway or meter room
- A mezzanine
- A loft.

The proposed rooftop terrace would not have a floor or ceiling above it, rather it would have a pergola atop that is an open framed structure. The proposed stairway to the rooftop terrace is specifically excluded as being a storey in the definition also.

An advice note has been included advising the applicant that the pergola is to remain as an open framed structure as defined under the R Codes, and that if covered in a water impermeable roof in future then planning approval would be required. This is because it would constitute a storey.

CR WALLACE:

How have the rooftop privacy screens been assessed against the building height standards? As they are directly above the south eastern wall, are they assessed as an entire wall?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The rooftop terrace privacy screens are included in the calculation for building height and assessed against the concealed roof standards.

The wall height is measured from the natural ground level directly below the wall to the top of the 1.6 metre high privacy screening. This results in a total concealed roof height of 7.9 metres which satisfies the deemed-to-comply building height standard of 8 metres.

CR WALLACE:

Are you allowed to pick and choose which building height criteria you want to apply to each part of the structure? For example, are you allowed to apply the 'top of external wall (concealed roof)' to the south east wall but then also apply the 'top of skillion roof' criteria to the stairwell?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The building height assessment is dependent on which roof form elements are proposed. If more than one roof form element is proposed, each element is assessed separately against the applicable standards.

For the proposed development, the stairwell roof form element has been assessed against the skillion roof building height standards and the remainder of the rooftop terrace area has been assessed against the concealed roof building height standards.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Construction Management Plan

Administration has added a new condition 11 to its recommendation to require the submission of a construction management plan. The condition would read as follows:

A Construction Management Plan shall be lodged with and approved by the City prior to the issue of a building permit. This plan is to detail how construction 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;
- Storage of materials and equipment on site;
- Parking arrangements for contractors and sub-contractors;
- The impact on traffic movement;
- Notification to affected landowners; and
- Construction times.

The approved management plan shall be complied with for the duration of the construction of the development.

The applicant has advised Administration that they would be in agreement with the imposition of this

recommended condition.

Lot Boundary Setback

There was an error in the Briefing Session report that has now been rectified that relates to the lot boundary setback to the south eastern boundary

Erroneously Administration identified the following departure in its assessment and in the Briefing Session report:

“The first floor ensuite to bath wall is proposed to be setback 1.5 metres from the south eastern lot boundary in lieu of 1.7 metres as set out under the R Codes deemed-to-comply standards relating to lot boundary setbacks.”

The deemed-to-comply setback requirement of 1.7 metres from the south eastern lot boundary was calculated using the height of the stairwell (to the top of the skillion roof) of 9.2 metres and the length of the wall of 9.3 metres. The top of the skillion roof of the stairwell is located centrally of the rooftop terrace area. The height of the south eastern building edge is 7.9 metres which is measured to the top of the screening of the rooftop terrace area.

The correct deemed-to-comply lot boundary setback of the first floor ensuite to bath wall is 1.5 metres under the R Codes, based on a length of 9.3 metres and a height of 7.9 metres.

The application proposes a 1.5 metre setback to the south-eastern lot boundary for the first floor ensuite to bath wall. This meets the deemed-to-comply standard of 1.5 metres.

The officer report has been updated to reflect this change.

5.3 NO. 17-19 (LOTS: 33 & 51, D/P: 1554 & 72073) BRISBANE STREET, PERTH - PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SERVICE STATION**Ward:** South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map
 2. Development Plans
 3. Applicant's Urban Design Study
 4. Transport Impact Statement
 5. Acoustic Report
 6. Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan
 7. Land Use Context Map
 8. Advertised Plans (Superseded)
 9. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response
 10. Summary of Submissions - Applicant's Response
 11. Determination Advice Notes

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, **APPROVES** the application for Alterations and Additions to Service Station at Nos. 17-19 (Lots: 33 & 51; D/P: 1554 & 72073) Brisbane Street, Perth, in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 11:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Alterations and Additions to Service Station as shown on the approved plans dated 17 May 2021 and 8 October 2021. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Use of Premises

This approval is for a Service Station as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2:

***Service Station** means premises other than premises used for a transport depot, panel beating, spray painting, major repairs or wrecking, that are used for – (a) the retail sale of petroleum products, motor vehicle accessories and goods of an incidental or convenience nature; or (b) the carrying out of greasing, tyre repairs and minor mechanical repairs to motor vehicles;*

3. Building Design

3.1 Doors, windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Brisbane Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with this street. Ground floor glazing and/or tinting shall be a minimum of 70 percent visually permeable to provide unobscured visibility. Darkened obscured, mirrored or tinted glass or other similar materials as considered by the City is prohibited; and

3.2 All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, 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;

3.3 The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with the details and annotations as indicated on the approved plans which forms part of this approval, to the satisfaction of the City; and

3.4 A non-sacrificial anti graffiti coating shall be applied to the external surfaces of the development prior to the occupation or use of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City;

4. Boundary Walls

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;

5. Landscaping

5.1 A detailed landscape and reticulation plan for the development site and adjoining road verge shall be lodged with and approved by the City prior to issue of a Building Permit. The plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and show the following:

- The location and type of proposed trees and plants;
- Areas to be irrigated or reticulated;
- The provision of a minimum of 4.6 percent deep soil and planting areas as defined by the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form; and
- The provision of a minimum of nine trees contributing towards canopy coverage within the deep soil areas and planting strips provided, with a minimum of 4.2 percent of the northern car park bays provided with canopy coverage. The tree species are to be in accordance with the City's recommended tree species list; and

5.2 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, all works shown in the plans as identified in Condition 5.1 shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and maintained thereafter, to the satisfaction of the City, at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

6. Car Parking, Access and Bicycle Facilities

6.1 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, five car parking bays and related access ways as shown on the approved plans shall be constructed and thereafter maintained in accordance with Australian Standard AS2890.1;

6.2 All driveways, car parking and manoeuvring area(s) which form part of this approval shall be sealed, drained, paved and line marked in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained thereafter by the owner/occupier to the satisfaction of the City; and

6.3 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, a minimum of two short-term bicycle parking bays and one long-term bicycle parking bay shall be provided on site. The design and construction of the bike bays shall be in accordance with Australian Standards AS2890.3 : 2015 Parking Facilities Part 3: Bicycle Parking;

7. Signage

7.1 All signage is to be in strict accordance with the City's Policy No. 7.5.2 – Signs and Advertising, unless further development approval is obtained;

7.2 Illuminated signage shall:

7.2.1 Not cause a nuisance, by way of light spillage, to abutting sites;

7.2.2 Not comprise flashing, intermittent or running lights, or images that change more than once in any five minute period;

7.2.3 Not interfere with or be likely to be confused with, traffic control signals; and

7.2.4 Not exceed 300cd/m² (candela per square metre) between sunset and sunrise;

7.3 All signage shall be kept in a good state of repair, safe, non-climbable, and free from graffiti for the duration of its display on-site; and

7.4 The signage shall not include third-party advertising or advertise products or services which are not available on the site;

8. Acoustic Report

All of the recommended measures included in the approved Acoustic Report (Reverberate Consulting, 11 May 2021) shall be implemented as part of the development, to the satisfaction of the City prior to the use or occupation of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

9. Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan

9.1 The development shall operate in accordance with the approved 'Management Plan – Anti-Social Behaviour' dated August 2021 at all times, to the satisfaction of the City. All of the recommended measures included shall be implemented as part of the development, to the satisfaction of the City prior to the use or occupation of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers; and

9.2 The Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan is to be reviewed to the satisfaction of the City:

9.2.1 every 24 months or as improvements are identified by the operator or the City; and

9.2.2 within 30 days of a change of the Service Station operator;

9.3 The purpose of the review as set out in condition 9.2 above is to consider whether any additional and/or updated measures are required in response to the presence of or potential risk of anti-social behaviour at or around the Service Station as identified through any issues or complaints received by the City or in the incident register maintained by the operator; and

9.4 Any changes identified during a review as set out in condition 9.2 and 9.3 above are to be incorporated into an updated Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan, and approved by the City. The development shall operate in accordance with the Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan as amended from time to time to the satisfaction of the City;

10. Waste and Servicing Management

Prior to the issue of a building permit, a Waste and Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The plan must include the following details to the satisfaction and specification of the City of Vincent:

- The location of bin storage areas and bin collection areas;
- The number, volume and type of bins, and the type of waste to be placed in the bins;
- Details on the future ongoing management of the bins and the bin storage areas, including cleaning, rotation and moving bins to and from the bin collection areas;
- Frequency of bin collections;
- Size of vehicles to be used for the purposes of general deliveries, rubbish collection and fuel deliveries; and
- Timing of deliveries and rubbish collection;

The Waste and Servicing Management Plan must be implemented at all times to the satisfaction of the City; and

11. Stormwater

11.1 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

11.2 Prior to the issue of a building permit, a geotechnical report prepared by a qualified

consultant shall be submitted to and approved by the City. This report is to demonstrate if on-site retention of stormwater is possible, or if connection to the City's drainage system is required. All stormwater produced on the subject land shall be retained on site, or connected to the City's drainage system at the expense of the applicant/landowner, in accordance with the recommendations of the approved geotechnical report, to the satisfaction of the City.

MAYOR COLE:

In relation to the expansion of convenience store, what is the floor area percentage of the % of entire floor area, and is the store actually an ancillary use? My understanding is that it should not be the dominant use, and that this is usually determined by floor space?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Under the previous approval 34 square metres was set aside for a store and office. This represents 13.3 percent of the entire floor area of the building which was 256 square metres.

The store for the proposed development would occupy the entire floor area of the building which would be 234 square metres.

The definition of a service station under LPS2 is as follows:

Service station means premises other than premises used for a transport depot, panel beating, spray painting, major repairs or wrecking, that are used for –

- a) the retail sale of petroleum products, motor vehicle accessories and goods of an incidental or convenience nature; or*
- b) the carrying out of greasing, tyre repairs and minor mechanical repairs to motor vehicles;*

This definition of service station permits the retail sale of petroleum products, motor vehicle accessories and goods of a convenience nature from the premises. It does not state that this retail sale is required to be ancillary or limited by floor area. This means that the retail sale and store component forms part of the permitted activities under a service station land use.

MAYOR COLE:

Flag an amendment that all signage be in compliance with the signage policy.

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

A proposed amendment will be prepared separately. Administration's comments in respect to this will be included in the proposed amendment.

CR CASTLE:

Could additional landscaping and planting strips adjacent to the western car parking bays be included in the landscaping plan for next week?

Could you advise what options there might be for an amendment proposing an increase to landscaping on the site to add more trees in the car park or increase the perimeter planting?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The applicant has advised that it would not be possible to accommodate landscaping adjacent to the western car parking bays as the hardstand areas are required for access to the refuse enclosure and bin movement/collection, access to the switchboard and metres, and access and space for the car and bicycle parking bays.

Instead the applicant has extended the landscaped area to the north of the car parking bays along Brisbane Street by 1.1 metres beyond the site boundary into the public realm and footpath to provide additional space for soft landscaping and tree growth. Administration has reviewed this change and advised that it is acceptable as the 1.5 metre minimum footpath width for pedestrian and wheelchair access would still be maintained. The applicant has also expanded the planting area adjacent to the monolith fuel price sign further south along Pier Street.

The applicant has also proposed an additional landscaped area in the verge along Pier Street in the bitumen area to the north of two existing on-street car bays, with this including a planting area and two additional

trees. Administration has reviewed this and advised that it would be acceptable.

These updates have been included in the officer report accordingly and the updated plans are included as Attachment 2.

CR CASTLE:

Delivery hours are limited from 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Saturday, does that include the hours that a fuel tanker can attend for refuelling?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Yes, Table 1 in the Acoustic Report states that fuel deliveries are proposed to occur only from 7:00am to 7:00pm on Monday to Saturday.

Administration's recommended condition 10 relating to a waste and servicing management plan has been updated to specify that this is to include that fuel and other deliveries to the service station shall only occur between 7:00am and 7:00pm on Monday to Saturday.

CR HALLETT:

In the original application with the larger signage, there were renderings to assist with getting a sense of the signage scale and impact. Can these be requested inclusive of the proposed landscaping?

B

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The applicant has stated that in the time available between Council's Briefing Session and the Council Meeting there may not be sufficient time to produce updated renders due to time and costs associated.

The applicant has recommended using the renders in the superseded advertised plans included as Attachment 8 to the officer report. These renders have been included below. The applicant has advised that this is because the only change to the monolith fuel price sign from these renders is a reduction in height of 1 metre and the introduction of small trees around it.

The applicant has stated that they will endeavour to provide the updated renders prior to the Council Meeting. Administration will circulate these to Elected Members if they are received in time.





CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED 17 May 2021 **ADVERTISED PLANS (SUPERSEDED)**



CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED 17 May 2021 **ADVERTISED PLANS (SUPERSEDED)**

**CR CASTLE:**

How does the height of the monolith sign compare to with the surrounding buildings? How visible is it from a distance? How does it sit in context with the surrounding buildings, not just that site on its own, where it might be visible from on approach or outside of the precinct?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Administration has reviewed the proposed monolith fuel price sign and the existing adjoining residential properties that the sign would be visible from would be the apartments on the northern/opposite side of Brisbane Street and the residential properties along Bulwer Street. These residential properties are shown on the land use context map included as Attachment 7 to the officer report.

As the sign is orientated to face along Brisbane Street it would not directly face these residential properties, minimising any impacts from its size and illumination. As the sign has a height of 6 metres, which satisfies the sign-specific height standards of the Signage Policy, it would not be visible from other properties located along Pier Street, Lacey Street and those which are further along or behind Bulwer Street. This is because it would be obscured from view by existing buildings and their roof lines. For reference, the existing three storey mixed use development on the northern/opposite of Brisbane Street has a roof height of 8.6 metres. Under the Built Form Policy the subject site and adjoining properties are also located within a Mixed Use built form area with a permitted height of 4 storeys where the roof height standards are between 14.3 and 16.3 metres depending on the type of roof proposed.

CR HALLETT:

What mechanisms exist to support transition to electric vehicles? Is there anything to that we can look at to facilitate future retrofits of service stations to switch to other types of fuel?

SENIOR SUSTAINABILITY AND INNOVATION ADVISOR:

Administration is not aware of specific mechanisms available to the City to facilitate and support transition to electric vehicles and alternative fuels for service stations. The State and Federal Governments are better placed to do this through grant funding programs and regulations. This includes the Australian Federal Government's Future Fuels Fund which is providing funding to charge network operators to install metropolitan and regional electric vehicle (EV) charge networks around Australia. The Western Australia Government's State Electric Vehicle Strategy has also committed to investing in, and facilitating, the provision of electric vehicle charging and refuelling infrastructure, as well as developing and updating guidelines, standards and requirements for planning approvals to assist the safe and efficient adoption of electric vehicles and associated infrastructure. Some service station providers have also started to partner with charge network operators, with a view to incorporating EV charging into their offerings as this becomes commercially viable.

EV chargers are relatively easy to retrofit to existing sites as it involves underground electric cable to the charger location from the main switch board and installing an above-ground charger. If existing electrical infrastructure on site is inadequate to support a fast charger, an upgrade may be required and this can be

expensive.

The applicant has advised that fuel bowsers can be swapped out for EV charging stations if there is suitable demand for that in future. To do that, they noted that the site would require significant electrical upgrade and new transformers. They also advised that the proposed operator (OTR) are actively looking at EV charging opportunities on their larger sites, so it is a broader consideration for them.

CR HALLETT:

What are the opening hours of the other service stations in the City of Vincent?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The opening hours of the other service stations in the City of Vincent are as follows:

- *Ampol Foodary Leederville (Vincent Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week;*
- *Puma North Perth (Fitzgerald Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week;*
- *Shell Coles Express Perth (William Street) – 6:00am to 10:00pm Monday to Friday, 6:00am to 11:00pm Saturday and 7:00am to 10:00pm Sunday;*
- *Ampol Foodary East Perth (Lord Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week;*
- *BP North Perth (Charles Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week;*
- *Shell Coles Express Mount Lawley (Walcott Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week;*
- *Vibe North Perth (Charles Street) – 24 hours, 7 days a week.*

CR LODEN:

What is the potential for additional trees on the verge on the northern and eastern side of the property?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Administration has reviewed the space available within the verge to Brisbane Street and at the corner of Brisbane Street and Pier Street.

Additional verge trees could not be accommodated along the verge to Brisbane Street due to the safety and sight lines issues associated with the existing access point and crossover to Brisbane Street and the corner of Brisbane and Pier Streets being in close proximity.

Additional verge trees could not be accommodated on the southern side of the corner of Brisbane Street and Pier Street for these safety and sight lines issues as well as because there is not sufficient space to include verge trees and maintain a 1.5 metre wide footpath for pedestrian and wheelchair access.

Instead the applicant has extended the landscaped area to the north of the car parking bays along Brisbane Street by 1.1 metres beyond the site boundary into the public realm and footpath to provide additional space for soft landscaping and tree growth. Administration has reviewed this change and advised that it is acceptable as the 1.5 metre minimum footpath width for pedestrian and wheelchair access would still be maintained. The applicant has also expanded the planting area adjacent to the monolith fuel price sign further south along Pier Street.

The applicant has also proposed an additional landscaped area in the verge along Pier Street in the bitumen area to the north of two existing on-street car bays, with this including a planting area and two additional trees. Administration has reviewed this and advised that it would be acceptable.

These updates have been included in the officer report accordingly and the updated plans are included as Attachment 2.

CR LODEN:

What is the potential of the two car bays on the street on the eastern side and what appears to be a large area of tarmac which is cross-hatched and not utilised? Could that be planted with a number of trees and landscaped in some way as an additional offset? Foreshadow an amendment to include the additional trees in the verge.

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

Administration has reviewed the space available in the cross-hatched area on the northern side of these car parking bays on Pier Street. A planting area and two 100 litre broad leaf paperbark trees could be provided in this area, and the applicant has proposed this on the updated plans included as Attachment 2 to the officer report.

The officer report has been updated to reflect this change and to amend Condition 5 relating to the submission of an updated landscaping plan. The condition now includes a requirement for a planting area to be provided in this cross-hatched area along with two 100 litre broad leaf paperbark trees, and for the planting area and trees to be installed in consultation with the City's Parks and Engineering teams.

CR WALLACE:

The minimum clearance distances and how far this is potentially above would be useful information to determine whether they are constrained on this site. Suggest that one or two car bays could be removed to meet the landscaping requirements.

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The applicant has advised that it would not be possible to accommodate landscaping adjacent to the western car parking bays as the hardstand areas are required for access to the refuse enclosure and bin movement/collection, access to the switchboard and metres, and access and space for the car and bicycle parking bays. Instead of removing car bays they have extended the planting areas at the corner of Pier Street and Brisbane Street as detailed above.

CR CASTLE:

Has the 24 hour operations been discussed with the applicant, are they all or nothing on these operating hours?

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

The applicant has advised that they would not be supportive of restricted operating hours as the current approval does not restrict the hours of operation, and as most, if not all, service stations trade 24 hours a day.

CR WALLACE:

Is the City able to give time-limited approval for operating hours, to be reviewed and potentially updated after say a 1 year period? This would allow an assessment of amenity impacts and revision of the operating hours as necessary. I'm currently unsure how to assess potential amenity impacts and whether they justify applying permanently restricted operating hours at this time, but I'm also wary of locking in 24/7 operating hours when I think existing approvals arguably do not provide this.

MANAGER DEVELOPMENT & DESIGN:

It is available to Council to grant a time-limited approval in respect to operating hours. In doing so Council would need to be of the mind that the operating hours should be trialled because of a possibly uncertain consequence of activities and that the proposal has some characteristics that are questionable or ambiguous in respect to compliance with planning standards.

Administration's view is that these circumstances are not apparent and that the proposed alterations and additions to the existing service station satisfies the relevant planning matters to be considered. This includes matters relating to built form, noise, traffic and lighting; as well as conditions of approval requiring compliance with waste and servicing management plan, acoustic report recommendations, and anti-social behaviour management plan. By doing so, the hours of operation proposed would not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the area and would not warrant a time-limited approval in relation to operating hours.

5.4 PLACE PLAN MINOR ANNUAL REVIEW

- Attachments:**
1. Volume 1: VTCPP Implementation Framework Progress Update
 2. Volume 2: NPTCPP Implementation Framework Progress Update
 3. Volume 3: MHTCPP Implementation Framework Progress Update
 4. Volume 1: Vincent Town Centre Place Plan Revised
 5. Volume 2: North Perth Town Centre Place Plan Revised
 6. Volume 3: Mount Hawthorn Town Centre Place Plan Revised

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. ENDORSES the revisions made to Volume 1: Vincent Town Centre Place Plan, Volume 2: North Perth Town Centre Place Plan, and Volume 3: Mount Hawthorn Town Centre Place Plan, as highlighted in Attachment 4, 5, and 6; and
2. NOTES:
 - 2.1 the annual review of the Place Plans for 2021; and
 - 2.2 [Volume 1: Vincent Town Centre Place Plan](#), [Volume 2: North Perth Town Centre Place Plan](#) and [Volume 3: Mount Hawthorn Town Centre Place Plan](#) will be updated to include the endorsed revisions, uploaded to the City's website, and circulated to town teams.

CR CASTLE:

There's a number of items that are registered as 'discontinue'. An example of that would be Axford Park in the Mount Hawthorn Town Centre Place Plan (MHTCPP). Is 'discontinue' always the correct wording? because it does imply that it's never coming back again. How do we ensure that these projects, that have not been funded for various reasons in the life of the place plan, don't get lost when the next place plan is prepared?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

Axford Park Upgrade was registered as 'discontinue' as it was not funded through the 2021/22 budget process. Axford Park Upgrade is proposed to be included in the LTFP in outer years, with \$206,700 attributed in 2024/25 and \$790,000 in 2025/26.

The next iteration of the MHTCPP will be the MHTCPP 2023/24 -2026/27. As part of the development of the MHTCPP 2023/24 -2026/27, a review of the existing MHTCPP 2019/20-2022/23 will be undertaken, including the review of the implementation and/or deferral of all previous place plan actions.

The term 'discontinue' was used to provide clarity regarding the action not being progressed during the life of the existing four year place plan. This has been reviewed and to avoid confusion, the term 'discontinue' has been replaced with 'defer' and additional commentary has been provided in the Implementation Framework comments section. This term has been updated in relation to all place plans and additional commentary has been provided.

CR CASTLE:

Can we have an update on whether there is a plan to review parking in Mt Hawthorn separately or whether that is something that could be added to the place plan?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The needs of parking differ greatly across Vincent. These needs are dependent on the level of activity in the area, the density and variety of development, and the availability of alternative transport modes. Parking should be considered as an ecosystem consisting of public and private, on street and off street, and considering all the many needs of people who use those bays. The optimal parking system would be one where all parking is used efficiently, with the minimum amount of space devoted to parking.

The City is currently undertaking Action 3.3.1 of the Accessible City Strategy which is due for completion this financial year:

Action 3.3.1: Establish a business plan for the management of parking within Vincent with a view to the following:

- Prepare precinct-specific parking management plans, with priority given to precincts already at capacity; and
- Expand paid parking using the 'demand responsive pricing' methodology.

The intent of this action is to review the City's existing parking mechanisms and policies, including the Precinct Parking Management Plans, to determine how these can best be improved City wide as well as specifically for each town centre. The business plan, being developed this financial year, will result in the determination of a number of actions including when the precinct-specific parking management for each town centre should be delivered and when the Mount Hawthorn precinct-specific parking management plan should be delivered.

The place plan has been updated to reference the project as follows:

Item 2.2 – Parking Management

~~The parking restrictions in lots adjoin Flinders Street Car Park are inconsistent and cause confusion. The parking restrictions in Mount Hawthorn Town Centre are inconsistent, cause confusion, and do not maximise parking efficiencies.~~

~~There are three separately owned car parks adjoin the City's Flinders Street Car Park. The boundaries of these car park areas are unclear and the varied restrictions and signage confusing. The fragmentation of the car parking inevitably means the available parking is not fully utilized. An opportunity exists to consolidate the management of these car parks to maximise the use of available car parking. With consistent external and internal signage there will be more effective sharing of parking and improved perceptions of the availability of public parking.~~

A precinct parking management plan was developed for the Mount Hawthorn precinct in 2009. Actions within the management plan were incrementally delivered over the past decade in an ad-hoc manner which has resulted in varied restrictions and signage which do not consider the precinct holistically.

This piecemeal approach to parking management is reflected in available parking not being fully utilised. An opportunity exists to rationalise parking management and maximise parking efficiencies by delivering an up-to-date Mount Hawthorn precinct-specific parking management plan. The City identified this opportunity through Action 3.3.1 of the Accessible City Strategy and will determine the preferred approach and timing to deliver an updated Mount Hawthorn precinct-specific parking management plan in 2021/22.

~~Rationalise the Parking Management of adjoining car parks between Fairfield Street and Flinders Street~~

~~Implement the Mount Hawthorn specific findings of Action 3.3.1 of the Accessible City Strategy, including the Development of a Mount Hawthorn Precinct-specific Parking Management Plan.~~

The timing of this action has been extended to 2022/23. Should the development of the Mount Hawthorn precinct-specific parking management plan be scheduled post 2022/23, this action will be included in the MHTCPP 2023/24 -2026/27.

MAYOR COLE:

In relation to the Vincent Place Plan, do you feel we're actually at a level of evolution where we can simply promote activation in our town centres or are we still needing to really support and implement to make it happen? Which community groups and town teams are actually in a position at this moment in time to be providing those events and be able to be run those successfully?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

Given its location, the City has a wide range of events run by community groups and town teams that occur throughout the year, some are solely community driven, some are supported by the City.

The City is not resourced to run large scale community events or ongoing activations. Our annual events sponsorship budget supports community driven events rather than allocating budget to City run events. This

allows the City to support local businesses and organisations as well as provide a varied offering each year for our local community.

The event application process reviews the capability of event organisers to run their event. Community groups and town teams receiving City funding for events have fulfilled the terms of their funding agreements and the City generally receives positive feedback from attendees. Recently held City funded events run by community groups and town teams include:

- *Northbridge Common - Lunar New Year;*
- *St Patricks Day WA Inc - St Patricks Day Parade;*
- *Rotary Club of North Perth - Hyde Park Fair;*
- *Subiaco Football Club - March and Family Fun Day;*
- *The Pickle District – Pickle District After Dark;*
- *North Perth Local - Halloween on Angove;*
- *Leederville Connect – Arty Farty Xmas Party;*
- *Mount Hawthorn Hub – Little Day Out;*
- *Beaufort Street Network – Dogtober and Nights on Beaufort.*

A number of these larger scale events are more difficult to hold given COVID-19 event requirements, and the associated risks.

Events which have previously been well organised and attracted substantial community participation include the festivals held in the City such as the Streets and Lanes Festival in Mount Hawthorn which was provided by the Mount Hawthorn Hub.

The City will review the event sponsorship process as Western Australia exits the pandemic to ensure the organisers are equipped to provide those events.

5.5 BRITANNIA NORTH WEST RESERVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- Attachments:**
1. Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan
 2. Community Consultation Summary
 3. Draft Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan

RECOMMENDATION:**That Council:**

1. **ENDORSES** the Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan, included as Attachment 1; and
2. **NOTES** the:
 - 2.1 **submissions received during the community consultation period and Administration's response, included as Attachment 2, in relation to the draft Britannia North West Reserve Development Plan, included as Attachment 3; and**
 - 2.2 **Litis Stadium Changeroom Design will be presented to Council for approval to formally submit to the Australian Federal Government in order to secure the \$3 million funding announced for Floreat Athena Football Club.**

MAYOR COLE:

Can you please provide an elevation to show the extent of the bund opening and the levels at the entry point of the stadium?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

Yes – this will be included as an attachment to the Council report.

The advertised Development Plan had proposed a complete removal of the south-eastern bund area. Based on the consultation received during this period, the extent of this removal has been significantly reduced, noting the feedback received both for and against its removal. This partial removal to achieves:

- *a direct connection to the car park to the east of the stadium;*
- *a direct connection to the cricket club changerooms;*
- *sightlines across the site;*
- *space for seating, bbq and picnics and informal kick-about areas;*
- *retention of the rest of the bund to keep operational functionality simple on game days; and*
- *retain existing mature trees (adjacent to the carpark).*

This small extent of removal increases the accessibility of the site and creates additional public open spaces that are usable by the broader community.

This element of the Development Plan has not been accounted for in the Corporate Business Plan or Long Term Financial Plan and requires further detailed design and consultation with key users including Floreat Athena Football Club to ensure the best outcome for all user groups. Council would determine the timing of this element of the Development Plan as part of its review of the Long Term Financial Plan this financial year and the development of next year's Corporate Business Plan. The timing would be based on the priority of this element of the development plan compared to other projects the City has planned for as well as the City's ability to pay.

If Council choose to budget for the implementation of this project the City ~~will~~ would ~~also continue to liaise~~ with Floreat Athena Football Club and other users when undertaking the detailed design to ~~enable them~~ ensure their needs are met.

MAYOR COLE:

Provide more information about the \$75K and what works are proposed to the building and get an idea of what repurposing looks like.

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The intention of the \$75k provisional sum is to highlight and enable any future repurposing work on the

turnstile building. The position of the turnstile building means it will be the first thing people see and possibly interact with as they enter the site from Britannia Road. This allowance might include conducting building surveys, addressing compliance issues, and applying modifications such as paint work or other upgrades.

This element of the Development Plan has not been accounted for in the Corporate Business Plan or Long Term Financial Plan and requires further detailed design and consultation with key users including Tools n Things group to ensure the best outcome for all user groups. Council would determine the timing of this element of the Development Plan as part of its review of the Long Term Financial Plan this financial year and the development of next year's Corporate Business Plan. The timing would be based on the priority of this element of the development plan compared to other projects the City has planned for as well as the City's ability to pay.

If Council choose to budget for the implementation of this project the City would consult with Tools n Things group to investigate the potential for repurposing, or improvements that would add value to the building, both functionally and aesthetically.

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

Costings are related to those outside of elements proposed to be delivered. Can a full project cost be provided?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:



The report has been updated to include further information pertaining to the \$3million federal grant funding.

CR ALEXANDER:

Why is the Percent for Art at 10 percent, normally 1 or 2 percent?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

This is a provisional cost that was deemed appropriate to enable suitable art elements in a public open space project. Given the community feedback requesting the provision of art and the scale of this project, 1% or 2% of the works cost would not enable delivery of a public art piece as intended by the City or expected from the community. If a development was to occur within the area, the percent for art funds obtained could be used to fund the art elements. Below outlines public art benchmarking which outlines various examples of public artworks and the associated costs.

<p>Chandelier reSPOKE</p> <p>\$23,830</p> <p>2015</p> <p><i>Lighting sculpture: recycled bicycle and metal components, electrical lighting</i></p> <p>483 Beaufort St, Highgate</p>	
<p>Togetherness Matt McVeigh</p> <p>\$30,000 (2018 value: \$33,000)</p> <p>2015</p> <p><i>Sculpture: steel and enamel paint</i></p> <p>2.8m x 1.5m</p>	

**The Last Swans
Amok Island**

\$35,000

2020

Large-scale entry statement mural

Approx. 60 metres long



**Weitj Noorook (Discovery Emu Eggs)
Jade Dolman**

\$45,000

2016

Sculptures: cluster of solid eggs, cracked eggs, egg shells (concrete)
Relief work: footprints of hatched emu imprinted into ground plane

Optus Stadium Park



**I Think Therefore I am
Robin Yakinthou**

\$50,000
(2018 value: \$65,000)

2014

Sculpture: 316 Marine grade stainless steel on granite plinth

2.5m tall

1-1A Albert St, North Perth



**Celebrating the Coolbaroo League
Sandra Hill, Jenny Dawson**

\$82,000
(2018 value: \$97,000)

2016

Interpretive artwork: integrated tile artwork to ground plane and metal storytelling pillar

Weld Square, Beaufort St, Perth



CR IOPPOLO:

Confirm the external landscape architect costs was based on 10% not 11%?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The external landscape architect costs were based on 10 percent. Reference to 11 percent was an error in the report and has now been amended.

CR IOPOLO:

Please clarify furniture elements cost and provide a breakdown.

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The furniture elements and associated provisional costs are as follows:

5.0	FURNITURE ELEMENTS	Quantity	Unit	Unit Rate	Total Rate
5.01	FE01 – FURNITURE ELEMENT 01: BENCH SEAT				
	Supply rate	4	ea	\$2,000.00	\$8,000.00
5.02	FE02 – FURNITURE ELEMENT 02: PICNIC SETTING				
	Supply rate	4	ea	\$4,500.00	\$18,000.00
5.03	FE03 - SHELTER				
	Supply rate	30	m2	\$1,000.00	\$30,000.00
5.04	FE04 SHADE STRUCTURE SHELTER (STEEL)				
	Supply rate	150	m2	\$1,000.00	\$150,000.00
5.05	FE05 - DRINK FOUNTAIN WITH DOG BOWL				
	Supply rate	3	ea	\$5,800.00	\$17,400.00
	Install rate	3	ea	\$3,200.00	\$9,600.00
5.06	FE06 - BIN				
	Supply rate	5	ea	\$2,600.00	\$13,000.00
	Install rate	5	ea	\$280.00	\$1,400.00
5.07	FE07 - BBQ				
	Supply and install	2	ea	\$6,500.00	\$13,000.00
5.08	FE08 - BOLLARD				
	Supply rate	8	ea	\$80.00	\$640.00
	Install rate	8	ea	\$60.00	\$480.00
5.09	FE09 - REMOVABLE BOLLARD				
	Supply rate	4	ea	\$230.00	\$920.00
	Install rate	4	ea	\$120.00	\$480.00
SUBTOTAL FURNITURE ELEMENTS					\$262,920.00

Rates have been derived from recent project tender submissions and represent the current market. The largest expense being Item 5.05 which relates to 'New Shade Structure Over Spectator Seating' as indicated on the Development Plan. This was requested through consultation with Floreat Athena Football Club.

Due to the high-level nature of the Plan, assumptions have been made as to what elements might be required based on similar landscape projects, to generate a more realistic forecast of the project costs. This cost estimate is preliminary and would need to be confirmed through detailed design as Council includes the implementation of particular elements in the Corporate Business Plan.

It should also be noted that these elements of the Development Plan has not been accounted for in the Long Term Financial Plan. Council would determine the timing of each of these elements as part of its review of the Long Term Financial Plan this financial year and the development of next year's Corporate Business Plan. The timing would be based on the priority of each element of the development plan compared to other projects the City has planned for as well as the City's ability to pay.

5.6 FINAL ADOPTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LOCAL LAW 2021

- Attachments:**
1. Draft Local Government Property Local Law 2021
 2. Draft Local Government Property Local Law 2021 - Tracked Changes Showing Revisions
 3. Draft Local Government Property Local Law 2021 - As Advertised
 4. Consultation Submission 1
 5. Consultation Submission 2
 6. Administration Response to Consultation Submission 2

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. NOTES that local public notice of the *City of Vincent Local Government Property Local Law 2021* was provided for the period 30 July 2021 to 24 September 2021 and two submissions were received;
2. NOTES the purpose of repealing the *City of Vincent Local Government Property Local Law 2008* and replacing it with the *Local Government Property Local Law 2021* is to:
 - 2.1. increase the efficiency in the management of signs located on local government property;
 - 2.2. provide the City with a discretion to require a permit for the erection or display of an election sign on local government property;
 - 2.3. remove provisions regarding animals;
 - 2.4. assist with the management and regulation of security deposits and bank guarantees provided by developers constructing on private land;
 - 2.5. increase the deterrent for:
 - (a) causing damage to local government property;
 - (b) increasing the risk of public harm or harming fauna on local government property; and
 - (c) using local government property for a commercial activity without a permit;
 - 2.6. increase the deterrent for offensive and indecent behaviour on local government property;
 - 2.7. increase the efficiency in the management (beautification) of verges;
 - 2.8. deter damage or removal of trees on verges, thoroughfares or local government property;
 - 2.9. prohibit and effectively deter the use of recording devices within change rooms;
 - 2.10. amend the local law in accordance with prior advice received from the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries;
 - 2.11. make administrative modifications so that the local law aligns with common practice and the City's current objectives and processes; and
 - 2.12. provide the City with discretion to make a determination prescribing a local government property or thoroughfare as a smoke-free area;
3. **NOTES the effect of repealing the *City of Vincent Local Government Property Local Law 2008***

and replacing it with the *Local Government Property Local Law 2021* is that:

- 3.1. conditions relating to when a sign permit will be required are now provided;
 - 3.2. election signs placed on local government property will now require a permit;
 - 3.3. provisions relating to animals will be incorporated into the proposed City of Vincent Animals Local Law;
 - 3.4. when and how the City may use security deposits or bank guarantees to rectify damage to local government property is regulated;
 - 3.5. increased penalties will apply for:
 - (d) causing damage to local government property;
 - (e) using local government property for a commercial activity without a permit;
 - (f) taking, injuring or killing (or attempting to) any fauna on local government property; and
 - (g) placing/draining offensive fluid or lighting a fire on a thoroughfare without a permit;
 - 3.6. increased penalties will apply for:
 - (a) offensive behaviour in a toilet block or changeroom on local government property;
 - (b) being indecently clothed on local government property; and
 - (c) spitting on or within community facilities;
 - 3.7. the conditions relating to management (beautification) of verges, prescribed in the City's relevant policy, are incorporated in the local law;
 - 3.8. increased penalties will apply for damage or removal of trees on verges, thoroughfares or local government property;
 - 3.9. the use of recording devices within change rooms is prohibited and an appropriate penalty is applicable;
 - 3.10. amendments are incorporated in the local law in line with the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries recommendations;
 - 3.11. administrative modifications are made to ensure the local law aligns with common practice and the City's current objectives and processes; and
 - 3.12. the procedure for making a smoke-free area determination is specified and a penalty for smoking in a smoke-free area is applicable; and
4. **MAKES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**, the *Local Government Property Local Law 2021* at Attachment 1, in accordance with section 3.12(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, subject to the Chief Executive Officer:
- 4.1. publishing the *Local Government Property Local Law 2021* in the Government Gazette in accordance with s3.12(5) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and providing a copy to the Minister for Local Government; and
 - 4.2. following Gazettal, providing local public notice in accordance with s3.12(6) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, and providing a copy of the law and Explanatory Memorandum signed by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to the Western Australian Parliamentary
-

Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.

MAYOR COLE:

Election signs permits – ballot boxes, election signage on polling day, will all political parties have to come and seek permits, and is this only City of Vincent policy?

EXECUTIVE MANAGER CORPORATE STRATEGY & GOVERNANCE:

The Local Law states that “the local government may issue a permit for the erection or display of an election sign on local government property.”

The City recently advertised a draft Election Signs Policy, which if adopted would establish a clear framework regulating how, where and for what period of time an election sign may be displayed.

The Local Law notes that the City has the discretion to require a permit in order for a candidate to display an election sign. The Policy would then specify that if the candidate’s election sign meets the requirements set out in the Policy, a permit under the Local Law is not required. This approach is the most common among WA Local Governments. The report has been updated to reflect this clarification.

MAYOR COLE:

Beautification of verges – why were the Street Tree Policy changes that were made (swings and cubbies) not included in the Local Law, but the Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautification Policy was.

EXECUTIVE MANAGER CORPORATE STRATEGY & GOVERNANCE:

The Street Tree Policy has provisions for street tree attachments (including swings and cubbies) and is sufficient to manage requests from residents to install these feature without a permit.

The Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautification Policy outlines permissible landscaping features, whereas the Local Law defines the landscaping features which are restricted.

CR CASTLE:

Understanding of what unisex toilet options there are in the City? Verge treatments – what is the status of synthetic grass and paved verges?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

City of Vincent has unisex toilets located at the following locations:

- *Axford Park;*
- *Oxford Park;*
- *Weld Square;*
- *Mt Hawthorn Lesser Hall;*
- *Loftus Recreation Centre;*
- *Loftus Community Centre;*
- *The Avenue Carpark Toilets;*
- *Administration Building;*
- *Beatty Park Leisure Centre;*
- *Loftus Library;*
- *Hyde Park East and West toilets;*
- *Royal Park Hall;*
- *Banks Reserve;*
- *Charles Veryard;*
- *Forrest Park;*
- *North Perth Town Hall;*
- *Mens Shed;*
- *Britannia Reserve;*
- *Department of Sport and Recreation; and*
- *Works Depot (outside the City).*

As per Policy No 2.2.4 – Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautification, Section 1.3 states; the installation of synthetic turf on verges is not an approved treatment.

In regards to paved verges, Section 1.4.3 addresses guidelines that apply to paved pathways and bin stands, and Section 4 of the policy addresses specifications for paving of verges for parking. Applications for

verge paving can be found on City website – <https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/documents/1807/verge-paving-application-form>.

Policy No. 2.2.4 – Verge Treatments, Plantings and Beautification can be found on the City of Vincent website at think link below: <https://www.vincent.wa.gov.au/documents/716/224-verge-treatments-plantings-and-beautification>.

CR WALLACE:

What was the basis for the inclusion of vaping in the definition of smoking?

MANAGER BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND WELLBEING:

The City is proposing to ban e-cigarettes in smoke free areas because all types of smoked products produce second-hand smoke which can be harmful.

The Federal Department of Health commissioned a comprehensive review of the evidence in relation to e-cigarettes conducted by the Australian National University. Its interim findings published in 2020 concluded that e-cigarettes pose more harm than benefit to the Australian population.

Prohibiting e-cigarettes is consistent with a number of other smoke free environments in Western Australia such as smoking (including e-cigarettes) is prohibited on a bus, train or at a station (Transperth - Department of Transport).

5.7 GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK REVIEW 2021

Attachments: 1. **Governance Framework Review - tracked changes 2021**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **NOTES** the review of the Governance Framework, as outlined in this report; and
2. **ADOPTS** the updated Governance Framework, as tracked at Attachment 1.

NO QUESTIONS

5.8 POLICY DOCUMENT REGISTER AND REVIEW PLAN - PROGRESS UPDATE AND IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

- Attachments:**
- 1. Policy Document Register and Review Plan - Tracked changes 2021**
 - 2. Policy Review Schedule**
 - 3. Policy Review Summary**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. APPROVES the:**
 - 1.1 updated Policy Document Register and Review Plan, as tracked at Attachment 1; and**
 - 1.2 Policy Review Schedule at Attachment 2; and**
- 2. NOTES the review of the Policy Document Register and Review Plan, as summarised at Attachment 3.**

NO QUESTIONS

5.9 CLIMATE EMERGENCY AUSTRALIA JOINT STATEMENT: AUSTRALIAN COUNCILS CALL FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND CLIMATE RESILIENT HOMES VIA THE NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION CODE

Attachments: 1. Climate Emergency Australia Joint Statement on Energy Efficient Homes

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council ENDORSES the Climate Emergency Australia 'Joint Statement: Australian Councils call for energy-efficient and climate resilient homes via the National Construction Code' at Attachment 1.

NO QUESTIONS

6 INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT

6.1 REVIEW OF MEMORIALS IN PARKS AND PUBLIC RESERVES (2.1.5)

- Attachments:
1. Memorials in Public Places and Reserves Policy (2.1.5) - Draft Review
 2. Policy 2.1.5 - Memorials in Public Parks and Reserves

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPROVES** the proposed amendments to the Memorials in Public Places and Reserves Policy, at Attachment 1, for the purpose of public notice, which is proposed to replace Policy 2.1.5 Memorials in Parks and Public Reserves, at attachment 2;
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to provide local public notice of the proposed policy and invite public comments for a period of at least 21 days; and
3. **NOTES** that at the conclusion of the public notice period any submissions received would be presented to Council for consideration.

MAYOR COLE:

Reason of deferral was to seek advice on scattering of ashes in parks and reserves, no info in report?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

Following deferral of the report in May, a further workshop information sheet was presented on the 21st September 2021 Council Workshop.

In relation to the scattering of ashes, Administration identified that allowing the scattering of ashes could have social impacts on the community.

The Workshop information sheet contained the following information;

Administration does not recommend permitting the scattering of ashes for the following reasons:

- *Given the sensitive nature of the matter, the scattering of ashes may make some members of the general public uncomfortable or cause distress.*
- *Scattering of ashes at Aboriginal sites or heritage places may be culturally insensitive and*
- *Inappropriate.*

Also noted

- *Administration has had very few requests from members of the community to scatter ashes.*
- *There were no major environmental or health issues associated with scattering of ashes but we would*
- *Hyde parks lakes were a specific location where Administration would not support the scattering of ashes*

Council were invited to provide comments and feedback and none were received.

MAYOR COLE:

Flag an amendment to retain current policy provisions that allow application to CEO to scatter ashes at a time of minimal disruption.

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

Council acts as a dispute resolution is that noted in policy in other local governments?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

Please see below examples of other Local Governments;

City of Wanneroo

All disputes in regard to this policy will be referred to the Director Assets in the first instance. In the event that an agreement cannot be reached, the

	<i>matter will be submitted to the CEO for a decision.</i>
<i>City of Subiaco</i>	<i>The City must receive a written application which will be evaluated. The Director of Technical Services will have final authority to approve the application.</i> <i>*Awaiting further information regarding disputes from officer responsible for memorials (is currently prepping Remembrance Day event)</i>
<i>City of Stirling</i>	<i>All eligible applications must be considered and approved by Council.</i>
<i>City of Canning</i>	<i>*Awaiting response from Officer at City of Canning</i>
<i>Town of Cambridge</i>	<i>Requests meeting the Policy criteria may be approved by the Chief Executive Officer. If the eligibility criteria is not met, the Town's Administration may submit a report to Council for consideration and determination.</i>

6.2 ASSET MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY - OUTCOMES OF ADVERTISING

- Attachments:**
1. **Asset Management and Sustainability Strategy**
 2. **Asset Management Discussion Paper**
 3. **AMSS Consultation Summary Report 2021**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ENDORSES** the Asset Management and Sustainability Strategy, included as Attachment 1;
2. **NOTES:**
 - 2.1 **The submissions received during community engagement, and Administration's responses, included as Attachment 3.**
 - 2.2 **The adopted Asset Management and Sustainability Strategy 2020-2030 will be subject to further formatting, styling and graphic design as determined by the Chief Executive Officer prior to publication**

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

Sport and recreation facilities plan – objectives and timelines for this project? Short term actions for asset prioritisation plan. When will Council be having the next discussion on this topic?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

The preparation of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Plan comprises of two main stages

1. *Active Reserve Strategic Club Allocation & Facility Rationalisation Plan*
2. *Facility Upgrade Program*

These stages will ensure the City can;

- *Accommodate sporting club growth & tenure*
- *Improve community accessibility to public open space*
- *Reduce asset maintenance expenditure*
- *Coordinate a facility and infrastructure works program and funding framework*

The desktop review along with research and information gathering commenced this year. In early 2022 Administration will discuss the project with Council through a Council Workshop. Following this there will further research and consultation workshops, surveys and meetings with clubs, associations and state sporting associations undertaken. Development of draft plan is scheduled to be endorsed for consultation in July 2022.

As per the AMSS Implementation Plan, the Asset Prioritisation Plan (APP) is a short-term (1-3 years), high-priority project. The timeline for the development of the first APP (Buildings) is anticipated to be late 2022 to align with budgetary considerations in early 2023.

CR CASTLE:

Were respondents residents of Vincent or not?

MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

It is confirmed that 76 out of 94 people who responded to the AMSS survey indicated that they were City of Vincent residents (81%). The 16 Community Engagement Panel members who participated in the AMSS survey were all City of Vincent residents because that was one of the eligibility requirements for their participation in the Panel.

6.3 HALVERSON HALL - CONDITION AND COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. NOTES the Condition and Compliance Assessment for Halverson Hall.**

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

If the dot points - \$195k bucket, will some be grouped together? Removal of existing toilets and installation of disabled toilets, eg – can more details of groupings be included in notes?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:

The works would all be carried out at the same time for the following reasons;

- Majority of works relates to access compliance and need to be completed at the same time to ensure compliance*
- The works are extensive and would require the tenants to be relocated for the duration of the works.*
- Most efficient and cost effective way is to carry out the works at the same time*

7 COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES

7.1 TENDER CB133-2021 SUPPLY AND INSTALL GYM EQUIPMENT AT BEATTY PARK LEISURE CENTRE

- Attachments:
1. Equipment Lists
 2. Portion 1 Cardio Evaluation Worksheet - Confidential
 3. Portion 2 Strength Evaluation Worksheet - Confidential
 4. Beatty Park Gym Equipment Renewal Business Case

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council

1. **NOTES** the outcome of the evaluation process for CB133/2021 Supply and Install Gym Equipment at Beatty Park Leisure Centre; and
2. **ACCEPTS** the following tender submissions for Tender CB133/2021 Supply and Install Gym Equipment at Beatty Park Leisure Centre:
 - a. the tender submitted by Technogym Australia Pty Ltd for Separable Portion 1 - Cardio Equipment
 - b. the tender submitted by Goldpin Corporation Pty Ltd trading as Gymcare for Separable Portion 2 - Strength Equipment

QUESTIONS ON CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENT

7.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 1 SEPTEMBER 2021 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2021

- Attachments:**
1. **Payments by EFT and Payroll September 21**
 2. **Payments by Cheque September 21**
 3. **Payments by Direct Debit September 21**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 1 September 2021 to 30 September 2021 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$6,981,167.92
Cheques	\$1,407.50
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$185,679.66
Total payments for September 2021	\$7,168,255.08

MAYOR COLE:

Devco – significant payment which just says maintenance – can this be broken down to property/venue?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

The expenditure schedule has been updated to provide a better description of works.

The amount for \$155,684.44 relates to various capital works items at Beatty Park including pool deck, showers, changerooms, temporary toilets, and garden bed walls.

7.3 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2021

Attachments: 1. **Financial Statements as at 30 September 2021**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 30 September 2021 as shown in Attachment 1.

CR IOPPOLO:

Capex and funding summary on page 3 – full year budget for Capex is \$22.1m and in Q1 we spent \$2m of the \$22m, which is considerably low given that it is 25% of the year but we are actually \$1m overbudget already? Is it possible to get further explanation on that item?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

The higher capex spend September YTD of \$1.3m is mainly a timing variance and relates to the phasing of when these have activities have been included in the budget.

These timing variances relate to Roads (\$0.6m), Beatty Park (\$0.4m) and various other items (\$0.2m).

There is also a timing variance of \$38k for street scaping in a road rehabilitation project on Oxford Street and Leederville parade.

7.4 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2021

Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 30 September 2021

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 30 September 2021 as detailed in Attachment 1.

CR IOPPOLO:

Summary of key investment decisions – talks about 3 transactions undertaken in September, but only 2 listed. Not sure if that is a typo or something has been omitted.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

Three (3) transactions were undertaken in September as follows:

- *\$3,800,000 and \$2,300,000 relating to Municipal funds; and*
- *\$1,955,669.15 relating to Leederville Gardens Inc Trust*

7.5 FIRST QUARTER BUDGET REVIEW 2021-2022

- Attachments:**
1. Operating Statement by Nature or Type
 2. Operating Statement by Program
 3. Rate Setting Statement
 4. Cash Backed Reserves
 5. Capital Budget

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY APPROVES** the following amendments to the 2021/2022 Annual Budget:

- a) A net increase in the Operating Budget of \$143,936 as per Attachments 1 and 2;
- b) An increase to Cash Backed Reserves of \$85,377 as per Attachments 3 and 4;
- c) A net increase in the Capital Expenditure Budget of \$318,303 as per Attachment 5; and
- d) A net increase in the opening surplus of \$1,076,504, resulting in a forecast year end surplus at 30 June 2022 of \$512,631, as per Attachment 3.

MAYOR COLE:

Should current budget for electrical infrastructure be reflected as a dash – original scope included electrical renewal, there is an additional 300k – this is not clear in the report – more explanation in report.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

This is a request to reallocate \$300k to the Beatty Park project (electrical infrastructure) which reflects and increase to the budget provision for this project. As it is reallocated from other Capex projects, there is no increase to the total capital expenditure budget.

More detail on the Beatty Park project, budget status and scope will be provided in a separate paper to Council in December 2021.

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

What is the total spend in both 2021 and 2021/22 in enterprise applications upgrade, and is there any variance (221k)

EXECUTIVE MANAGER INFORMATION AND COMMUNIIATION TECHNOLOGY:

The \$221k is capital budget carry-forward from 2020/2021. It was confirmed by the business but missed in the original carry-forward figures.

The 2020/2021 budget reports a single line “Enterprise Applications”. This was in fact budgeted as two items: Enterprise Applications (Authority) and additional Infrastructure Upgrade (primarily a network switching project) relating to OAG findings. Both of these projects ran into the 2021/2022 financial year, hence the need for carry-forward. Both projects are now near completion. The carry-forward used in 2021/2022:

Enterprise Applications	\$53,020	completed	Authority Upgrade, enhancements
	\$23,297	committed	Authority Upgrade, enhancements
Infrastructure Renewal	\$111,484	completed	Admin, Depot, Beatty Park
	\$30,000	to be completed	Library, Loftus, BP Gym
TOTAL	\$217,801		

Total spend on Enterprise Applications (capital budget). There has not been any budget overrun.

	2020/2021	2021/2022 YTD
Enterprise Applications	\$189,683	\$76,317

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

\$375 Norfolk St construction been removed? \$50k budget remains for design?

Glendalough bike design still going ahead? Three bike network activities clarification

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

Correct, Norfolk Street design only was planned for this year.

A feasibility study was carried out in relation to the proposal for an upgraded shared path from Glendalough Train Station to Eucla Street, Mount Hawthorn. The project did not proceed to the because the available land was too narrow and had too many restrictions such as power poles to build a path of sufficient width to qualify for WA Bike Network funding. In the future (2-5 years), when the properties located on the south side are sold, a wider street reserve will become available and a high quality 3.0m wide path will be possible without the need to move power poles and other services. For the time being, the existing footpath (shared path), while narrow, does provide the ability to walk or cycle to the train station.

The final bicycle network project to be delivered this year is the Bike Network Plan.

CR IOPPOLO:

Opening surplus as at 1 July 2021 increased by \$1M, resulting in an overall budget surplus of \$500k, does this include any favourable variance from Capex from prior years? So to the extent that we didn't spend our entire budget on Capex, actual vs budget, does that favourable variance, for monies not spent, is that included in the opening surplus?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:

The \$1m surplus adjustment is mainly due to following factors.

Main roads grant funding of \$0.6m was removed from prior year surpluses as these funds were restricted. The costs associated with this grant have been expensed between FY18-FY21. Additionally, during this period there was a change in the Accounting Standards as to how these funds should be treated, requiring the reversal of this adjustment in FY21, and increasing the FY22 opening surplus.

A further \$0.2m capex related to the enterprise upgrade and \$0.1m relating to operating initiatives for Policy and Place that resulted from timing variances.

CR LODEN:

Glendalough bike lanes, is that impacted by potential changes to the intersection of Main Street, I understand there is some barriers around that project proposed at the corner of Main Street and Scarborough Beach Road

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

Intersection upgrade is still in the design phase (MRWA). Connectivity of the cycle and pedestrian network is a key part of the design yet to be finalised, and is independent from the wider Glendalough Link.

8 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

8.1 UNDERGROUND POWER UPDATE

Attachments: 1. Underground Power Options - City of Vincent

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **RECEIVES** the high level report on options for providing underground power in the City of Vincent at Attachment 1.
2. **AUTHORISES** the CEO to engage with Western Power on options to provide underground power through-out the City of Vincent including those identified in the report at Attachment 1.
3. **REQUESTS** Administration include the establishment of an underground power reserve to support the delivery of an underground power program in partnership with Western Power as part of annual budget preparation for 2022-2023.
4. **REQUESTS** Administration to seek feedback on underground power options from the Community Panel as part of the City's long term finance and asset management priorities.

MAYOR COLE:

What are we asking a community panel? Would the next step not be a business case, and then community panel? What is the cost to the City and to residents? Is there any reason we can't use the current reserve?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:

The proposal to engage the community panel on high level options would be to seek its feedback on whether the City of Vincent should pursue an underground power program or not – and provide feedback on what level of priority this should be given compared to the City's other priorities and how much property owners might be prepared to pay for underground power.

There would be less value in engaging the Community Panel once a business case has been prepared and options analysed and assessed. We would not be seeking detailed feedback from a Community Panel on the implementation process if Council decided to proceed with an underground power program.

The estimated costs to the City and to property owners are outlined in the report with some benchmark comparisons to marker Councils in metropolitan Perth.

There is \$222,000 in the City's Underground Power Reserve. One option in the report estimates a requirement of a reserve ranging from \$.65M to \$3.5m at high point to meet shortfall between annual cost investment and loan repayments, until surpluses kick in from Year 17. As an example, in the case of NRUP:RUP Mix scenario, if only 30% of ratepayers choose to pay upfront, Council will require a reserve ranging from \$1.2 to \$6.1m at high point to meet shortfall between annual cost investment and loan repayments, until surpluses kick in from Year 17.

CR GONTASZEWSKI:

Wording of the recommendation – seek feedback – if the recommendation is endorsed there is no recommendation on the priority of these works – consideration on resourcing and next steps? Suggesting a further report to council.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:

The report recommendation has been updated to propose the preparation of a business case for consideration by Council if Western Power announce a new underground program in which the City of Vincent would be eligible to participate.

CR IOPPOLO:

Can administration consider if items 3 and 4 should be deferred? Problems caused by solar, 23% of Vincent dwellings have solar – what is the impact of a high impact of solar on the implementation of an underground power program?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:

The report recommendation has been updated to propose the preparation of a business case for consideration by Council if Western Power announce a new underground program in which the City of Vincent would be eligible to participate.

We do not expect increased uptake of solar to impact the requirement for households to be connected to the grid.

8.2 SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY 2019-2024 PROGRESS UPDATE

Attachments: 1. **Metrics and Mapping - SES Progress Update 2020/21**

RECOMMENDATION:**That Council NOTES:**

1. the update on progress towards targets within Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019 – 2024;
2. that targets exceeded in 2019/20 were reviewed and amended where appropriate following referral to the City's Sustainability and Transport advice group in 2020/21;
3. that Administration intends to refer all targets met or exceeded in 2020/21 to the City's Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group in 2021/22 for review and advice relating to further amendments; and
4. that a renewable energy contract for the City's contestable electricity accounts is expected to commence in April 2022.

CR LODEN:

FOGO – roughly 90% reduction in waste emissions, will there be carbon abatement, will the credits come to us or the waste provider?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

It is widely accepted that aerobic composting of organic waste reduces greenhouse gas emissions (for the portion of waste that is composted and compared to landfilling) by about 90%.

Any potential carbon credits resulting from this activity will be claimed by the processor and not the City. This is the first FOGO processing contract embarked upon by the City and the focus has been on getting a cost effective service from a contractor that could actually deliver the service, as processing capacity in the region is very limited. In the future more focus can be given to the issue of carbon credits and if it would be beneficial for the City to be the recipient if credits are available.

CR LODEN:

How many other Local Governments have signed up?

SENIOR SUSTAINABILITY AND INNOVATION ADVISOR

51 Local Governments indicated their intent to proceed with the Contract. Until the 18 November deadline passes, we won't know the final number, but as indicated to us, WALGA appears to have received sufficient commitments to guarantee that the project will proceed.

8.3 COUNCIL BRIEFING AND ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL DATES FOR 2021

Attachments: 1. City of Vincent Meeting Cycle Calendar - 2022

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. ADOPTS the 2022 monthly cycle of Council Briefings and Ordinary Meetings of Council, each commencing at 6pm and held at the City of Vincent Council Chambers, 244 Vincent Street, Leederville, as listed below and shown in the calendar at Attachment 1; and**

Council Briefing	Ordinary Meeting of Council
1 February	8 February
1 March	8 March
29 March	5 April
10 May	17 May
14 June	21 June
19 July	26 July
16 August	23 August
13 September	20 September
11 October	18 October
8 November	15 November
6 December	13 December

- 1.**
- 2. PROVIDES local public notice of the Council Briefing and Ordinary Meeting of Council dates, time and place, as listed in Recommendation 1. above.**

NO QUESTIONS

8.4 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER PERFORMANCE REVIEW PANEL

Attachments: 1. Model Standard for CEO Recruitment Performance and Termination

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council APPOINTS the following Council Members to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO Performance Review Panel for the term 19 October 2021 to the next ordinary local government election, 21 October 2023:

- 1. Mayor Emma Cole Chairperson
- 2. Cr _____;
- 3. Cr _____; and
- 4. Cr _____.

NO QUESTIONS:

8.5 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS TO THE METRO WEST JOINT DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANEL

Attachments: 1. Development Assessment Panel Request for Nominations

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council APPOINTS the following Council Members to represent the City of Vincent on the Metro West Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) for the period 27 January 2022 – 26 January 2024:

Member:

- 1. Cr _____;
- 2. Cr _____

Alternate Members:

- 1. Cr _____;
- 2. Cr _____

NO QUESTIONS

8.6 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO THE CITY OF VINCENT AUDIT COMMITTEE AND AMENDMENT OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

Attachments: 1. Audit Committee Terms of Reference

RECOMMENDATION:

1. In accordance with the provisions of sections 5.10 and 7.1A of the *Local Government Act 1995*, **APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the appointment of the following Council Members to the Audit Committee for the term 19 October 2021 to the date of the next ordinary local government election, 21 October 2023:

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

2. In accordance with the provisions of sections 5.10 and 7.1A of the *Local Government Act 1995*, **APPROVES BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the appointment of the external independent members to the Audit Committee for the term 2 November 2021 to the date of the next ordinary local government election, 15 October 2023:

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

NO QUESTIONS

8.7 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES TO ADVISORY GROUPS

Attachments: Nil

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPOINTS** the following Council Members as Council's representatives on the below advisory groups for a term expiring on 21 October 2023:

1.1 Arts Advisory Group (2 Elected Members)

Members:

1. Cr
2. Cr

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

1.2 Children and Young People Advisory Group (2 Elected Members)

Members:

1. Cr
2. Cr

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

1.3 Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group (2 Elected Members)

Members:

1. Cr
2. Cr

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

1.4 Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group (3 Elected Members)

Members:

1. Cr
2. Cr
3. Cr

and the Chair of the Working Group will be Cr.....;

1.5 Safer Vincent Advisory Group:

Members:

1. Cr
2. Cr

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

2. **RECEIVES** the community nominations at Confidential Attachments 1, 2, 3, and 4;
 3. **APPOINTS** the following community representatives to the City's advisory groups for a term expiring on 21 October 2023:
 - 3.1 **Arts Advisory Group (up to 10 community members), as detailed in Confidential Attachment 1;**
 1. Applicant #;
 2. Applicant #;
 3. Applicant #;
 4. Applicant #;
 5. Applicant #;
 6. Applicant #;
 7. Applicant #;
 8. Applicant #;
 9. Applicant #; and
 10. Applicant #.
 - 3.2 **Children and Young People Advisory Group (up to 6 community members), as detailed in Confidential Attachment 2;**
 1. Applicant #;
 2. Applicant #;
 3. Applicant #;
 4. Applicant #;
 5. Applicant #; and
 6. Applicant #.
 - 3.3 **Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group (up to 10 community members), as detailed in Confidential Attachment 3;**
 1. Applicant #;
 2. Applicant #;
 3. Applicant #;
 4. Applicant #;
 5. Applicant #;
 6. Applicant #;
 7. Applicant #;
 8. Applicant #;
 9. Applicant #; and
 10. Applicant #.
 - 3.4 **Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group (up to 6 community members), as detailed in Confidential Attachment 4;**
 1. Applicant #;
 2. Applicant #;
-
-

3. Applicant #;
4. Applicant #;
5. Applicant #; and
6. Applicant #.

CR LODEN:

Can the process for the Working Group be adapted to accommodate the selection of an Aboriginal Working Group Member as Chairperson?

EXECUTIVE MANAGER CORPORATE STRATEGY & GOVERNANCE:

Policy No. 4.2.12 Advisory Groups provides that Advisory Group Chairpersons are to be appointed by Council, preferably a Council Member, or then by a Senior City Officer.

The Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group falls outside of this policy as it is a 'Working Group', not an 'Advisory Group'.

The proposal to appoint an Chairperson to the Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group who is recognised as Whadjuk Noongar can be accommodated in several ways –

- 1. by Council appointing a suitable nominee (of the Working Group - with their consent) to the role of Chairperson, and nominate a Council Member as Deputy Chairperson.*
- 2. Appoint a Council Member as Deputy Chairperson, who in the absence of a Chairman, will chair the first meeting of the Working Group and as the first order of business, calls for nominations as Chairperson from the membership.*

The Deputy Chairperson can then act in the absence of the Chairperson, whenever the occasion arises.

8.8 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. **Minutes of the Sustainability and Transport Advisory Group Minutes - 7 October 2021**
 2. **Minutes Children and Young Peoples Advisory Group (CYPAG) 29 September 2021**
 3. **Statistics for Development Services Applications as at October 2021**
 4. **Quarterly Street Tree Removal Information**
 5. **Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential**
 6. **Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress report as at 28 October 2021**
 7. **Register of Applications Referred to the MetroWest Development Assessment Panel - Current**
 8. **Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current**
 9. **Register of Petitions - Progress Report - October 2021**
 10. **Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - October 2021**
 11. **Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - October 2021**
 12. **Council Workshop Items for August and September 2021**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **RECEIVES** the Information Bulletin dated November 2021.

NO QUESTIONS

9 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

10 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil OR <type text>

11 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

Pursuant to Section 5.23(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* and clause 2.14 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2008, proceeds “behind closed doors” at the conclusion of the items, to consider the confidential reports.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **APPOINTS** Ms Jane Wedgwood and Ms Pina Christie for a further three year term to the Board of Leederville Gardens Inc. commencing from 18 November 2021 and ending on 17 November 2024;
2. **ENDORSES** the Leederville Gardens Inc. Board Member Selection Criteria as contained in Attachment 3; and
3. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to commence the search and selection process for appointing a third Director to the Leederville Gardens Inc. Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

4. **APPOINTS** Ms Jane Wedgwood and Ms Pina Christie for a further three year term to the Board of Leederville Gardens Inc. commencing from 18 November 2021 and ending on 17 November 2024;
5. **ENDORSES** the Leederville Gardens Inc. Board Member Selection Criteria as contained in Attachment 3; and
6. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to commence the search and selection process for appointing a third Director to the Leederville Gardens Inc. Board.

PROCEDURAL MOTION

That the Council resume an “open meeting”.

MAYOR COLE

The report can be public

EXECUTIVE MANAGER CORPORATE STRATEGY & GOVERNANCE

Report has been made public

Closed 8.56pm