



**CITY OF VINCENT**

# **NOTES**

**Council Briefing**

**11 May 2021**

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies / Members on Approved Leave of Absence</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Strategy &amp; Development</b> .....	<b>6</b>
5.1	No. 1/278 (Lot: W108; D/P: 223022) Beaufort Street, Perth - Unauthorised Change of Use to Restricted Premises .....	6
5.2	Draft Pickle District Place Plan .....	8
5.3	Accessible City Strategy - Outcomes of Advertising.....	10
<b>6</b>	<b>Infrastructure &amp; Environment</b> .....	<b>12</b>
6.1	Public Consultation Results - Mini-Roundabout Pilot Project .....	12
6.2	Advertising of new/amended policy - Memorials in Public Places and Reserves (2.1.5) .....	14
6.3	Tender no IE105/2020 Design, Supply and Install Solar Photovoltaic Systems at City of Vincent Sites .....	15
6.4	E-Permits Implementation Progress Report – 7:47 .....	16
<b>7</b>	<b>Community &amp; Business Services</b> .....	<b>17</b>
7.1	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 1 March 2021 to 31 March 2021 – 7:48.....	17
7.2	Investment Report as at 31 March 2021 – 7:50.....	18
7.3	Financial Statements as at 31 March 2021 – 7:50 .....	19
7.4	Differential Rating Strategy 2021/22 – 7:53.....	20
7.5	May Budget Review 2021/22 [ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION REQUIRED].....	22
<b>8</b>	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b> .....	<b>24</b>
8.1	Quarterly Update of 26 Strategic Projects Outlined in Corporate Business Plan 2020/21 - 2023/24 – 7:58.....	24
8.2	New Lease to the Western Australian Volleyball Association Inc.- portion of 413 Bulwer Street, West Perth – 8:11.....	25
8.3	Results of Consultation - Proposal for a Commercial Kiosk at Hyde Park .....	29
8.4	Report and Minutes of the Audit Committee Meeting held on 4 May 2021 – 8:23 .....	31
8.5	Information Bulletin – 8:24 .....	32
<b>9</b>	<b>Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Representation on Committees and Public Bodies</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed</b> .....	<b>33</b>

**NOTES OF CITY OF VINCENT  
COUNCIL BRIEFING  
HELD AS E-MEETING AND AT THE  
ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,  
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE  
ON TUESDAY, 11 MAY 2021 AT 6.00PM**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>Cr Susan Gontaszewski</b>	<b>South Ward (Presiding Member)</b>
	<b>Cr Alex Castle</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Joanne Fotakis</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Jonathan Hallett</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Sally Smith</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Dan Loden</b>	<b>North Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Ashley Wallace</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
	<b>Cr Joshua Topelberg</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<b>David MacLennan</b>	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
	<b>Andrew Murphy</b>	<b>Executive Director Infrastructure &amp; Environment</b>
	<b>John Corbellini</b>	<b>Executive Director Strategy &amp; Development</b>
	<b>Tara Gloster</b>	<b>Virginia Miltrup Executive Director Community &amp; Business</b>
	<b>Jay Naidoo</b>	<b>Manager Policy &amp; Place Manager Development &amp; Design (electronically)</b>
	<b>Sean Foster</b>	<b>Coordinator Civil Design</b>
	<b>Jordan Koroveshi</b>	<b>A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy &amp; Development</b>
	<b>Sophie Cole</b>	<b>Executive Assistant Infrastructure &amp; Environment (electronically)</b>

**Public:** Approximately 20 members of the public.

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

The Presiding Member, Deputy Mayor Susan Gontaszewski, 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**

Emma Cole was on leave of absence for this meeting.

## **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.

### **John Viska of North Perth – Item 8.3**

- Spoke against the process
- Noted that the consultation material did not mention the history of the site. The land was gifted from the Forest Government and one of the conditions was that the land was for recreation purposes only. This is a commercial venture.

- Mentioned that the proposal will generate waste and there will be no access for a rubbish collection service.
- Suggested that the proposal not go ahead because of the heritage implications, noting that whatever happens it would need to go to the Heritage Council.

#### **Jerko Ostoic of Belmont – Item 6.1**

- **Is the** Main Roads Director Road Access and Planning,
- Spoke in support of the recommendation and provided background to the proposal from Main Roads perspective.
- Mentioned that mini roundabouts force speed reduction and results in a reduction in serious crashes.

#### **Rodney O'Brien of Highgate – Item 8.3**

- Spoke against the recommendation.
- Suggested that a better solution would be to move the food trucks to Glendower Street or Throssell Street to stop them rolling over the root systems in the park.
- Stated that the proposal is an unnecessary expenditure and raised concerns around the maintenance of the park.
- Stated that there is already a café across the road.

#### **Islam Bouyahia of Perth – 8.3**

- Spoke against the kiosk proposal.
- Commented that the consultation questions were biased toward the kiosk.
- Noted that the food and beverage demand is seasonal in the park and that there are few customers between 2pm to 6pm.
- Commented that the money would be better spent on the amenity and historical interpretation of the park.
- Mentioned that he does not think the kiosk would achieve the vision for the site especially without a commercial kitchen.
- Stated that the kiosk will be seasonal.
- Suggested better toilets, lights, seats, water sports and mini museums as an alternative.

#### **Laurie Saunders of North Perth – 5.3**

- Noted that it is unclear how the strategy will change the behaviour of rat runners. A lot of the traffic is through traffic. The strategy would not reduce traffic volumes and so don't see how the strategy will address this issue and the associated safety issues.
- Noted that he has emailed the City on two occasions about rat running but has not received a response.
- Mentioned that the proposal does not address ongoing safety concerns of the residents.

#### **Simon Chester of Mt Lawley – Item 8.3**

- Spoke against the recommendation.
- Questioned the process and contends that the Council Members have not been provided with all of the information. Does not support the commercial nature of the proposal.
- Mentioned that there are indigenous plantings located within the vicinity of the proposed kiosk. Worried that park traffic will increase and put the park under further duress. Concerned about the physical impact on the park.
- Queried if the kiosk fits with the long term vision of the park.

#### **Graeme Pitt of Leederville – Item 5.3**

- Raised concern that the Strategy would not resolve issues with verge side parking in the street.

- Medium density accommodation is forcing people to park up the side streets.

#### **Barbra Lidal of Mt Lawley– Item 6.1**

- Spoke in support of the recommendation.
- Noted that this morning she witnessed a cyclist nearly hit by a car and that this proposal would help reduce this risk.

#### **Steve Heidel of North Perth – Item 5.3**

- Notes that in one of the items on page 37 it notes that the City of Vincent makes a contribution to the Perth Parking Management area of \$400,000 a year but the City of Vincent only covers 5% of the Perth Parking Management area. The Perth Parking Area funding goes to things like the CAT services which are located in the City of Perth. The City of Vincent can do far better than giving this money to the City of Perth.

#### **Pat & Sam Benich of Ellenbrook – Item 8.3**

- Spoke against the recommendation.
- Requested a meeting with the City to discuss the issues and potential solutions, including providing power for the food trucks and solutions to customer queuing if these things are an issue.

#### **Chris Niven of North Perth – Item 8.3**

- Spoke against the proposal.
- Suggested that Council decides if they want both the kiosk and the food trucks as this would not provide certainty for potential kiosk businesses.
- Further work is required on the detail in relation to things like queuing, seating and rubbish.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6:41pm.

## **4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 4.1 Cr Sally Smith declared an impartiality interest in item 12.4 Report and Minutes of the Audit Committee Meeting held on 2 March 2021. The extent of her interest is that her husband is a member of the Audit Committee.
- 4.2 Cr Joshua Topelberg declared a proximity interest in item 10.1 Public Consultation Results – Mini-roundabout pilot project. The extent of his interest is that his primary residence is located within the proposed trial area. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote on the matter.
- 4.3 Cr Ashley Wallace declared a financial interest in item 11.1 Authorisation of Expenditure 1 March 2021 to 31 March 2021. The extent of his interest is that A payment was made to GHD a “Beatty Park leisure pool assessment.” He is employed by GHD, who were engaged by the Project Consultant (Ninnes Fong) to scan and core drill the indoor pool shell to ensure its integrity, which resulted in that payment. He is not seeking approval to participate in the debate or to remain in Chambers or to vote on the matter.

## 5 STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT

### 5.1 NO. 1/278 (LOT: W108; D/P: 223022) BEAUFORT STREET, PERTH - UNAUTHORISED CHANGE OF USE TO RESTRICTED PREMISES

Ward: South

Attachments:

1. Consultation and Location Plan
2. Development Plan
3. Outline of Activities
4. Summary of Submissions - Administration's Response
5. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response
6. Parking Management Plan
7. Determination Advice Notes
8. Beaufort Street Land Use Context Plan

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme:

1. APPROVES part of the application for unauthorised Change of Use to Restricted Premises and Signage at No. 1/278 Beaufort Street, Perth (Lot: W108; D/P: 223022), in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions and advice notes included in Attachment 7:
  - 1.1 This approval is for Change of Use to Restricted Premises and Signage as shown on the approved plans dated 23 March 2021. No other development forms part of this approval;
  - 1.2 This approval is for Restricted Premises as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No.2. Use of the subject land for a different use may require further development approval in accordance with the provisions of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*;
  - 1.3 A minimum of three on-site parking bays shall be provided for use of the premises;
  - 1.4 A minimum of two short-term bicycle bays shall be provided within the verge adjoining the development. The bicycle bays shall be designed in accordance with AS2890.3 and installed within 28 days from the date of this determination to the satisfaction of the City;
  - 1.5 The proposed Restricted Premises shall be limited to the following hours of operation:
    - Monday to Sunday – 10:00am to 7:00pm;
  - 1.6 Doors and windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Beaufort 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;
  - 1.7 Within 28 days from the date of this determination, all signage the subject of this approval is to be installed in accordance with Elevation 01 on the approved plans dated 23 March 2021. Thereafter the signage shall be:
    - 1.7.1 Kept in strict accordance with the City's Policy No. 7.5.2 – Signs and Advertising, unless further development approval is obtained;
    - 1.7.2 Kept in a good state of repair, safe, non-climbable, and free from graffiti for the duration of its display on-site; and

**1.7.3 Be wholly contained within the subject lot; and**

- 2. REFUSES** part of the application for unauthorised roller shutters at No. 1/278 Beaufort Street, Perth (Lot: W108; D/P: 223022), in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, for the following reasons:
- 2.1** The development does not satisfy the objectives of the Commercial zone under Clause 16 of the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, as the roller shutters are incompatible with the design of facades within the streetscape. This is as a result of the roller shutters providing for reduced activation to the street frontage;
- 2.2** The development does not satisfy the Local Housing Objectives of Clause 1.13 Façade Design of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form Policy as:
- 2.2.1** The appearance of the roller shutters as a security measure adversely impacts on and does not reflect the character of the local area;
- 2.2.2** The roller shutters reduce activation provided to the street frontage, which reduces visibility of the internal use from the street; and
- 2.2.3** As a result of the roller shutters, the use does not provide for a visual connection with the adjoining public spaces and does not adhere to the performance criteria of the Western Australian Planning Commissions, Designing Out Crime Planning Guidelines; and
- 2.3** As a consequence of the adverse appearance of the roller shutter addition and subsequent reduced street surveillance outlined in Refusal Reasons 1 and 2, the roller shutter additions:
- 2.3.1** Are not compatible nor complimentary to the area in which it is located (Clause 67(2)(m) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*); and
- 2.3.2** Would detract from the amenity and character of the locality, and would set an undesirable precedence (Clause 67(2)(n)(ii) and (iii) of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*); and
- 2.4** Within 28 days from the date of this determination, the roller shutters must be removed from the façade and the affected areas of the façade made good, to the satisfaction of the City.

<b>NO QUESTIONS</b>
---------------------

## 5.2 DRAFT PICKLE DISTRICT PLACE PLAN

Attachments: 1. Draft Pickle District Place Plan

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **ENDORSES** the Draft Volume 7: Pickle District Place Plan for the purpose of advertising in accordance with the City's Policy No. 4.1.5 – Community Consultation; and
2. **NOTES** that the outcomes of advertising and Draft Volume 7: Pickle District Place Plan will be presented to Council for endorsement following the 42 day advertising period.

#### MAYOR COLE:

Under Connected Community: Was consideration given to including an action on events, more broadly than NAIDOC Week (which is a great inclusion)? The Pickle District is home to many events venues, galleries, a cinema and studios and this is a key part of the character of the place, which lends itself very strongly to events. The Pickle District After Dark event on Friday was incredibly well done and highlighted that this precinct has a number of advantages and presents ongoing opportunities for it to be known for its events.

#### MANAGER POLICY AND PLACE:

The Pickle District After Dark event was funded through City grants and sponsorship (Town Team Grant and Festival and Events Sponsorship). The City will continue to support the town team and community events in the Pickle District moving forward through this funding opportunity which is captured in Action 3.1 of the Pickle District Place Plan.

NAIDOC week was included as Action 3.2 as it is a City led event and is also a key part of Action 7 in the City's Innovate Reconciliation Action Plan to hold an annual City of Vincent NAIDOC Festival. All other events in the Pickle District are business led and so the City's Place Plan actions would need to work to support those businesses deliver events.

The City is working to support Pickle District businesses to achieve public building status in order to increase the number of venues that can be involved in future events. An additional action, Action 6.2 – Public Buildings, has been included in the Place Plan to ensure to City continues to support the Pickle District businesses to comply with the Building Act and Public Health Act requirements for a public building.

#### MAYOR COLE:

Action 5.1 – should and could this make a commitment to doing a Precinct Plan and a timeframe attached?

#### MANAGER POLICY AND PLACE:

This Action is the first step in determining what the most appropriate planning mechanism is, through understanding the community vision for the future. Currently it is proposed that the planning for the area be determined through local planning policy, as this is controlled by the City of Vincent and does not require approval from the State Government. The intention of the Action is to engage with the landowners and occupiers to determine if there is a need to provide further planning provisions, beyond what a local planning policy can, that would require the support of the State Government, either through a Precinct Structure Plan and/or a Scheme Amendment. Following this, the Action would be updated at the annual place plan review to reflect the outcomes of the workshop, including any potential changes recommended for the planning framework.

#### MAYOR COLE:

Action 6.1 – Is a bit unclear. Should this refer to working with inner city local governments *and State and Federal Governments* to identify incentives and support mechanism to retain and establish creative spaces *and creative industries* in the Pickle District?

#### MANAGER POLICY AND PLACE:

The wording of Action 6.1's solution reflects the project the City is currently undertaking with the inner city local governments. This project does not include the State or Federal governments at this stage. The Action would be updated at the annual place plan review if the project is expanded to include State and Federal

governments.

**CR LODEN:**

Given the Beaufort Street Place Plan included an action in relation to supporting businesses implement community solar, has a similar wording action been considered for this Place Plan?

**MANAGER POLICY AND PLACE:**

This action has now been included in the Place Plan.

### 5.3 ACCESSIBLE CITY STRATEGY - OUTCOMES OF ADVERTISING

- Attachments:**
1. Submission Report
  2. Accessible City Strategy

#### RECOMMENDATION:

#### That Council:

1. **ADOPTS the Accessible City Strategy 2020-2030; and**
2. **NOTES the adopted Accessible City Strategy 2020-2030 will be subject to further formatting, styling and graphic design as determined by the Chief Executive Officer prior to publication.**

#### MAYOR COLE:

Is any of the \$3m total cost of the Strategy factored into the LTFP at this stage?

#### MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The currently adopted 10 Year Long Term Financial Plan 2020/21 – 2029/30 (LTFP) did not factor in the Accessible City Strategy, including the \$3 million cost of implementing the new actions proposed by the Strategy, the additional parking revenue likely to be generated as a result of the actions in the Strategy, the use of much of the Cash-in-lieu of Car Parking Reserve funds on the Strategy's action, the revenue likely to be generated from additional Cash-in-lieu of car parking contributions and the actions in the Strategy.

The LTFP does not include \$1 million of the City's Cash-in-lieu of Car Parking Reserve and these funds are proposed to be used to implement some of the actions in the Strategy.

The LTFP also does not assume any increase in the Cash-in-lieu of Car Parking Reserve. There is already \$130,000 due to be paid to the Reserve over the next 10 years through payment plans and another \$100,000 is likely to be required to be paid as a result of development applications this financial year. It is assumed that \$100,000 per year will be contributed to the Reserve over the next 10 years, resulting in a further \$1 million that would be used to fund the implementation of the Strategy.

The remaining \$1 million required to fund the actions in the Strategy over the next 10 years is proposed to be funded from the municipal budget and be offset by additional revenue in other areas, such as parking revenue increases resulting from the implementation of actions in the Strategy.

#### MAYOR COLE:

Could the proposed 2021/22 funding of \$425,000 please be broken down further into projects and funding sources (noting subject to approval of 2021/22 budget)?

#### MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:

The projects proposed for next financial year are outlined below, totalling \$425,000, subject to 21/22 budget approval.

Item #	Action	Cost	Source
1.1.3	Develop and implement a consistent wayfinding and signage plan across the City. This should consider parking, cycling and pedestrian transport modes, and localised details for each centre. (Plan and first year implementation).	\$100,000 (\$20,000 spent in 20/21)	Cash in lieu
2.2.1	Develop a set of link and place guidelines to guide future streetscape improvements.	\$100,000	Operational expenditure
2.3.3	Ensure all new and existing high-density residential development has access to EV charging bays. Amend LPP 7.7. 1 to require EV parking bays for new developments.	\$5,000	Operational expenditure (staff)
3.3.1	Establish a business plan for the management of parking within the City with a view of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prepare precinct specific parking management plans, with priority given to precincts already at capacity; and</li> <li>- Expand paid parking using the 'demand responsive</li> </ul>	\$100,000	Cash in lieu

	pricing methodology'		
3.3.3	Better manage the supply of on street parking through the implementation of various restrictions by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limiting roadside residential parking, confining parking to the property;</li> <li>- Restricting parking to 3P or less within 2 blocks of train stations or transit nodes, with residential permit exemptions;</li> <li>- Restricting parking to 2P or less within 2 blocks of town centres or mixed-use areas, with residential permit exemptions.</li> </ul>	\$100,000	Cash in lieu

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Foreshadowed an amendment to 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.

**MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:**

The proposed amendment will be prepared.

**CR LODEN:**

Used 2010 Sydney data, but it has been mentioned that this isn't an appropriate proxy and neither is the number of persons per dwelling.

**MANAGER POLICY & PLACE:**

Residential trip generation is extremely difficult to assess, because it must include all trip purposes; to school, work, shopping, recreational etc. This information is not provided by ABS journey-to-work data and can be increasingly difficult to source.

The most appropriate data to inform how residents might change their behaviour to reduce vehicle ownership is a household travel survey, the PARTS (the Perth and Regions Travel Survey) is outdated, having been completed almost 20 years ago. As such, Cardno utilised the Sydney household travel survey (VISTA) to provide information which demonstrates the potential impacts of a reduced parking supply rate. This data was collected in 2009, and although still some time ago is not considered to be outdated.

This has been applied on a proportional basis (i.e. it is the % change in vehicle trip generation that has been used, not the absolute magnitude). This preserves the baseline generation rate for local development, while allowing us to assess the impact of potential residential parking maximums. The information is not intended to be an exact comparison to Vincent but to be an example of how change can occur.

There is a strong correlation between vehicle trip generation and dwelling size, noting that dwelling size includes several factors that all contribute to vehicle trip generation: household income, family size, location etc. While traditionally, dwelling size has been ignored in trip generation assumptions, this reflects only the generic nature of benchmarking, not an implicit understanding of the factors influencing vehicle trips. Through looking at differing factors, we were able to gain a greater understanding of the current situation.

## 6 INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT

### 6.1 PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS - MINI-ROUNABOUT PILOT PROJECT

- Attachments:**
1. Plan of Proposed Locations of Mini-Roundabouts
  2. Map of Proposed Project Area
  3. Letter - Mini Roundabouts URSP Consultation - Resident Letter
  4. Mini-roundabout Correspondence Responses

#### RECOMMENDATION:

##### That Council:

1. **NOTES** the public consultation results on the 'mini roundabout' pilot program contained in this report.
2. **APPROVES** the implementation of the Urban Road Safety Program 'mini roundabout' pilot project within the area bounded by Raglan Road, Hyde, Vincent and Fitzgerald Streets, North Perth/Mt Lawley in May/June 2021, as shown on Plan 3612-CP, Attachment 1.
3. **NOTES** that the pilot project will be fully funded by Main Roads WA.
4. **APPROVES** the subject area moving from 50kmh to 40kmh during the pilot project period in liaison with Main Roads WA as shown in Attachment 2.
5. **REQUESTS** Administration to inform the respondents of Council's decision.

#### **MAYOR COLE:**

Clause 4: 50kph to 40kph during trial.

I wanted to understand the timeframe to secure funding and deliver the project and whether there would be time to do a consult on the reduction in speed in the area, possibly for those on the impacted streets? This is a reasonable change for residents and I am not sure if this would meet the requirements of the draft Community Engagement Strategy/policy?

#### **MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

Main Roads are open to the area, bounded by Fitzgerald, Alma, William and Vincent Streets (as per below), either being reduced to 40 kph 'local area traffic zone' from the projects implementation or deferring the speed reduction until a later date. A later date would not only allow the City to consult with the residents but would also allow traffic data to be collected prior to any speed limit reduction to determine the effectiveness of the 'mini-roundabouts' in a typical 50 kph urban speed zone, and on the assumption the 40 kph zone is approved, any changes after it's ( the 40 kph limit) introduction.

#### **MAYOR COLE:**

Safe Active Street on Norfolk: Is there any way to progress discussions between DoT and MRWA on the interplay and compatibility between these two projects before implementation?

#### **MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

Main Roads and Department of Transport are of the view that 'mini-roundabouts' will complement the SAS if the 'mini-roundabouts' project achieves its objectives of both lower speeds and volumes. With fewer, and/or less severe accidents, prior to the SAS being implemented, then the typical SAS treatments (i.e. mid-block single lane slow points) will likely reduce speeds even further making it easier to realise the desired SAS 30 kph road operating environment.

#### **CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Cost estimate of removing the roundabouts

#### **MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

If they were to be removed it would be at the City's cost, estimated to be in the order of \$40,000. The majority of the cost is not in removing the nine 'mini-roundabouts' but rather the removing the line-marking

(either grinding off or re-surfacing over) and reverting to the previous line-marking and signage, with the associated traffic control.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Can please ask Main Roads if they would include zebra crossing being included as part of the project and would the City need to pay?

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

Both Administration and MRWA do not believe that zebra crossings are required in conjunction with the installation of mini-roundabouts. To date the practice has not been widely adopted within Australia on local streets with low pedestrian traffic. The City has only held informal discussions with Main Roads about the possible inclusion of zebra crossing's on all four legs of the 'mini-roundabouts'

One of the issues with 'zebra crossing's' at roundabouts is the requirement for parking exclusion zones on approach. To ensure that approaching drivers have a clear view of a pedestrian stepping out onto the crossing the on-road parking would have to be 'pulled back' on all four approach legs, to comply with the standards, and on which we have not consulted. Further, while the onus is on the driver to ensure that they show due regard for pedestrians on zebra crossing's some recent data suggests that pedestrians have a false sense of security when using a 'zebra crossing' and don't allow for a distracted or inconsiderate driver's. In addition the street lighting is unlikely to comply with the Australian Standards for road lighting specific to 'pedestrian crossings, and as it would be a considerable additional cost and it has not been factored into the project.

However, that said Main Roads has advised that they are open to considering the inclusion of zebra crossings in future (albeit this or other projects) when assessing the findings of the project on the understanding that the additional costs would be borne by Local Government.

**CR HALLETT:**

Are you able to provide crash data for the last 10 years?

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

The accidents data is typically over a 5 year period (as used to determine Black Spot's). The current data is for the period 1 Jan 2016 to 31 December 2020.

Three of the nine intersections had reported accidents during this period, a total of 7 accidents, while the entire project cell (inclusive of the intersections, mid-block accidents and other non-specific or poorly documented reports) had 25 accidents.

Of the 7 intersection accidents 1 required hospitalisation, 2 medical treatment, 2 major property damage and 2 minor property damage.

**CR WALLACE:**

Are the updated statistics from the 2021 report mentioned by the representative from Main Roads available?

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

The report referred to by Main Roads Director Road Access and Planning, Jerko Ostoic, is the updated (March 2021) Austroads 'Guide to Road Design Part 7' which now includes a section on 'New and Emerging Treatments' in which section 2.3 deals with 'mini-roundabouts', **as attached**.

In respect of Safe Active Streets and 'mini-roundabouts' clause 2.32, dot point 4, talks to the suitability of roundabouts and cyclists. It should be noted that if the SAS is implemented it will include additional traffic calming, or speed reduction measures, typically mid-block single lane slow points, narrowing the carriageway by line-marking and additional 'nibbed out' street tree planting. It should also be noted that the 'mini-roundabouts' the City is proposing are raised domes, not painted, which are far more effective in moderating driver behaviour.

**6.2 ADVERTISING OF NEW/AMENDED POLICY - MEMORIALS IN PUBLIC PLACES AND RESERVES (2.1.5)**

- Attachments:
1. **Memorials in Parks and Public Reserves Policy (2.1.5) - February 2010**
  2. **Memorials in Parks and Public Reserves Policy (2.1.5) - Reviewed and amended April 2021**

**RECOMMENDATION****That Council:**

1. **APPROVES** the reviewed and updated Memorials in Public Places and Reserves Policy (2.1.5) as shown at Attachment 2, for the purpose of public notice.
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to provide local public notice of the proposed new 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:**

I would welcome more detail on whether we should consider particular parks, particular areas in parks and whether there is a length of time that memorials can be maintained, and whether there is a certain capacity for memorial locations in parks? A few unanswered questions for me on this policy.

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

Administration did not specifically consider setting aside City public open space for memorials as part of this policy review as this service is supplied by the cemeteries board.

There is no specific length of time a memorial can be maintained – maintenance of memorials is the responsibility of the applicant and the City reserves the right to remove and return a memorial to the applicant if required.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Did the review of this policy follow the Policy Review Policy and come to a Council Workshop to discuss the objectives of the policy? Foreshadowed a deferral.

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

Yes – 23 February 2021

**CR CASTLE:**

Wording, New policy clause 1.4, "won't permit burial or interment of ashes" - should it be scattering?

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

New wording, 'won't permit the **scattering**, burial or internment of ashes' will be used in the policy prior to its public advertising.

**6.3 TENDER NO IE105/2020 DESIGN, SUPPLY AND INSTALL SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS AT CITY OF VINCENT SITES**

- Attachments:**
1. Evaluation Worksheet - RFT IE105-2020 - Solar Panel RFT - Confidential
  2. Comparison table and relevant information - Confidential

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **ACCEPTS** the tender submitted by DNX Energy Pty Ltd for Tender No. IE105/2020 for the Design, Supply & Installation of Solar Photovoltaic Systems at various City of Vincent sites.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Will we meet the targets in the SES if we don't so some or all of these PV projects?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:**

We will not meet our solar PV install target if we do not do some or all of these PV projects. However, there are other mechanisms available to us to achieve our GHG emissions target. If we did not do any leased sites (apart from DLGSC which has installation of solar PV as a lease condition) there would be a shortfall against our 400 kW solar PV target by 2024 of 178.2 kW.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Vincent community Centre (Bethanie) – confirm what building that is – Bulwer St or the community centre in the precinct?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:**

Bethanie is located at 40 Violet Street, West Perth.

**6.4 E-PERMITS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT – 7:47****Attachments: Nil****RECOMMENDATION:****That Council NOTES the progress in the implementation of the E-Permit system.****MAYOR COLE:**

Would welcome an update on how some of the 'bespoke' arrangements put in place to assist residents with accessibility issues, such as phoning in with registration changes, are going and if there are any operational issues?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT:**

Administration are continuing to assist residents either in person at the Library or over the phone, with creating their e-permits account, and also taking the time to explain and show them how to manage their account once it has been created. From looking at the permit activity of some of these residents that have needed assistance creating their account, the account has been able to be managed by themselves or a family member with vehicles being made active and inactive. This is considered a good result in that the resident, either by themselves or with assistance from family/friends have been able to manage their account with no need for further help from Administration. Some residents are also phoning Administration with registrations to be added to the system which involves minimal time on the phone.

Administration have also offered assistance to a resident who had concerns with creating and managing their account moving forward, by offering a sms text service, where the details could be texted to Administration, who in turn could update the details onto the system. The resident has since created their account, however has not yet had a requirement to take up the text option offered.

In summary, assistance being given to residents in relation to e-Permits is minor and manageable with current resources.

Rangers are continuing to issue cautions to those vehicles with a physical permit displayed, and not yet on the e-permits system, however, have reported to Administration that these cases are minimal over the amount of vehicles checked whilst on patrol.

## 7 COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES

### 7.1 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 1 MARCH 2021 TO 31 MARCH 2021 – 7:48

- Attachments:
1. Payments by EFT and Payroll March 2021
  2. Payments by Cheque March 2021
  3. Payments by Direct Debit March 2021

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 1 March 2021 to 31 March 2021 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$8,235,049.34
Cheques	\$715.15
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$123,757.69
<b>Total payments for March 2021</b>	<b>\$8,359,522.18</b>

#### CR FOTAKIS:

A charge 19/3 City of Stirling waste tipping fees, meals on wheels can we have separated, in future because they are 2 very different services.

Could we have an indication of the number for the distribution of fliers?

Temporary staff costs, over previous 6/7 months we haven't tipped over \$100,000 mark. So just want an explanation why we are now up about \$134K whether it is specific projects but just want an understanding why we have got a peak at this time?

#### EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS SERVICES:

The payment for City of Stirling has been separated in the expense schedule.

Flier distribution numbers were 730 for North Perth Common letter, 1000 for Barlee Street Car Park postcards, 2800 for Hyde Park Kiosk flyers and 670 roundabout letters.

The total of payments for March 21, for temporary staff was \$103,854. The normal monthly costs for temp agencies average \$70,000 per month. The increase is due a payment for Hays of \$12,760 for a Building Surveyor for 3 months commencing mid-January. This surveyor has since been employed directly by the City as from the start of May. The payments to Programmed Skilled Workforce also increased by \$13,894, this payment was for a project manager at BPLC overseeing indoor pool works, and is for three months.

#### CR HALLETT:

Have we ensured local printers have been approached as preferred options before going to companies outside of Vincent?

#### EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND SERVICES:

We did choose one printer in Osborne Park due to a competitive price. Administration is about to go out to the local Vincent market as part of an annual review of printing costs. This will refresh our database of frequently used printers and ensure we remain abreast of local suppliers and their prices.

**7.2 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 MARCH 2021 – 7:50**

**Attachments: 1. Investment Statistics as at 31 March 2021**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 March 2021 as detailed in Attachment 1.**

<b>NO QUESTIONS</b>
---------------------

**7.3 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 MARCH 2021 – 7:50**

**Attachments: 1. Financial Statements as at 31 March 2021**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 March 2021 as shown in Attachment 1.**

<b>NO QUESTIONS</b>
---------------------

**7.4 DIFFERENTIAL RATING STRATEGY 2021/22 – 7:53**

**Attachments:** 1. **Rate Setting Statement by Nature & Type 2021/2022**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **ADVERTISES** by local public notice for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Section 6.36(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, its intention to levy the following differential rates and minimum rates in 2021/2022 as set out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons for Differential Rates - 2021/2022;
2. **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to invite submissions from electors and ratepayers on the below proposed differential rates and minimum payments for 2021/2022:

Rating Category	2021/2022	
	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate
Residential	0.08012	\$1,247.05
Vacant-Residential	0.07460	\$1,160.00
Vacant-Commercial	0.12817	\$1,516.40
Other	0.06718	\$1,197.70

3. **NOTES** any public submissions received in response to 1 and 2 above will be presented to Council for consideration;
4. **NOTES** that Administration will be maintaining a funding of up to \$100,000, when finalising the 2021/2022 budget, to support the City in responding to ratepayers in financial crisis.

**MAYOR COLE:**

Seeking that an amendment please be prepared to amend the RSS so that it reflects a 2.4% rate increase, in place of 2.9%

I will provide reasons for decision (awaiting on some responses to questions in email from last Friday) but one of the primary budget reductions would be to:

- Reduce new FTE to one (as per the LTFP) with 50% of funding towards additional graffiti support and 50% towards traffic engineer (positions identified by Council or Admin as priority). Any remaining positions sought to be funded within existing resources wherever possible and, where Admin believes that new employees are revenue positive, a business case to be provided to Council for a 12 month trial.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS SERVICES:**

A decrease in residential rates from 2.9% to 2.4% in Year 1 will result in a reduction of revenue by \$132,919. Referring to the Rate Setting Statement (Attachment 1 of Item 7.4) has a closing deficit of \$263,816, which increases to \$396,735 in Year 1 with the proposed amendment. In addition, this will add further pressure to the LTFP due to this reduction of income. However, we expect that carry forwards will return the rate setting statement to surplus.

**CR FOTAKIS:**

Could you confirm the closing deficit?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS SERVICES:**

Same response as above.

**CR TOPELBERG:**

Can I request some commentary because there has been some interest in the vacant properties. I understand that no more than 50% can be on the vacant rate but given that the rate in \$ because of revaluation last year, Can we perhaps get some Layman's terms explanation of how the city is using its differential rating, particularly with vacant properties, commercially it seems to make more sense the way that it reads currently but given the disparity between vacant commercial and other commercial in the rate in the \$, what are the medium term strategies to be able to ensure that the reason for it being differential and

vacant is to incentivise development on both properties as I understand it but the numbers don't reflect that as presented here. Can both the logic, the requirements of the Act and the strategies to address that over time, can we get some commentary on that?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS SERVICES:**

In 2019/20 both vacant residential and residential properties had the same RID (Rate in the Dollar) and min payments.

In 2020/21 LG's were mandated to not increase rates yield due to the impact of COVID-19, and the GRV revaluation of properties occurred. The City's focus shifted to the **immediate impact** of the GRV increases/decreases, minimising the impact on residential property owners, and total rates yield.

In 2020/21 GRV of vacant residential properties increased by 4.06% while the GRV of residential RID decreased by 15.75% for (occupied) residential properties.

Strategically, vacant residential land would be rated higher than residential to encourage development. However, the cumulative impact of last year's adjustments has resulted in the RID for (occupied) residential being higher 7.4% than vacant residential.

In the event that an amendment is brought forward to reduce the residential RID from 2.9% to 2.4%, Administration would be recommending that the RID reduction does not apply to vacant residential.

Council may also wish to consider increasing the vacant residential RID over the next 2 years to correct this issue.

## 7.5 MAY BUDGET REVIEW 2021/22 – 7:51

- Attachments:
1. Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature and Type
  2. Statement of Comprehensive Income by Program
  3. Rate Setting Statement by Program
  4. Capital Expenditure Report
  5. Cash Backed Reserves

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council **ADOPTS BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY** the May budget review for the 2020/21 financial year as detailed in this report and Attachments 1 – 5, in accordance with Regulation 33A of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

**MAYOR COLE:**

What percentage is revenue at now in comparison to pre-Covid adjustments and taking indoor pool work considerations into account?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:**

90%

**MAYOR COLE:**

Asset Sustainability Reserve – movement of additional surplus. Has this been factored in draft 2021/22 budget?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:**

Yes it has.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Where the items have had a revised budget that has been identified as a saving, can we identify which items are true savings, in terms of perhaps we have done the work and it costs less vs haven't done work yet or we are deferring it perhaps for the period that is likely to be in the CBP. With that in mind was there any thinking in relation to the distribution of funds in terms of moving the funds into the asset sustainability reserve, and leaving \$135,000 as surplus.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY & BUSINESS SERVICES:*****Responded on the night.***

*The figures that we have that show the surplus of \$135,000, as best we know reflects the current position and it reflects the state of those projects including any provision for carry forwards or deferrals or savings. I am not sure if that answers that latter question but I can certainly go through and provide a little bit more of a breakdown, in terms of those carry forward figures, are they a true saving or is it something that's been deferred or postponed and all of those decisions then are wrapped up in that final figure*

The below is summary of capital budget amendment of \$276,270 including the reason for the amendment.

Description	MYBR Revised Budget	Budget Amendment	Reason for Amendment
Intersection of Beaufort and Harold Streets, Highgate	100,000	- 97,180	No longer proceeding due to property development in the area
Intersection of Fitzgerald Street & Raglan Road, North Perth	80,000	- 73,380	Works cancelled - \$100K of additional works required therefore no longer proceeding

Air Conditioning & HVAC Renewal - Admin Building HVAC	300,000	- 50,000	Market value of works less than forecast at time of scope
Auckland/Hobart St Res Renew Inground Irrigation	50,000	- 50,000	Budget was duplicated
Solar Photovoltaic Panel System Installation - Perth Soccer Club	30,000	- 30,000	Deleted from scope until current debt is settled Installation of poles and sensors not required as new cloud-based sensors will be used.
Parking Sensors Pilot Project	11,810	- 11,810	
Solar Photovoltaic Panel System Installation - North Perth Town Hall	8,900	- 8,900	Deleted from scope Heritage Building 1 additional vehicle due to be received by 30 June
Melville Renault / Magic Kia	-	45,000 -	
		<b>276,270</b>	

The other reason for the increase in transfer to asset sustainability reserve of \$1.3m is the increase of fees and charges of \$1,406,467. Fees and charges estimated revenues have now been updated based on current capacity. The major changes is Beatty Park increase of \$608,766 and Parking facilities of \$ 808,291.

**8 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER****8.1 QUARTERLY UPDATE OF 26 STRATEGIC PROJECTS OUTLINED IN CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2020/21 - 2023/24 – 7:58**

**Attachments:** 1. 26 Strategic Projects Update - Corporate Business Plan 2020/21 - 2023/24

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council NOTES the updates to the 26 Strategic Projects outlined in the Corporate Business Plan 2020/21 – 2023/24 as at Attachment 1.**

**MAYOR COLE:**

Project 2: FOGO: when is public advertising commencing?

**MANAGER MARKETING AND PARTNERSHIPS:**

Teaser advertising has commenced already, with a monthly advert in April. More designed elements will be in market by the end of May.

**MAYOR COLE:**

Project 4: 40kph trial: what happens next now that 2 year trial has been completed? Publication of results etc?

**MANAGER ENGINEERING:**

While the 40 kph Speed Zone Trial concluded on the 29 April in light of the recent COVID disruptions it is proposed to undertake a further, and final, round of data collection (typically 6 weeks) to address the resultant traffic fluctuations (March/April 2020, Feb and April 2021).

Once completed it is then proposed to reconvene the Vincent 40kph Speed Zone Trial Implementation Working Group (inclusive of the Road Safety Commission (RSC), Main Roads WA, RAC, WA Police, WALGA and the consultants GHD) to close-out the trial and to determine 'whereto from here?'.  
At this time the RSC has not committed to funding the final report and it will be one of the topic's to be discussed.

**MAYOR COLE:**

Project 24: Draft Asset Sustainability and Management Strategy

When is the Community Panel taking place and can the current consultation be extended up to or including this date? My understanding is that consultation has been extended to 17 May, but if the Panel is not happening until June/Jul, it seems it should be further extended.

**MANAGER MARKETING AND PARTNERSHIPS:**

The panel is due to meet in June. The intent was to use the feedback from the consultation to provide to the independent facilitators to enable them to develop the panel workshops so we will need time between the survey closing and the workshops commencing to enable those workshops to be developed. The consultation is due to finish in Mid May but could be extended until late May if needed.

**MAYOR COLE:**

How is the consultation going and could we please have an update?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT:**

There are currently 65 responses to the survey.

## 8.2 NEW LEASE TO THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN VOLLEYBALL ASSOCIATION INC.- PORTION OF 413 BULWER STREET, WEST PERTH – 8:11

- Attachments:
1. Premises plan
  2. Market Rent Valuation Report - Confidential
  3. Maintenance Schedule

### RECOMMENDATION

#### That Council:

#### 1. APPROVES a lease of part of 413 Bulwer Street, West Perth (Premises) to the Western Australian Volleyball Association Inc. (Tenant) on the following key commercial terms:

- 1.1. **Initial term:** two (2) years.
- 1.2. **Option:** two x two (2) year terms, exercised upon mutual agreement by the City and the Tenant.
- 1.3. **Premises area:** 452m<sup>2</sup> (buildings) and 1,200m<sup>2</sup> (volleyball courts).
- 1.4. **Rent:** \$15,000 per annum (plus GST).
- 1.5. **Rent Review:** CPI on 1 July each year of the term, commencing on 1 July 2021.
- 1.6. **Outgoings:** the Tenant to pay all ESL, rubbish and recycling bin charges, utilities (including scheme water, electricity and gas) and minimum level of service statutory compliance testing (including RCD, DFES and pest inspection fees and charges), applicable to the Premises.
- 1.7. **Insurance:** the Tenant to maintain a public liability insurance policy for not less than \$20million per one claim, in respect of the Tenant's use and occupation of the Premises and car park.  
  
The Tenant to reimburse the City for the building insurance premium payable in regard to all buildings, structures and improvements within the Premises area. If the Tenant requests the City make a claim on the Tenant's behalf (under the building insurance policy) the City may require the Tenant to pay any excess payable in respect to that claim.
- 1.8. **Repair/maintenance:** the Tenant is responsible for:
  - (a) general minor maintenance of premises which includes replacement of fittings and fixtures including light globes and taps;
  - (b) re-painting of painted surfaces within the premises to ensure they remain in good repair; and
  - (c) cleaning (including carpets annually),
 see the maintenance schedule at **Attachment 3** for more information.
- 1.9. **Capital upgrades:** The Tenant is responsible for capital upgrade and capital expansion of all assets within the leased or licenced area and the maintenance of the Premises fit-out.
- 1.10. **Inspections:** The City will inspect the premises annually or as required.
- 1.11. **Responsibilities of the City:** The City is responsible for maintenance of roofing and main structure of the Premises (unless the damage is caused by the tenant) and the capital renewal and upgrade of existing assets at the City's discretion.
- 1.12. **Special Condition:** Car park licence
  - (a) The City grants the Tenant a licence to use:
    - (i) ten (10) car bays at the Premises for the Tenant's employees

parking (Staff Car Bays); and

- (ii) five (5) car bays at the Premises for tenant visitor car parking (Visitor Car Bays),

as identified on the Premises plan (Licensed Area) between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:30pm Monday to Friday for the duration of the Term and at no extra cost to the Tenant (Licence).

- (b) A valid parking permit must be displayed in the front windscreen of all tenant employees' cars using the Staff Car Bays.
- (c) A three-hour time limit applies to the Visitor Car Bays at all times.
- (d) The Tenant must at all times keep and maintain the Licensed Area free of litter and in particular oil spillage or leakage and in a reasonable state of cleanliness.
- (e) The Tenant indemnifies the City from and against all losses arising from damage to any property or the death of or injury to any person caused by:
  - (i) the Tenant or the Tenant's employees and visitors in a vehicle while on the Licensed Area; or
  - (ii) the use of the Licensed Area by the Tenant or the tenant's employees and visitors,

except to the extent that the loss or damage is caused or contributed to by the City or the City's employees, agents or contractors.

- (f) The Tenant must ensure its public liability insurance policy extends to cover public liability resulting from the use by the Tenant and the Tenant's employees and visitors of the Licensed Area.
- (g) The Licence will come to an end upon the expiry or determination of this Lease.

2. **Subject to final satisfactory negotiations being carried out by the Chief Executive Officer, AUTHORISES the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to affix the common seal and execute the lease in recommendation 1. above.**

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

On the maintenance obligations table, are these standard obligations in line with Property Management Framework?

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

Volleyball WA is State level sporting association, a category 3 tenant under the PMF. Category 3 tenant leases are subject to negotiation between the parties. The PMF reflects this by providing scope for negotiation of lease terms, options, rent and tenant responsibilities. The proposed maintenance schedule takes into account the age and condition of the premises along with the tenant's obligations under its current lease. As stated in the Legal/Policy section, the proposed lease terms are consistent with the PMF.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Does Volleyball WA want a longer lease?

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

Volleyball WA suggested a 2-year initial term with two further 2-year option terms to provide the Association with more flexibility. In light of the age of the premises and the Sport and Recreation Facilities Plan, the proposed term and option terms were considered suitable by Administration.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

The courts and use of the courts, do we have Health Check information?

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

A copy of Volleyball WA's 2020 Health Check has been attached to the report.

**CR FOTAKIS:**

The possible replacement of garage due to significant crack in shed wall, undue impact on tenant if we determine that it is not possible for the tenant to continue using the shed?

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

During lease negotiations, Volleyball WA expressed its concern about the shed and the City's position that if it becomes unsafe the Association would be unable to use it. We advised the Association that if the garage does become structurally unsound or is determined to no longer be safe for use, the cost of demolishing the garage versus the cost of structural repairs will be considered before any action is taken. If the cost of demolishing the garage is less than undertaking repairs, this would be the City's preferred course of action. We recommended that the Association consider other leasing or storage arrangements if the garage was crucial to its operation. The Association chose to proceed with lease negotiations. For the avoidance of doubt, the report has been amended to include a special condition in regard to the possible demolition of the garage and no compensation or rent abatement being payable to the Association in such a scenario.

**CR TOPELBERG:**

Is there a reason why we haven't received a business case to just lease out the car bays and leave the offices vacant, if the intent is to not charge for the car bays is that in the financial interest of the City? Commercial value of car bays at this car park?

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

The car bay licence to Volleyball WA reflects the historical lease terms. Under their current lease, Volleyball WA does not pay to use the 10 staff car bays or the 5 visitor bays. Using the not-for-profit parking permit rate (below), the charge for 10 staff bays for this site would be \$10,200 per annum. The market for leasing/licensing these car bays for use by parties other than tenants on the site is unknown as no valuation has been undertaken. The car parking permit fees, under the City's current Schedule of Fees and Charges, are as follows:

Parking Permits	Not for Profit	\$85.00 per month
Parking Permits	Trades	\$145.00 per month
Commercial parking permits	all other areas	\$1,736.00 per annum

Royal Park Hall is one of the City's community facilities that is available for hire. The car park is, therefore, frequently used by casual hirers of the Hall. There is some street parking available nearby but the situation of the Hall on the corner of a busy intersection makes access (other than from the car park) more difficult. Leasing or granting permits to use a set number of the car bays at the car park may be feasible but consideration of use by casual hirers and the resources to attend and enforce parking compliance would be necessary.

**CR TOPELBERG:**

Conclusion of report, market valuation received but recommendation is to only charge for the offices. Any other consideration of use of the land by alternative tenants/parties?

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

We have not considered alternative tenants to lease the office premises or courts. To make full use of the offices and courts, another volleyball club would need to be approached and it is unlikely a smaller club would require office space. The market for office space is competitive with high vacancy rates in both West Perth and the City. While it is possible that an alternative tenant can be located for the office premises, there is no guarantee that the City could charge full market rent for this space. It is also unlikely another tenant would be willing to sign up to only a 2 + 2 year lease.

**CR TOPELBERG:**

Could you provide data regarding expenditure by Volleyball WA to create courts and the amount of City of Vincent residents who use the courts/facilities?

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

Volleyball WA has confirmed that it received a CSRFF grant in 1999 of \$240,000, which comprised \$80,000 from the City, \$80,000 from CSRFF and \$80,000 from Volleyball WA. This covered the complete refurbishment of the office space and also the installation of the beach courts. In order to provide its contribution, Volleyball WA obtained a loan in the amount of \$79,200 from the City in August 1999 and repayments were completed in 2008.

Volleyball WA has a total of 79 (out of 365) members who are City residents. More details around use of the

premises and courts has been included in the report.

**8.3 RESULTS OF CONSULTATION - PROPOSAL FOR A COMMERCIAL KIOSK AT HYDE PARK**

- Attachments:**
1. Summary Diagrams of Hyde Park Kiosk Consultation Results
  2. Detail of Hyde Park Kiosk Consultation Results
  3. Community Consultation Additional Comments

**RECOMMENDATION:****That Council:**

1. **NOTES** the results of the consultation on the proposal to install a commercial kiosk at Hyde Park, as summarised at Attachment 2;
2. **APPROVES** the conversion of the storage shed in the western corner of Hyde Park to a commercial kiosk subject to compliance with the public tender requirements in section 3.58(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995*;
3. **INVITES** public tender submissions for the operation of the commercial kiosk for a period of 4 weeks;
4. **NOTES** that the public tender submissions will be assessed and presented to Council for a decision on the operation of the commercial kiosk; and
5. **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer to provide advice to Council on the future operation of food vans within Hyde Park in the same report responding to Recommendation 4 above with advice on the nature of the preferred proposal for a potential commercial kiosk. This advice should consider whether the preferred commercial kiosk proposal should have exclusive use of Hyde Park or be in addition to the operation of food vans. If food vans are recommended to continue in Hyde Park then further advice should be provided on:
  - 5.1 Locations of existing power sources and potential locations of new power sources;
  - 5.2 Preferred trading locations for any mobile food vendors, considering proximity to other infrastructure such as amenities;
  - 5.3 Annual fees for mobile food vending permits;
  - 5.4 Vehicular access to trading locations; and
  - 5.5 Other factors that could impact the implementation of Policy No. 3.8.12 – Mobile Food Vendors.

**CR GONTASZEWSKI:**

Can the advice from the Department of Lands on the consistency of the commercial kiosk with the management plan be provided to Council Members?

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

This will be circulated once it is received.

**CR CASTLE:**

Is the proposal in line with the Conservation Plan in 2003?

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

It is proposed that tenderers address compliance with the Conservation Plan as part of their tender proposal. Tenders that do not align with the Conservation Plan can be discounted from the tender process. The report has been updated to clarify.

**CR HALLETT:**

How can vendor ensure only healthy food is provided? Public Health outcomes in the report saying 'if the operator provides healthy food...' doesn't create confidence, how do we ensure this?

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

If the kiosk proposal proceeds, the lease will be a retail shop lease and the requirements of *Commercial Tenancy (Retail Shops) Agreements Act 1985* will apply. As a result, prohibiting the kiosk operator from selling 'unhealthy' food is not advisable as it may affect the profitability of the kiosk. The City can request that the tender applicants provide a plan for the provision of healthy foods and encourage the chosen operator to adhere to this plan. However, enforcing the plan is unlikely to be possible, particularly if the operator believes its profitability has or will be affected.

The Expression of Interest would include criteria relating to the healthy eating deliverable 5.1 of the Public Health Plan – '*Increase healthy food and drink options at City venues, public open spaces, festivals and community activities*'.

**CR HALLETT:**

Modelling or forecasting on whether kiosk will bring more people to the park and effect on rubbish and parking?

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

No modelling has been conducted. One of the proposed tender requirements is that the applicants provide a plan for managing rubbish, parking and customers (i.e. foot traffic). Waste services already access the Park to remove rubbish, it is anticipated that waste removal for the kiosk would use the same access ways.

**CR HALLETT:**

Sustainability, how can this item contribute to our sustainability outcomes?

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

The report has been updated under this section.

**CR LODEN:**

Concern was raised tonight that the que of people and provision of waste services would compact the ground and impact the trees. Can these impacts be mitigated through management?

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

One of the proposed tender requirements is that the applicants provide a plan for managing rubbish, parking and customers (i.e. foot traffic). A business case for the operation of the kiosk (or alternative business) including forecast customer numbers, receiving/managing stock deliveries and access requirements may be required in order for Administration and Council to determine the likely effect of the business on the surrounding area. Waste services already access the Park to remove rubbish, it is anticipated that waste removal for the kiosk would use the same access points.

The park is already serviced by a waste compactor truck which operates around the perimeter of the park on asphalt paths picking up existing waste and recycling bins.

As long as the waste truck remains on existing hardstand paths, Administration does not see that there will be any increased tree root compaction or associated decline in tree health.

Whilst pedestrian traffic could lead to compaction of turfed and garden areas, there is an existing concrete apron and pedestrian paths around and leading up to the proposed kiosk site that would cater for the majority of patrons which could be considered an improvement in comparison to the situation with food vans. Therefore, Administration does not envisage any major issue from this perspective and one that could be easily managed with additional aeration of turfed areas via a coring machine or verti-drained, if required.

**8.4 REPORT AND MINUTES OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4 MAY 2021 – 8:23**

- Attachments:**
1. **Audit Committee Meeting Minutes - 4 May 2021**
  2. **Attachments to Audit Committee Minutes - 4 May 2021**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That Council:**

1. **RECEIVES** the City's Corporate Risk Register as at 8 October 2020; and
2. **APPROVES** the proposed risk management actions for the high and extreme risks, noting the suggested amendment that the City undertake a reassessment of the risks associated with the 3 grandstand structures (Leederville Oval, Litis Stadium and Beatty Park) using the broader consequence types, specifically to include people (safety) and reputation and present the findings to the next Audit Committee meeting; and
3. **NOTES** the proposed amendments to the City's Risk Management Policy, which will be subject to public notice and formal adoption by Council and **NOTES** that the Risk Management Policy and Procedure report was deferred to the next Audit Committee meeting;
4. **APPROVES** the Internal Audit Program 2021/22 – 2023/24 (noting the amendment) and **NOTES** that the Chief Executive Officer will engage a suitably qualified auditor to undertake the audits in accordance with the Internal Audit Program 2021/22 – 2023/24.
5. **NOTES** the findings from Office of the Auditor General's Application Controls Audit 2021;
6. **NOTES:**
  1. the status of the City's Audit Log as at 27 April 2021, at Attachment 1 and as summarised in the table below;
  2. **NOTES** that the completion date for the below items was previously extended:
    - 2.1 **EA:2020/10 (1) (a) and (b) Office of the Auditor General Information Systems Audit – Confidential – extended from February 2021 to August 2021 and now on track for completion;**
    - 2.2 **EA:2020/10 (11) Office of the Auditor General Information Systems Audit – Confidential – extended from January 2021 to August 2021 and now on track for completion; and**
    - 2.3 **EA:2020/10 (12) Office of the Auditor General Information Systems Audit – Confidential – extended from February 2021 to December 2021, as it has been planned as a staged approach.**
  3. **APPROVES** the amendment to the proposed completion date for the following items:
    - 3.1 **EA:2019/7 Office of the Auditor General's Performance Audit 2019 - Fraud Prevention in Local Government - Findings and Recommendations – was proposed for closure at the 2 March 2021 meeting but reinstated until training has been completed. Due for completion May 2021; and**
    - 3.2 **EA:2020/10 (20) Office of the Auditor General Information Systems Audit – Business Continuity Plan – Testing was extended from March 2021 to April 2021 and now on track for completion.**

<b>NO QUESTIONS</b>
---------------------

**8.5 INFORMATION BULLETIN – 8:24**

- Attachments:**
1. Unconfirmed Minutes Arts Advisory Group (AAG) 7 April 2021
  2. Unconfirmed Minutes Children and Young People's Advisory Group 21 April 2021
  3. Unconfirmed Minutes of Tamala Park Regional Council Meeting held on 15 April 2021
  4. Unconfirmed Minutes of Mindarie Regional Council Special Meeting held on 29 April 2021
  5. Director General signed Endorsement letter - City of Vincent's Waste Plan - 2021
  6. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at April 2021
  7. Quarterly Street Tree Removal Information
  8. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
  9. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress report as at 29 April 2021
  10. Register of Applications Referred to the MetroWest Development Assessment Panel - Current
  11. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current
  12. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - April 2021
  13. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - April 2021
  14. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - April 2021

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated May 2021.

<b>NO QUESTIONS:</b>
----------------------

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

Nil

**10 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES**

Nil

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

Nil

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8:45pm.