

minutes

Major Projects Committee

MEETING HELD ON **MONDAY 17 JULY 2017**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item No.	Title	Page No.
	Declaration of Opening	3
	Declarations of Interest	4
	Apologies/Leave of absence	4
	Confirmation of Minutes	4
	Announcements by the Presiding Member without discussion	5
	Identification of matters for which the meeting may be closed to the public	5
	Petitions and deputations	5
	Reports	6
1	Ocean Reef Marina Project Status	6
2	Optimisation of the City's Administration Building	15
3	Confidential – Joondalup City Centre Development – Project Status	29
4	Confidential – Joondalup City Centre Development – Considerations for the Development of the Hotel Site	30
	Urgent Business	32
	Motions of which previous notice has been given	32
	Requests for Reports for future consideration	32
	Closure	32

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF THE MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON MONDAY 17 JULY 2017.

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members

Mayor Troy Pickard	<i>Presiding Member</i>
Cr Kerry Hollywood	<i>Deputy Presiding Member</i>
Cr Nige Jones	
Cr Liam Gobbert	
Cr John Chester	
Cr Russ Fishwick, JP	

Observers

Cr Philippa Taylor
Cr Tom McLean, JP

Officers

Mr Garry Hunt	Chief Executive Officer
Ms Dale Page	Director Planning and Community Development
Mr Blignault Olivier	Manager City Projects
Mr John Byrne	Acting Manager Governance
Mrs Genevieve Hunter	Senior Project Officer
Mrs Lesley Taylor	Governance Officer

Guest

Mr Simon Moen Technical Advisor, Partner - Jackson McDonald Lawyers

DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 5.52pm.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil.

APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**Apology**

Cr Mike Norman.

Leave of Absence previously approved

Cr Sophie Dwyer	1 July to 17 July 2017 inclusive;
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	14 July to 21 August 2017 inclusive;
Cr Sophie Dwyer	23 September to 8 October 2017 inclusive.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**MINUTES OF THE MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 8 MAY 2017**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Major Projects Committee held on 8 May 2017 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 JUNE 2017

That the minutes of the special meeting of the Major Projects Committee held on 7 June 2017 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**MINUTES OF THE MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 8 MAY 2017 AND
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 JUNE 2017**

MOVED Mayor Pickard, **SECONDED** Cr Hollywood that the minutes of the following meetings of the Major Projects Committee be **CONFIRMED** as a true and correct record:

- 1 Ordinary meeting of the Major Projects Committee held on 8 May 2017;**
- 2 Special meeting of the Major Projects Committee held on 7 June 2017.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (6/0)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hollywood and Jones.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil.

IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Clause 5.2 of the City's *Meeting Procedures Local Law 2013*, this meeting was not open to the public.

PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

REPORTS**ITEM 1 OCEAN REEF MARINA PROJECT STATUS**

WARD	North Central
RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR	Mr Garry Hunt Office of the CEO
FILE NUMBER	04171, 101515
ATTACHMENTS	Attachment 1 Summary of Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1270/41 submissions Attachment 2 Indicative Approvals Timelines as at June 2017
AUTHORITY / DISCRETION	Executive – The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council, such as adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.

PURPOSE

For Council to note the progress on the Ocean Reef Marina project and consider requesting the Chief Executive Officer to engage with the State Government and LandCorp on the on-going involvement of the City in the project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To progress the approval of the Ocean Reef Marina project, the following activities and tasks were undertaken since the previous project status report was considered by the Major Projects Committee at its meeting held on 8 May 2017.

- 1 Finalisation of the responses to comments received on the draft preliminary *Ocean Reef Marina Structure Plan* (Ocean Reef Marina SP).
- 2 Finalisation of the responses to comments received on the draft Negotiated Planning Outcome for Bush Forever (NPO).
- 3 Preparation of draft responses to submissions received by the Department of Planning (DoP) on MRS Amendment 1270/41 – Ocean Reef Marina Redevelopment (Attachment 1 refers).
- 4 Continued preparation of responses to submissions received by the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority (OEPA) on the Public Environmental Review (PER) document and appendices.
- 5 Engagement with the State Government, through LandCorp, regarding proponentcy.

Details of the above are provided in this Report.

As far as possible the project is progressing in accordance with the Ocean Reef Marina Indicative Approvals Timeline updated as at June 2017 (Attachment 2 refers).

It is therefore recommended that Council:

- 1 *NOTES the Ocean Reef Marina Project Status Report;*
- 2 *NOTES that the City understands that a decision on State Government / LandCorp proponentcy for, and implementation of, the Ocean Reef Marina will not be made by the State Government until after the State Budget is handed down in September 2017;*
- 3 *Subject to the State Government deciding to assume the role of proponent for the Ocean Reef Marina and implementing the project, REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to engage with the State Government and LandCorp in relation to the City's on-going role in the delivery of the project and the future management and operational options for the Ocean Reef Marina.*

BACKGROUND

1 Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1270/41

The City lodged the Ocean Reef Marina MRS Amendment request with the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in April 2014 and the MRS Amendment 1270/41 was initiated by the WAPC in June 2014.

The MRS Amendment Report, prepared by the DoP was advertised for public comment from 22 November 2016 to 24 February 2017 (as approved by the Minister for Planning).

2 Draft Negotiated Planning Outcome for Bush Forever

The WAPC requires that an NPO be agreed to by the DoP, Department of Parks and Wildlife (Parks and Wildlife) and the OEPA prior to the finalisation of MRS Amendment 1270/41. This includes a legal agreement between the State of WA and the City (or the proponent at the time the agreement is finalised) to ensure the obligations and agreements contained within the NPO are implemented.

It should be noted that funding for the land acquisition and rehabilitation portions of the NPO will be the responsibility of the ultimate proponent for the project.

The DoP, Parks and Wildlife and OEPA formally provided in-principle support for the draft NPO and it was agreed that the draft NPO would be made available for public review concurrently with the MRS Amendment report and PER documents (22 November 2016 to 24 February 2017).

The information contained within the draft NPO is particularly pertinent to the MRS Amendment and it was considered appropriate that all possible information on the planning process be made available at the same time.

3 Public Environmental Review

Occurring in parallel with the MRS Amendment, the marine based components of the Ocean Reef Marina project are being assessed by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* via a PER – the highest level of assessment.

Following completion of the required investigations / studies and various amendments to the documents, the PER document and appendices were approved for release for public review in October 2016. The PER documents were advertised for public comment from 22 November 2016 to 24 February 2017, concurrently with MRS Amendment 1270/41.

4 Ocean Reef Marina Structure Plan

It was considered desirable that the draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina SP be released for the public to view and provide informal comments concurrently with the PER, MRS Amendment 1270/41 and the draft NPO. Much of the information contained within the plan is particularly relevant to the MRS Amendment and NPO and providing the draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina SP to the community would ensure that all possible information on the planning process was available.

Once finalised and formally submitted to Council for consideration, the Ocean Reef Marina SP will be formally advertised for public comment as required under *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Structure Plan Framework*. However this can only occur following finalisation of the MRS Amendment process as noted by the Major Projects Committee at its meeting held on 28 November 2016.

5 State Government Proponency

Following a review of the concept plan and feasibility by LandCorp, in September 2016 the former State Government announced that it would assume the lead role for the project and a detailed business case and Cabinet Submission was prepared for consideration.

As part of the campaigning for the State Election held on 11 March 2017, both major political parties made a financial commitment to the Ocean Reef Marina Development (State Labor Party - \$40 million; State Liberal Party - \$105 million).

DETAILS

1 Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1270/41

MRS Amendment 1270/41 was formally advertised for public submissions on 22 November 2016. The amendment report was available to the community via the DoP website. The City's website provided detailed information on the submission process with links directly to the document.

The DoP provided the City with a summary of the submissions received on 15 May 2017. In accordance with the relevant process, the full submissions will not be provided to the City and the summary does not contain identifying information on submitters.

A total of 94 submissions were received as follows:

- Support 39
- Objection 33
- Comment 22

A total of 14 requests for hearings were received (including the City's). A hearing can either be closed or open to the public and provides 'submitters' the opportunity to present their submissions to the WAPC.

The DoP has advised the City that neither the hearings nor the decision on MRS Amendment 1270/41 will take place until the marine environmental assessment process has been significantly progressed. This ensures that any minor boundary changes arising from approval conditions and the approval conditions themselves can be taken into consideration prior to a final decision on the amendment.

The summary of the submissions is provided to the City for consideration and comment and the summary prepared by the DoP has been further summarised and is provided, together with the City's preliminary comments, as Attachment 1 to this Report.

It should be noted that a number of State Government agencies and organisations provided submissions on MRS Amendment 1270/41 but raised no objections, provided no comment or only general comments that relate to the subsequent more detailed stages of the planning and development process.

In collaboration with consultants Taylor Burrell Barnett, Strategen and MP Rogers & Associates, the responses will be finalised and forwarded to the DoP for consideration.

2 Draft Negotiated Planning Outcome for Bush Forever

As previously reported (Major Projects Committee, 8 May 2017, Item 1), the City directly received four submissions on the draft NPO. A further three submissions received for the PER included commentary regarding the NPO and were therefore recorded as NPO submissions.

In collaboration with consultants Taylor Burrell Barnett and Strategen responses to the submissions were prepared and forwarded to the DoP, Parks and Wildlife and OEPA for review / input. Further, given that the ultimate proponent for the project is likely to be LandCorp, the responses were also provided for input / approval to publish.

Where identifying information was provided, the submitters were notified that responses to the draft NPO submissions are now available on the City's Ocean Reef Marina webpage.

In collaboration with LandCorp, the draft NPO, together with a legal agreement between the State of Western Australia and the City of Joondalup, can now be finalised for approval by the relevant authorities. The inclusion of suggestions / comments made by the community during the public advertising will be considered during the finalisation of the NPO.

It should be noted, that the important requirements of the legal agreement are the transference of the NPO responsibilities and obligations to the ultimate proponent as well as the responsibilities and obligations of all parties, including the City, in ensuring the NPO is implemented if MRS Amendment 1270/41 is approved and gazetted.

3 Public Environmental Review

With substantial input from consultants Strategen and MP Rogers & Associates, preparation of the required responses to the PER has commenced. It is anticipated that the City and the consultant team will meet with officers from the OEPA and other relevant agencies to review the draft responses.

The submissions received from the relevant agencies were complex and technical and it is considered vital that the City engage with these agencies to ensure that the additional information provided addresses the issues raised.

Once finalised, the responses will be formally submitted to the OEPA for consideration and if considered adequate, the formal assessment process of the marine components of the Ocean Reef Marina can commence.

4 Draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina Structure Plan

A total of 21 submissions were received on the draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina SP. This figure includes PER submissions that contained specific comment on the plan and therefore counted as Ocean Reef Marina SP submissions.

As recommended by the Major Projects Committee, at its meeting held on 16 May 2017 (CJ079-05/17 refers), it was agreed that Council:

“2 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to respond to submissions received by the City on the draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina Structure Plan following consultation with Taylor Burrell Barnett and Strategen.”

As requested above, responses to the submissions were prepared and finalised following input / feedback from LandCorp.

Where identifying information was provided, the submitters were notified that responses to the draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina SP submissions are now available on the City's Ocean Reef Marina webpage.

Where the consultants recommend amendments to the contents of the Ocean Reef Marina SP, arising from submissions, these will be considered during the finalisation of the plan and in consultation with the DoP.

Formal consideration by Council of the final Ocean Reef Marina SP can only occur following finalisation of the MRS Amendment process and the amendment of the City's district boundary. The Ocean Reef Marina SP will be formally advertised for public comment as required under the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Structure Plan Framework*.

5 State Government Proponency

Following the election of a Mark McGowan led State Labor Government on 11 March 2017, LandCorp advised the City that briefings had been provided to the new Minister for Planning, Hon Rita Saffioti, MLA. The Minister requested a Cabinet

Submission, based on the LandCorp prepared Business Case for the development which the City understands has been completed.

LandCorp also briefed the local member for Joondalup on a variety of LandCorp projects with emphasis on the Ocean Reef Marina project.

The City understands that a decision on whether the State Government (through LandCorp) will assume the role of proponent to implement the project will not be made under after the State Budget is handed down in September 2017.

Therefore it is anticipated that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) endorsed by Council at its meeting held on 20 September 2016 (CJ151-09/16 refers), or an amended MOU and / or other appropriate formal agreement/s will not be negotiated until after the decision is made.

It is also anticipated that the City's on-going role and responsibilities for the project, both pre and post-construction, will be the subject on on-going engagement with the State Government and LandCorp. The establishment of a "project committee" (with representation by the City) to oversee progression of the project could also be a consideration, subject to discussions with the State Government and LandCorp.

Issues and options considered

Not applicable.

Legislation / Strategic Community Plan / policy implications

Legislation

The City is governed by the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1995* in relation to dealings involving commercial undertakings and land development.

Other applicable legislation includes:

- *Planning and Development Act 2005.*
- *Environmental Protection Act 1986.*
- *Environmental Protection, Biodiversity and Conservation Act 1999 (Cwlth).*

The approvals for the development are influenced by State Planning and Development Control policies:

- 2.6: *State Coastal Planning Policy.*
- 2.8: *Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region.*
- 3.7: *Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas.*
- 1.8: *Canal Estates and Artificial Water Developments.*

Strategic Community Plan

Key theme

Economic Prosperity, Vibrancy and Growth.

Objective

Destination City.

- Strategic initiative**
- Facilitate the establishment of major tourism infrastructure.
 - Encourage diverse accommodation options.

Policy Not applicable.

Risk management considerations

The City has amassed a substantial amount of information on all aspects of the project over a number of years. This information together with that compiled for both the planning and environmental assessment documentation ensured that the City was well positioned to respond to the requirements of the relevant approvals processes, including providing adequate responses to submissions on the PER and MRS Amendment 1270/41.

Throughout the planning and environmental assessment phase the City is continuing to engage with the relevant decision-making agencies regarding the investigations undertaken, the outcomes and the agency requirements with regard to the contents of the assessment documentation and responses to submissions.

The Ocean Reef Marina Risk Management Assessment is continuously updated taking cognisance of the environmental and planning approval requirements.

It is also anticipated that the detailed and comprehensive business case, prepared by LandCorp with assistance from the City, will enable further risk management considerations to be identified, mitigated and/or managed.

Financial / budget implications

2016-17 financial year impact

Account no.	C1001
Budget Item	Ocean Reef Marina.
Budget amount	\$ 882,313
Amount spent to date	\$ 531,421
Balance	\$ 350,892

Note: The 2016-17 approved budget includes income of \$500,000 (State Government financial contribution) which has yet to be received.

Total Project Expenditure (as at 31 May 2017)

2007-08	\$ 133,241
2008-09	\$ 968,284
2009-10	\$ 266,604
2010-11	\$ 325,046
2011-12	\$ 388,552
2012-13	\$ 376,393
2013-14	\$ 838,371
2014-15	\$1,314,917
2015-16	\$1,163,151
2016-17	\$ 570,139
LESS Grants Received	<u>\$ (785,500)</u>
Total City Expenditure	\$5,559,197

2017-18 financial year impact

Account no.	C1001
Budget Item	Ocean Reef Marina.
Approved budget	\$ 163,785

Note: It is anticipated that any remaining funds from the 2016-17 budget (including the \$500,000 State Government financial contribution) will be carried forward to enable the necessary tasks / actions required for finalisation of the planning and environmental approvals process to be completed.

Annual operating cost The relevant business case/s, as far as possible, will include anticipated on-going operating costs.

Estimated annual income The relevant business case/s, as far as possible, will include estimated annual income.

Capital replacement Detailed analysis will be required at the appropriate stage of the project.

20 Year Strategic Financial Plan impact The City's *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan 2015-16 to 2034-35* includes \$2,070,000 which represents capital expenditure for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 financial years. Further analysis of the impact on the *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan* will be undertaken at the appropriate stage of the project.

Impact year 2016-17.

All amounts quoted in this report are exclusive of GST.

Regional significance

The Ocean Reef Marina development will become a significant tourist / visitor destination and a key focal point within the northern Perth corridor.

Sustainability implications

Progression of the Ocean Reef Marina planning process required a number of studies / reports addressing key issues pertaining to sustainability (such as social and economic impact and environmental sustainability). Various management plans were required to be prepared as part of the MRS amendment, NPO, PER and structure plan processes and it is highly likely that further management plans will be required as conditions of any environmental and planning approval.

Consultation

Extensive on-going consultation with key stakeholders, State Government departments and agencies has been undertaken to ensure the relevant approvals processes proceed in accordance with expectations and agreed timelines.

While not a statutory requirement, the City invited comments on the draft NPO and draft preliminary Ocean Reef Marina SP during the public advertising of the MRS Amendment and PER. The comments during this community consultation process will be considered during the finalisation of both documents.

Should the State Government decide to assume the role of proponent and implement the project, it will be necessary for the City to engage with the State Government and LandCorp in relation to the City's on-going involvement in the project. Consultation will be required on the City's involvement and responsibilities both pre- and post-construction including the future management and operational options for the Ocean Reef Marina.

COMMENT

Not applicable.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

MOVED Cr Gobbert, SECONDED Cr Hollywood that Council:

- 1 NOTES the Ocean Reef Marina Project Status Report;**
- 2 NOTES that the City understands that a decision on State Government / LandCorp proponency for, and implementation of, the Ocean Reef Marina will not be made by the State Government until after the State Budget is handed down in September 2017;**
- 3 Subject to the State Government deciding to assume the role of proponent for the Ocean Reef Marina and implementing the project, REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to engage with the State Government and LandCorp in relation to the City's on-going role in the delivery of the project and the future management and operational options for the Ocean Reef Marina.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (6/0)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hollywood and Jones.

Appendix 1 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1MPC170717.pdf](#)

ITEM 2 OPTIMISATION OF THE CITY'S ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

WARD	North
RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR	Mr Garry Hunt Office of the CEO
FILE NUMBER	103036, 101515
ATTACHMENTS	Nil
AUTHORITY / DISCRETION	Executive - The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council, such as adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.

PURPOSE

For Council to note the outcome the investigations undertaken on the City of Joondalup Administration building (Administration building) and to consider the options available for the optimisation of the building.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting held on 27 July 2015, it was agreed that the former Office Development Committee:

“REQUESTS a report be presented to Council considering the options for the potential redevelopment of the City’s Administration Centre, 90 Boas Avenue, Joondalup, including but not limited to:

- 1 demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site for the City administrative operations plus other commercial activities;*
- 2 refurbishment of the existing building such that the building’s external features and façade complement the components and building form of the Boas Place Concept Plan;*
- 3 demolition of the existing building with the relocation of the City’s administrative operations to another location within the Boas Place Concept Plan.*

To facilitate the above, a multi-disciplined consultant team, led by Arup, was engaged to explore the options available for the optimisation of the Administration building.

The investigations were undertaken taking into consideration the Joondalup City Centre Development (Boas Place). The proposed refurbishment uses and / or other options investigated by the consultant team are consistent with the City’s strategic vision and draft design guidelines for Boas Place.

The consultant team collated and reviewed relevant background information and documentation and used this in conjunction with a site inspection to carry out an assessment of the existing building to determine its condition from a structural, building services and compliance perspective.

Based on known constraints and opportunities, the consultant team identified potential options for further consideration with the following options investigated further:

- 1 Do nothing.
- 2 Demolish the building and sell the land for development as part of Boas Place.
- 3 Refurbishment of the building for other uses (hotel, residential apartments and purpose built student accommodation).

The administration building was opened in 1979 and the investigations established that the building is reaching the end of its serviceable life. There are also pressures on the existing space to house the City's administrative operations within the current configuration of the building.

It is anticipated that significant investment will be required to refit existing building services and equipment to keep the building operational and meeting the minimum code requirements due to the age of the building and its services.

This report presents a summary of outcomes of the investigations undertaken by the consultant team and outlines the identified options with regard to the optimisation of the administration building.

It is therefore recommended that Council:

- 1 *NOTES the Optimisation of the City's Administration building report;*
- 2 *REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to undertake further investigations into the residual capacity of the City's administration building to allow for additional floors to be constructed;*
- 3 *REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to assess the City's current and future utilisation of the City's administration building and investigate the maximisation of existing space to accommodate the City's administrative operation in the short, medium and long-term.*

BACKGROUND

The City's vision for Boas Place is the creation of a modern, vibrant "City Centre" which will cement Joondalup as the capital of the fast growing north metropolitan region of Perth. In identifying the components required to ensure the success of the development, investigations into the optimisation of the City's administration building were considered appropriate.

The Boas Place project identifies that, in the short to medium-term, the administration building would be retained in its current location. However, the administration building is aging (opened in 1979) and the level and amount of accommodation provided may no longer suit the City's needs in the medium to long-term.

Through the progression of the Boas Place project, it has been identified that the demand for A Grade office accommodation away from the Perth CBD is declining. The identification of an anchor tenant for the Boas Place office building is considered a catalyst for the entire development and the potential exists for the City to occupy the office building as the anchor tenant.

The investigations undertaken include consideration of the potential options as proposed in the former Office Development Committee's request (at its meeting held on 27 July 2015) as well as other identified options. The outcome of the investigations will assist in the identification of optimum solutions for the short, medium and long-term use of the City's administration building and its place within the Boas Place development.

DETAILS

Heritage value of the City's Administration building

The assessment of the administration building and its potential future uses did not consider its heritage value. The administration building was one of the first buildings constructed in Joondalup City Centre and as such may have heritage and historical value. Construction on the building commenced in 1978 and it was opened on 1 December 1979. The second major development in Joondalup City Centre was the Wanneroo Hospital (now Joondalup Health Campus) which was opened in August 1980.

The site of the administration building, the timing of construction and other matters were quite contentious at the time. As such, the administration building may be considered of significant historical value to the community.

Prior to a decision being made on demolition or major external refurbishment, it is recommended that a detailed heritage and historical investigation be undertaken.

Administration building assessment

A multi-disciplined consultant team, lead by Arup, undertook the following assessment of the City's administration building:

- 1 Asset condition – building services.
- 2 Asset condition – structure engineering.
- 3 National Construction Code (NCC) Audit.
- 4 Lettable area.
- 5 Valuation.

The assessment was carried out subject to the following limitations:

- No existing fittings, cladding, wall or floor finishes, covers or similar were removed as part of the inspection.
- The building was occupied and operational at the time of inspection.
- No calculations or assessments were undertaken to assess the adequacy of the design of the existing services or their compliance with relevant or current codes.
- No assessment was made regarding hazardous materials.

The consultant team provided the following summary and recommendations based on the administration building assessment.

While the overall structure of the building appears to be in good condition for its age, the visual inspection uncovered some building services and compliance issues that require attention. The consultant team recommended that if the building was to remain in use in its current configuration the items outlined below should be addressed as a priority to ensure a safe and comfortable work environment for both staff and visitors.

- 1 Building Services: While there is no requirement to update building services infrastructure as codes and standards evolve, all new works or refurbishment works must be undertaken in line with current standards. During the site visit, it was observed that a significant quantity of the services infrastructure is aging and will require replacement in the near future.

It was suggested that the following items be addressed in the term short:

- Replacement of all final circuit distribution boards and circuit protective devices.
 - Provision of additional emergency lighting and escape signage to meet code requirements.
 - Provision of additional smoke detectors and fire alarm sounders to meet code requirements.
 - Undertake a flow and pressure test on the hydrant system to discern whether the most remote hydrant achieves 20 L/s at 700kPa.
- 2 NCC Compliance: The building compliance audit identified a number of key building compliance aspects that were considered should be addressed / actioned immediately. Of those compliance aspects identified, the following have been actioned:
 - Relocate stored goods and remove storage cages from fire isolated stairways.
 - Provide smoke lobbies to entry doors to the fire stairway at ground level. Alternatively, provide smoke seals to the doorways leading into the fire isolated corridor.
 - Install emergency lighting and exit signage to enclosed external areas to Levels 1 and 2. Review directional signage within each level and install additional signs to appropriately identify paths of egress to exits.
 - Increase the height of the balustrade on Level 3 to a least 1.0 metre above finished floor level.
 - Review location of control buttons to automatic opening doors and relocate to achieve compliance.
 - Install 'FIRE HYDRANT' and 'FIRE HOSE REEL' signage to each hydrant / FHR cupboard within the building.

Further investigations of the other major issues identified are currently being undertaken by the City and will be actioned as appropriate.

- 3 Structural Engineering: The assessment found that overall the structure of the building appears to be in good condition for its age. However, additional investigation and / or remedial work may be required in certain areas to address some of the observations of the visual inspection.

Based on the observations, the consultant team concluded and recommended that the following items be reviewed in the next stage of the project:

- Determination of the structure supporting the edges of the slab on the external edges of the building to determine if the cracking of the brickwork around the columns is significant. This could be achieved by reviewing the original structural drawings (not provided to Arup) or by partial removal of the brickwork on one of the columns to determine if there is a steel column within the brickwork.
 - The structural review of the condition of the Level 3 parapet on the eastern side of the building and the top of the wall at plant level to determine what remedial works are required to repair the existing damage.
 - Removal of the ceiling panels and / or the floor finishes around the sagging Level 2 slab to determine if this sag is structurally significant.
 - Further investigation into the significance of the crack within the western stair case including determining the spanning direction and reinforcement within the stair slab.
- 4 Net Lettable Area (NLA): Based on building plans provided by the City and on-site measurements, the NLA of the administration building is 5,294.2sqm. The NLA includes the areas on the Ground Floor and Level 2 currently occupied by Community Vision.

It should be noted that the assessed lettable area has the potential to be materially affected subject to shared area and common areas being excluded from the adopted NLA.

- 5 Valuation Report: The consultant team provided market valuations for the Administration building based on two scenarios:
- 'As-is' condition (vacant possession) \$ 11.1 million
 - 'As-is' condition subject to a seven year lease to the City \$ 16.5 million

More information on these scenarios is provided in the Issues and Options section of this report.

The valuation report indicated that market value of the land only was between \$900 to \$1,100/sqm which is consistent with the market valuation prepared by McGees Property in December 2016. Taking the lot area from the *Boas Place Concept Plan* (Option 4B) of 1,842sqm, the total land value is estimated at between \$1.66 million and \$2.02 million.

Issues and options considered

As requested by the former Office Development Committee at its meeting held on 27 July 2015, the following options were investigated:

1 **Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site for the City administrative operations plus other commercial activities.**

A full assessment of the City's short, medium and long-term administration space requirements has not been undertaken at this stage. There are currently 420 City officers accommodated in the administration building and for the purposes of cost estimates, an additional 30 officers have been assumed for the City's long-term requirements.

The estimation of the potential cost to construct a new building has been prepared based on the financial modelling undertaken for the City's State Government office accommodation in Joondalup proposal, RBL Quantity Surveyors and other information.

The estimation has assumed a requirement to accommodate 450 'work units' in a new administration building with an area of 15m² of floor space per work unit (as per the *State Government Office Accommodation Master Planning Strategy, 2012*). Based on this requirement the calculation has assumed 6,750 NLA which equates to approximately 8,395 gross floor area @ \$3,231/sqm.

Existing building demolition:	\$ 1.215 million
Construction costs:	27.126 million
Fit out ¹ :	<u>3.500 million</u>
Estimate New Building Cost	\$ 31.841 million

Caution should be exercised when considering the above estimate as it provides a very low degree of certainty. No allowance has been made for the cost of commercial activities within the building.

Disadvantages

- Interim accommodation would need to be sought during the building construction.
- Represents a significant capital cost.
- Potentially volatile commercial market making securing commercial tenants difficult.
- Community opposition given the potential historical and heritage value of the building.

Advantages

- Enables the site to contribute to the strategic vision for Boas Place.
- Provides the opportunity for increased building height and mass.
- Lease / sale of commercial space provides an income to the City.

2 Refurbishment of the existing building such that the building's external features and façade complement the components and building form of the Boas Place Concept Plan.

As previously indicated the building is reaching the end of its serviceable life and there are currently pressures on space to house the City's administrative operations within the building.

As the external refurbishment will require significant expenditure, it is considered appropriate that the City's future needs are carefully considered in any potential refurbishment works.

The City's *Five-Year Capital Works Program* and *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan* provides for the following administration building works:

- \$160,000 over 2016-17 and 2017-18 for the replacement of the cooling towers, motors and pumps.
- \$5,090,000 over 2017-18 and 2018-19 for a major refurbishment including re-cladding, major electrical works and extensions.

It should be noted that any major refurbishment of the building will necessitate full compliance with current standards and codes.

¹ Based on a mid-range fit out commensurate with the usual State Government fitout.

Prior to undertaking any major refurbishment works consideration should be given to engaging a space planning consultant to:

- assess and report on the City's current utilisation of the Administration building
- based on information to be provided by the City, assess and report on the City's space needs in the short, medium and long-term
- prepare diagrammatic drawings and associated commentary that most effectively utilises the existing space to satisfy the City's administration needs into the future
- prepare cost estimates based on the prepared diagrammatic drawings.

The outcome of the above would assist the City in determining the overall estimated expenditure required to "future proof" the building and whether the building can be suitably refurbished / extended to suit the City's administration needs. It would also enable the City to more accurately budget for the major refurbishment already identified in the *Five Year Capital Works Program* and *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan*.

Disadvantages

- No income to the City from the sale of the building or the land.
- Major refurbishment works will require alternative accommodation – this could be on a "rolling" basis if individual areas are refurbished separately (for example floor by floor).
- Major refurbishment works will require full compliance with current standards and codes.

Advantages

- Significant less capital cost than a new build.
- The major refurbishment costs are included in the City's *Five Year Capital Works Program* and the *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan*.
- Less disruption to the City's administrative operations.
- Enables the building to contribute to the strategic vision for Boas Place.
- Provides an up-to-date, modern workplace for the City's officers.

3 Demolition of the existing building with the relocation of the City's administrative operations to another location within the *Boas Place Concept Plan*.

The cost implications to the City of this option are considered similar to that reported for Option 1 above. However, this option offers the additional advantage of income to the City through the sale of land – estimated between \$1.66 million and \$2.02 million. Further, the City's administrative operations could remain in the existing building until such time as the new building is complete.

This option still represents a substantial capital cost to the City with no certainty that the state of the commercial market will result in an expedited sale of the land.

Disadvantages

- Represents a significant capital cost.
- Potentially volatile commercial market restricting the sale of the land.
- Community opposition given the potential historical and heritage value of the building.

Advantages

- Enables the site to contribute to the strategic vision for Boas Place.
- Provides the opportunity for increased building height and mass.
- Sale of the land provides income to the City.
- Provides an up-to-date, modern workplace for the City's officers.

4 Do nothing

The option to 'do nothing' is not considered a viable option as the building currently stands.

The building assessment undertaken by the consultant team has indicated a number of items that require remedial work.

It is anticipated investment will be required to refit existing building services and equipment to keep the building operational and meeting the minimum code requirements due to the age of the building and its services.

Quantity Surveyor's Rider Levett Bucknall has estimated that approximately \$81,424 would be required to rectify the items identified during the NCC audit. This expenditure does not include items that are required to meet current requirements for any major refurbishment nor does it include those items already actioned by the City.

As indicated in Option 2 above, major refurbishment costs are already included in the City's *Five Year Capital Works Program* and the *20 Year Strategic Financial Plan*.

5 Sell the building 'as-is' to a developer to either redevelop the site or refurbish and lease back to the City.

The full valuation report details the strengths / opportunities as well as the weaknesses / threats of the sale of the building in its current condition. These include:

- suitability for office use
- location
- floor plate size
- quantum of value accessible to a broad range of investors
- Joondalup is considered by the State Government as a important centre of trade
- current fit-out is of an older style positioning it at the bottom end of the office market
- there is generally limited demand for large contiguous office areas in suburban locations such as Joondalup
- Perth office market is subdued.

Consultants CBRE have estimated a total of \$1.8 million of capital expenditure would be required to prior to the sale of the building to undertake required maintenance and upgrading of amenities. This total includes City's programmed general capital expenditure for the building.

Sale to a development “as is” and lease back to the City

The primary advantage to the City of this option is the retention of the building for the City’s administrative operations while alternative accommodation is constructed.

The advantage to a potential developer is that they have a tenant in place while the necessary planning tasks required for future refurbishment / redevelopment are undertaken or if the redevelopment/refurbishment is postponed due to market conditions.

Consultants CBRE have estimated the potential revenue from the sale of the building “as is” under a lease back arrangement is approximately \$16.5 million. This value includes the provision of the land component to meet car parking requirements under the City’s draft *Joondalup Activity Centre Plan*.

In its assessment of the available options, CBRE adopted the following annual lease terms for the City:

Rent	\$240 / m ² x 5,294m ²	\$ 1,270,560
Car bays (106)	\$80 / bay / month x 106 bays	\$101,760
Storage	\$100 / m ² x 87.6m ²	\$10,950
Outgoings	\$120 / m ² x 5,294m ²	<u>635,304</u>
	Total per annum	\$ 2,018,575

The above estimate equates to approximately \$15.5 million over the life of the seven year lease (including 3.5% per annum escalation).

The estimated \$240/m² rental is based on the “as is” condition of the building. Should the purchaser of the building fund a major refurbishment for the City as the tenant the rental could be considerably higher (\$350 to \$400/m²).

Advantages

- Retention of the building for the City’s administrative operations while alternative accommodation is constructed.
- The City is not required to fund the demolition of the building.
- Postponement of the significant capital outlay to construct a new administration building.
- The City would not be required to fund any major refurbishments; however this is likely to result in increased rental.

Disadvantages

- Capital expenditure estimated at \$1.8 million would be required prior to the sale of the building.
- The lease expenditure represents a considerable cost to the City.
- Loss of income from the existing Telco leases.
- The City may still be required to outlay significant capital to construct a new administration building.
- The loss of this major City asset may result in community opposition given the potential heritage and historical value of the building.

Sale to a developer “as is” – Vacant Possession

Any redevelopment / refurbishment of the site would need to meet the City’s vision for Boas Place and provide an acceptable end use – such as commercial, residential, mixed-use.

Consultant CBRE has estimated the potential revenue from the sale of the building “as is” is approximately \$11.1 million. This value includes the provision of a land component to meet car parking requirements under the City’s draft *Joondalup Activity Centre Plan*.

To further assess the viability of the sale of the administration building for redevelopment the following uses were identified and investigated in detail:

5.1 Hotel / Hostel

This option consists of the following:

- Approximately 90 rooms ranging from twin / queen to suites (dictated by the existing window locations).
- Hotel amenities and / or retail spaces located on the Ground Floor.
- Further amenity provided on the roof terrace and Level 3.

Estimated total cost: \$ 22.02 million

5.2 Residential

This option consists of the following:

- Approximately 40 units comprising 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments / units.
- Commercial space located at Ground Floor facing north.
- Extensions for new balconies / external areas to meet the requirements if the R-Codes.
- All car parking located at grade within Lot 507 (90) Boas Avenue – 60-70 bays depending on the final mix and marketing requirements.

Estimated total cost: \$ 20.66 million

5.3 Purpose Built Student Accommodation

This option consists of the following:

- Approximately 105 rooms ranging from studio to shared rooms
- Ground Floor activated by student common spaces or commercial areas
- Roof terrace and Level 3 for primary student common spaces
- Storage, laundry located in basement areas.

Estimated total cost: \$ 18.74 million

The above high level cost estimates were based on a number of assumptions and the consultant team recommended that additional detailed assessments be undertaken if it was the City’s preference to further consider these options.

The consultant team also recommended that if it was the Council’s preference to redevelop the property the opportunity should be presented to the broad market place via an expression of interest campaign.

Legislation / Strategic Community Plan / policy implications

Legislation The City is required to comply with its obligations under the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Strategic Community Plan

Key theme Financial Sustainability.

Objective Effective management.

Strategic initiative Manage liabilities and assets through a planned, long-term approach.

Policy Consideration of the options available to the City in regard to the administration building will be subject to the provisions of the relevant City planning policies.

Risk management considerations

Detailed Risk Management assessment will need to be undertaken once decisions are made regarding the preferred option.

Financial / budget implications2016-17 financial year impact

Account no.	220-C1041	
Budget Item	Joondalup City Centre Commercial Office Development – 220-2.	
Budget amount	\$ 448,311	2016-17 Mid Year Review
Amount spent to date	\$ 365,415	
Balance	\$ 107,450	

The approved 2016-17 Joondalup City Centre Development project budget makes provision for investigations into the optimisation of the City's administration building.

It is acknowledged that a business plan process may be required in accordance with the City's obligations under the *Local Government Act 1995* should the options proposed be considered for implementation.

2017-18 financial year impact

Budget amount \$ 533,301

Future financial impacts will be considered once future direction on the project is known.

All amounts quoted in this report are exclusive of GST.

Regional significance

The future of the City's administration building is integral to Boas Place. A fully developed Boas Place will enhance the vitality and vibrancy of the City Centre by increasing the number of people attracted to it for work, retail, leisure, entertainment and commercial purposes.

As the first major development in the Joondalup City Centre, the administration building may have considerable regional significance. The timing, location and other matters relating to the then Wanneroo Shire Offices were the cause of some disagreement between the Joondalup Development Corporation, Wanneroo Council and the State Government. The matter figures prominently in the *Lakeside City: The Dreaming of Joondalup*.²

Sustainability implications

Environmental

Environmental sustainability initiatives, based on the report prepared by consultants Cundall, will be incorporated into the Boas Place Design Principles. The application of these principles would apply to the City's administration building whether refurbished, redeveloped or retained in its existing form. The sustainability focus is underpinned by two core principles:

- Enhance the end user experience and provide a high quality environment.
- Reduce operating expenses with sensible solutions that satisfy whole of life considerations.

The look and feel of a physical workspace is integral to employees' overall fulfilment and performance in their jobs. Therefore any refurbishment of the City's administration building should take into consideration modern workplace design principles. Organisations utilising modern workplace design principles report the following benefits:

- Cost and space saving.
- Activity approach to learning and working.
- Increased collaboration, communication, skill and idea sharing.
- Increased awareness of productivity and efficiency.
- Improved team work and team bonding.
- Increased job satisfaction.

Social

A fully developed Boas Place will offer a range of attractions and activities for locals, workers, visitors and tourists to see and do, throughout different times of the day, week and year.

As an integral part of Boas Place, the retention or otherwise of the City's administration building must align with the above.

Economic

The overall economic impacts of the total development of Boas Place include one-off construction impacts and on-going impacts generated by additional employment.

The current *Boas Place Concept Plan* predicts that the total benefit, including flow on impact to the Joondalup economy will be 2,920 jobs. It is anticipated that of this number, 63% of the jobs generated will be taken up by local residents (some 1,857). This is likely to have a

² Stannage, T (1996), University of Western Australia Press.

significant positive impact on the wider Perth metropolitan transport system by improving the employment self-sufficiency of the region.

The total on-going impact on the Australian economy will be in the vicinity of \$648 million in additional output and a total of 3,175 jobs added to the Australian economy.

The addition of 800 State Government officers, located in the new office building on the corner of Shenton Avenue and Davidson Terrace, will also benefit the Joondalup City Centre Development. These officers will increase the customer base for the commercial / retail tenants of the development and act as an attractor to potential end-users.

Consultation

In determining the potential options for the City's administration building, the consultant team engaged with the relevant Business Units to ensure all possible information on the building was obtained.

Further internal and external engagement will be required once a decision is made regarding the short- and long-term use of the building.

COMMENT

The visual inspection of the existing administration building uncovered some building services and compliance issues that require attention. The consultant team recommended that if the building is to remain in use in its current configuration a number of items would need to be addressed as a priority to ensure a safe and comfortable work environment for both staff and visitors.

If the Council's preference is to remain within the existing building, a detailed current and future workplace strategy should be commissioned to ensure that a considered and coordinated approach to the growth and refresh of the City's administration offices is developed. This should include as a minimum:

- The development of an overall vision for the City's workplace through gaining an understanding of the culture, ideas and visions of the end users.
- An thorough analysis of the current workplace, organisational structures, business unit requirements, key adjacencies and work setting configurations including IT strategies, support space and meeting rooms so as to understand the existing use of the space.
- Analysis of the future needs of the City.
- Benchmarking of the current workplace against workplace exemplars and best practice precedents and emerging trends.
- The development of a strategic workplace brief so as to develop a consistent set of objectives, standards and guidelines for the City.
- Consideration of alternate working methods that compliment various working needs and styles.

Irrespective of the direction finally adopted by the Council, there would be value in understanding whether there is any residual capacity within the columns and lateral stability system to allow additional floors to be constructed on top of the existing building. It is therefore recommended that a structural assessment be undertaken to determine the additional structural capacity of the building. A cost estimate for undertaking this work is approximately \$16,000.

It is considered that the outcome of the assessment of the administration building will assist in determining, as a minimum, whether the City's administrative operations should remain in the current building or relocate to alternative premises enabling the sale of the building for refurbishment or redevelopment.

However, any final decision will be dependent on the findings of investigations into the heritage value of the building and the perception of the community as whole with regard to its redevelopment, demolition or refurbishment.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 NOTES the Optimisation of the City's Administration building report;
- 2 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to undertake further investigations into the residual capacity of the City's Administration building to allow for additional floors to be constructed;
- 3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to assess the City's current and future utilisation of the City's Administration building and investigate the maximisation of existing space to accommodate the City's administrative operation in the short, medium and long-term.

MOVED Cr Hollywood, SECONDED Cr Gobbert that the Major Projects Committee:

- 1 NOTES the Optimisation of the City's Administration building report;**
- 2 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to undertake further investigations into the residual capacity of the City's Administration building to allow for additional floors to be constructed;**
- 3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to assess the City's current and future utilisation of the City's Administration building and investigate the maximisation of existing space to accommodate the City's administrative operation in the short, medium and long-term.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (5/1)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert and Hollywood.

Against the Motion: Cr Jones.

**ITEM 3 CONFIDENTIAL - JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE
DEVELOPMENT - PROJECT STATUS**

WARD	North
RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR	Mr Garry Hunt Office of the CEO
FILE NUMBER	103036, 101515
ATTACHMENTS	Attachment 1 Boas Place Concept Plan (Option 4B) <i>(Please Note: The report and attachment is confidential and will appear in the official Minute Book only).</i>
AUTHORITY / DISCRETION	Information - includes items provided to Council for information purposes only that do not require a decision of Council (that is for 'noting').

This report is confidential in accordance with section 5.23(2)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, which also permits the meeting to be closed to the public for business relating to the following:

A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

A full report was provided to Elected Members under separate cover. The report is not for publication.

MOVED Mayor Pickard, SECONDED Cr Fishwick that the Major Projects Committee NOTES the Joondalup City Centre Development Project Status Report.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (6/0)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hollywood and Jones.

ITEM 4 CONFIDENTIAL - JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT - CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HOTEL SITE

WARD	North
RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR	Mr Garry Hunt Office of the CEO
FILE NUMBER	103036, 101515
ATTACHMENTS	Attachment 1 Boas Place Concept Plan (Option 4B) Attachment 2 Business Plan – draft Table of Contents <i>(Please Note: The report and attachments are confidential and will appear in the official Minute Book only)</i>
AUTHORITY / DISCRETION	Executive - The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council, such as adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.

This report is confidential in accordance with section 5.23(2)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, which also permits the meeting to be closed to the public for business relating to the following:

A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

A full report was provided to Elected Members under separate cover. The report is not for publication.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 NOTES the legal advice provided by Jackson McDonald as outlined in this Report;
- 2 NOTES that the current Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Devwest Group Pty Ltd will automatically come to an end on 10 September 2017;
- 3 AGREES that the current Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Devwest Group Pty Ltd should not be extended;
- 4 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to commence negotiations for a Heads of Agreement between the City and Devwest Group Pty Ltd for the sale and development of one or more components of the Boas Place concept following the receipt of a formal proposal (or proposals) from Devwest Group Pty Ltd;
- 5 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to undertake the business plan process as outlined in Option 2 of this Report for the sale and development of the components of the *Boas Place Concept Plan*.

MOVED Cr Fishwick, SECONDED Cr Chester that:

- 1 Council NOTES the legal advice provided by Jackson McDonald as outlined in this Report;**
- 2 Council NOTES that the current Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Devwest Group Pty Ltd will automatically come to an end on 10 September 2017;**
- 3 Council AGREES that the current Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Devwest Group Pty Ltd should not be extended;**
- 4 the Chief Executive Officer ADVISES Devwest Group Pty Ltd, so that a Heads of Agreement can be explored for the sale and development of one or more of the components of the *Boas Place Concept Plan*, Devwest Group Pty Ltd needs to lodge a formal proposal that is acceptable to Council and that formal proposal needs to be lodged prior to 10 September 2017;**
- 5 Council REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to undertake the business plan process as outlined in Option 2 of this Report for the sale and development of the components of the *Boas Place Concept Plan*;**
- 6 the Major Projects Committee REQUESTS Council consider this item as a matter of urgent business at the Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 18 July 2017.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (6/0)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hollywood and Jones.

URGENT BUSINESS

Nil.

MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

REQUESTS FOR REPORTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Nil.

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7.22pm; the following Committee Members being present at that time:

Mayor Troy Pickard
Cr Kerry Hollywood
Cr Nige Jones
Cr Liam Gobbert
Cr John Chester
Cr Russ Fishwick, JP