

# minutes

## Policy Committee

MEETING HELD ON **MONDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2012**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
	Declaration of Opening	3
	Apologies/Leave of absence	3
	Confirmation of Minutes	4
	Announcements by the Presiding Member without discussion	4
	Declarations of Interest	4
	Identification of matters for which the meeting may sit behind closed doors	4
	Petitions and deputations	4
	Reports	5
1	Review of State Administrative Tribunal - Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy	5
2	Review of Environmentally Sustainable Buildings in the City of Joondalup Policy	9
3	Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Public Space, Pedestrian Accessways and Uniform Fencing - Subdivision Policies	13
4	Development Requirements for Wind Turbines and Satellite Dishes	18
5	Child Care Centres Policy Review	24
6	Draft Consulting Rooms Policy	28
7	Community Facilities - Built Policy - Major Review	32
8	Draft Property Management Framework - Various Policies	40
9	Asset Management Policy - Major Review	46
	Motions of which previous notice has been given	51
	Requests for Reports for future consideration	51
	Closure	51

## CITY OF JOONDALUP

### MINUTES OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN CONFERENCE ROOM 2, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON MONDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2012.

#### ATTENDANCE

##### Committee Members:

Cr Liam Gobbert	<i>Deputy Presiding Member</i>	
Mayor Troy Pickard		
Cr John Chester	<i>(Deputising for Cr Brian Corr)</i>	<i>from 6.45pm</i>
		<i>absent from 7.56pm until 7.59pm</i>
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime		
Cr Kerry Hollywood		
Cr Teresa Ritchie		

##### Observers:

Cr Tom McLean, JP		<i>absent from 7.33pm until 7.37pm</i>
Cr Mike Norman		

##### Officers:

Mr Garry Hunt	Chief Executive Officer	<i>from 6.53pm</i>
		<i>absent from 7.36pm until 7.43pm</i>
Mr Jamie Parry	Director, Governance and Strategy	
Mr Mike Tidy	Director, Corporate Services	
Ms Dale Page	Director, Planning and Community Development	
Mr John Humphreys	Manager Planning Services	<i>to 7.37pm</i>
Mr John Byrne	Governance Coordinator	
Mrs Deborah Gouges	Governance Officer	

#### DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Deputy Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.44pm.

#### APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

##### Apologies

Cr Philippa Taylor.

##### Leave of Absence previously approved

Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	1 to 25 November 2012 inclusive.
Cr Brian Corr	6 to 16 November 2012 inclusive.
Cr Sam Thomas	12 to 24 November 2012 inclusive.
Cr Geoff Amphlett, JP	14 to 23 November 2012 inclusive.
Cr Liam Gobbert	20 to 28 November 2012 inclusive.
Cr Teresa Ritchie	27 November to 4 December 2012 inclusive.

*Cr Chester entered the Room, the time being 6.45pm.*

## **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

### **MINUTES OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE HELD ON 6 AUGUST 2012**

**MOVED Cr Hamilton-Prime, SECONDED Mayor Pickard that the minutes of the meeting of the Policy Committee held on 6 August 2012 be confirmed as a true and correct record.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

Nil.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nil.

## **IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY SIT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS**

In accordance with Clause 76 of the City's *Standing Orders Local Law 2005*, this meeting was not open to the public.

## **PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS**

Nil.

**REPORTS****ITEM 1                    REVIEW OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL -  
MEDIATION AND REVISED DEVELOPMENT  
PROPOSALS POLICY**

<b>WARD:</b>	All
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Ms Dale Page Planning and Community Development
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	101281, 101515
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1            State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy showing recommended revisions

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to consider the draft State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy following advertising, and decide whether to adopt the policy as final.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The City has recently undertaken a review of the Policy Manual. As part of this review, the State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy was proposed to be updated in the line with the new standard policy template. However, at its meeting held on 15 May 2012 (CJ093-05/12 refers), Council requested that a separate report be prepared on this policy.

The current policy contains elements that are considered procedural and as such has been amended slightly to better reflect the high level values that City officers will apply when attending the State Administrative Tribunal in relation to development proposals. The specific references to mediation and revised development proposals have also been removed to better indicate that these principles will be applied throughout the State Administrative Tribunal process, where applicable. It is also proposed to modify the name of the policy to reflect this change. The policy is to be titled 'Development Proposals before the State Administrative Tribunal Policy'.

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ163-08/12 refers), Council resolved to advertise the draft policy for public comment. The draft policy was advertised for 21 days, closing on 4 October 2012. No submissions were received.

*It is therefore recommended that Council ADOPTS as final the draft Development Proposals before the State Administrative Tribunal Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.*

## BACKGROUND

The State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy was adopted by Council in October 2005 as part of an overall review and update of the City's Corporate Policy Manual (CJ206-10/05 refers).

The policy sets out several statements regarding the manner in which matters brought before the State Administrative Tribunal which involve the City should be dealt with. These statements particularly relate to items that proceed to mediation and/or result in the consideration of revised development proposals.

The City has recently undertaken a review of the Policy Manual. As part of this review, the above policy was proposed to have minor amendments in line with the new standard policy template. At its meeting held on 15 May 2012 (CJ093-05/12 refers), Council resolved in part as follows:

*“5.3 REQUESTS separate reports be presented to the next meeting of the Policy Committee on the following policies:*

*5.3.3 The State Administrative Tribunal Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy.”*

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ163-08/12 refers), Council considered a revised policy and resolved as follows:

- “1 ADOPTS the proposed amendments to the Development Proposals before the State Administrative Tribunal Policy as shown in Attachment 1 to Report CJ163-08/12, for the purpose of public advertising; and*
- 2 ADVERTISES the proposed amendments to the Development Proposals before the State Administrative Tribunal Policy for public comment for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.”*

## DETAILS

It is proposed to modify the policy to remove any elements that are purely procedural and to broaden the scope to the whole State Administrative Tribunal process. The modified version of the policy is intended to better set out the high level objectives and principles that City officers will observe when dealing with matters before the State Administrative Tribunal.

It is also proposed to modify the name of the policy to reflect this change.

It is expected that the policy will be supported by an internal protocol for City officers. This protocol will set out details such as:

- Who will generally attend the State Administrative Tribunal for various matters and when and how additional consultation should take place for amended or modified proposals; and
- When consultants will generally be engaged to represent the City on matters determined under Delegated Authority and matters determined by Council.

**Issues and options considered:**

Council has the option to:

- Adopt the draft policy as final;
- Adopt the draft policy as final, with modifications; or
- Refuse to adopt the policy.

**Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation**                      *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004.*

**Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:**                      Quality urban environment.

**Objective:**                        Quality built outcomes.

**Policy:**

City Policy – State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

Should Council resolve not to endorse the proposed modifications to the State Administrative Tribunal – Mediation and Revised Development Proposals Policy for the purpose of public advertising, matters will continue to be dealt with in accordance with the existing policy where possible.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

The costs associated with advertising the policies in the local paper and notice of the final adoption of the policies will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

Not Applicable.

**Consultation:**

The proposed policy was advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days, closing on 4 October 2012, as follows:

- A notice published in the Joondalup Times for two consecutive weeks (13 and 20 September 2012);
- A notice placed on the City's website.

**COMMENT**

No submissions were received during the advertising period and no further changes are proposed to the draft policy.

As the advertising of the draft Development Proposals Before The State Administrative Tribunal Policy has not raised any issues that would warrant not proceeding with the proposal, it is recommended that the policy be adopted as final.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**MOVED Cr Hollywood, SECONDED Cr Ritchie that Council ADOPTS as final the draft Development Proposals before the State Administrative Tribunal Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*The Chief Executive Officer entered the Room, the time being 6.53pm.*

*Appendix 1 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

## **ITEM 2                    REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS IN THE CITY OF JOONDALUP POLICY**

<b>WARD:</b>	All
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Ms Dale Page Planning and Community Development
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	21452, 101515
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1            Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy

---

### **PURPOSE**

For Council to consider the amended Environmentally Sustainable Building in the City of Joondalup Policy (now named Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy) following advertising, and decide whether to adopt the policy as final.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The City has recently undertaken a review of the Policy Manual. The Environmentally Sustainable Buildings in the City of Joondalup Policy (adopted 2011 – CJ041-03/11 refers) is proposed to be updated in line with the new standard policy template, including several formatting and wording improvements. The policy name has been changed to Environmentally Sustainable Buildings to better reflect the purpose of the policy.

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ165-08/12 refers), Council resolved to advertise the amended policy for the purpose of public comment for a period of 21 days. The comment period ended on 4 October 2012 and no submissions were received during the advertising period.

*It is therefore recommended that Council, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup Planning Scheme No. 2, ADOPTS as final the modified Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.*

### **BACKGROUND**

The Environmentally Sustainable Buildings Policy was adopted by Council in October 2010 (CJ174-10/10 refers). The Environmentally Sustainable Buildings in the City of Joondalup Policy was adopted by Council in March 2011 (CJ041-03/11 refers).

The City has recently undertaken a review of the Policy Manual. As part of this review, the above two policies were proposed to have minor amendments in line with the new standard policy template. The Policy Committee resolved at its meeting of May 2012 as follows:

“5.3 *REQUESTS separate reports be presented to the next meeting of the Policy Committee on the following policies:*

5.3.2 *the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy and the Environmentally Sustainable Design for City Buildings Policy with the intention that the two policies be combined;...*”

A report was prepared outlining that the policies were prepared under different legislation, and therefore it was not appropriate to combine the policies.

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ165-08/12 refers), Council considered the report on the combining of policies, and resolved as follows:

- “1 *APPROVES the proposed amendments to the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy as shown in Attachment 1 to Report CJ165-08/12 for the purpose of public advertising;*
- 2 *ADVERTISES the proposed amendments to the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy for public comment for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2; and*
- 3 *ADOPTS the proposed amendments to the Environmentally Sustainable Design for City Buildings Policy as shown in Attachment 2 to Report CJ165-08/12.”*

## **DETAILS**

The Environmentally Sustainable Buildings Policy applies to the construction and redevelopment of residential, commercial and mixed-use buildings (excluding Single and Grouped Dwellings) in the City of Joondalup.

The policy has been updated in line with the current review of the Policy Manual, therefore several formatting and wording improvements are proposed as well as a change to the policy name to better reflect the purpose of the policies. These proposed modifications are highlighted in red underlined (additions) and red strikethrough (deletions) at Attachment 1.

### **Issues and options considered:**

Council has the option to:

- Adopt the amended policy as final;
- Adopt the amended policy as final, with modifications; or
- Refuse to adopt the policies.

### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation** *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.*

Clause 8.11 of DPS2 enables Council to prepare, amend and add to local planning policies that relate to any planning and development matter within the Scheme area.

**Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:** Quality urban environment.

**Objective:** Quality built outcomes.

**Policy:**

City Policy - Environmentally Sustainable Buildings Policy.

City Policy - Environmentally Sustainable Buildings in the City of Joondalup Policy.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

Not Applicable.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Costs associated with advertising any proposed amendment to a local planning policy in the local newspaper, and notice of any final adoption of the amended policy, will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

The policies provide encouragement for the integration of environmentally sustainable design principles into new buildings and redevelopments in the City of Joondalup which would support the environmental sustainability of the City and help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Consultation:**

The Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy was advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days, closing on 4 October 2012, as follows:

- A notice published in the Joondalup Times for two consecutive weeks (13 and 20 September 2012);
- A notice placed on the City's website.

No submissions were received.

**COMMENT**

No submissions were received during the advertising period and no further changes are proposed to the draft policy.

As the advertising of the modified Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy has not raised any issues that would warrant not proceeding with the proposal, it is recommended that the policy be adopted as final.

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup Planning Scheme No. 2, ADOPTS as final the modified Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.

### MOVED Cr Hamilton-Prime, SECONDED Cr Chester that Council:

- 1 **APPROVES** the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy as shown in Attachment 1 to Report CJ165-08/12 for the purpose of public advertising with the following amendments:
  - 1.1 An additional dot point be ADDED under heading 4 - Details, subheading 4.1 - Design Principles to read as follows:
    - *“Designing buildings so materials can be easily recycled if in the future the building is to be demolished.”;*
  - 1.2 The words ‘seek to’ between the words ‘will’ and ‘prioritise’ in paragraph two under heading 3 – Statement be DELETED;
- 2 **ADVERTISES** the proposed amendments to the Environmentally Sustainable Design Policy for public comment for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2*.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (5/1)

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime and Ritchie.

**Against the Motion:** Cr Hollywood.

*Appendix 2 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach2agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)



## BACKGROUND

The Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Public Space, Pedestrian Accessways and Uniform Fencing - Subdivision policies have been operating since adoption in 2000, 2004 and 1999 respectively. There have been minimal amendments to the policies since they were adopted.

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ164-08/12), Council resolved as follows:

- “1 *APPROVES the draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space Policy and the draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways Policy, as shown in Attachment 1 and 2 to Report CJ164-08/12, for the purposes of public advertising;*
- 2 *APPROVES the revocation of the Uniform Fencing – Subdivision Policy for the purposes of public advertising;*
- 3 *ADVERTISES the draft Subdivision and Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space Policy, the draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways Policy, and the revocation of Uniform Fencing-Subdivision Policy, for public comment for a period of 21 days, in accordance with Clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2.”*

## DETAILS

The proposed modifications involve the relocating of guidelines currently contained within the Pedestrian Accessway Policy and Uniform Fencing - Subdivision Policy to the draft Subdivision Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space Policy. The Pedestrian Accessway Policy is then proposed to deal specifically with the closure of PAWs.

All information contained within the Uniform Fencing - Subdivision Policy is now proposed to be contained within the draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space policy and can therefore be revoked.

The format of the draft policies has been updated in line with the current review of the Policy Manual. In addition, changes to the details within the policies have been made, and are outlined below:

### Draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space

- Encouragement for retaining to a height of 500 millimetres as part of a subdivision to elevate and provide a distinction between public and private space;
- Allowance for fencing adjacent public space to be solid for a height of 1.8 metres for up to 50% of the boundary length. The remaining 50% is to be visually permeable 1.2 metres above natural ground level;
- Development adjoining areas of public space to include a major opening or outdoor living area which offers surveillance to the public space; and
- Inclusion of a required width of a PAW at a cul-de-sac head to be the minimum width of an accessway under State Planning Policy DC 2.6 – Residential Road Planning (11.5 metres to 15 metres); and
- Fencing adjacent PAWs to be 1.8 metres high with the exception of the street setback area or to the front building line (whichever is the greater).

### Draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways

- Change to the name of the policy to reflect the content;
- Landscaping and lighting to be designed having regard to the requirements of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and Reducing Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour in Pedestrian Accessways planning guidelines; and
- Conversion of impact assessment into table format.

The draft policies are provided in Attachments 1 and 2 of this Report.

#### **Issues and options considered:**

Council has the option to:

- Adopt the draft policies as final;
- Adopt the draft policies as final, with modifications; or
- Refuse to adopt the policies.

#### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation**                      *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.*

Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* enables Council to prepare, amend and add to local planning policies that relate to any planning and development matter within the Scheme area.

#### **Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:**                      Quality urban environment.

**Objective:**                        Quality built outcomes.

#### **Policy:**

City Policy – Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Public Space.

City Policy – Pedestrian Accessways.

City Policy – Uniform Fencing – Subdivision.

State Planning Policy DC 2.6 – Residential Road Planning.

State Planning Policy DC 2.2 - Residential Subdivision.

The above State Planning Policies provide recommendations on the creation of PAWs, public space and subdivision of land adjoining areas of public space. The policies have been drafted having regard to these State Planning Policies.

#### **Risk Management Considerations:**

Should the draft policies not be adopted, it is considered there is minimal risk given that much of the information contained within the draft policies is covered under the current policies. However, the draft policies aim to provide greater clarity on the process and matters considered in request for closures of PAWs, as well as improved development requirements for owners of sites adjoining public space.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

The costs associated with advertising the policies in the local paper and notice of the final adoption of the policies will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

The draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space Policy has been designed to ensure that surveillance and perceived safety of public space is provided, enhancing both the amenity and safety of the public environment.

The draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways Policy ensures that appropriate consideration is given to the role of a PAW in the context of the pedestrian environment and access to key community facilities, particularly by aged persons.

**Consultation:**

The proposed policy was advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days, closing on 4 October 2012 as follows:

- A notice published in the Joondalup Times for two consecutive weeks (13 and 20 September 2012);
- A notice placed on the City's website.

No submissions were received.

**COMMENT**

No submissions were received during the advertising period, and no further changes are proposed to the draft policies.

The draft policies are considered to address concerns with current policies over lack of privacy and perception of security for land owners adjoining public space and pedestrian accessways, while still ensuring that surveillance is provided to these areas. The changes also align with current State Planning Policies and planning guidelines including Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design guidelines.

It is recommended that the draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Public Space and the draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways policies be adopted as final (as per Attachments 1 and 2 of this Report), and the Uniform Fencing – Subdivision policy be revoked.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**MOVED Cr Hollywood, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Council:**

- 1 In accordance with Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* ADOPTS as final the draft Subdivision and Dwelling Development Adjoining Areas of Public Space Policy and the draft Closure of Pedestrian Accessways Policy, as detailed in Attachments 1 and 2 to this Report; and**
- 2 In accordance with Clause 8.11.4(b) of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* REVOKES the Uniform Fencing - Subdivision Policy as detailed in Attachment 3 to this Report.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 3 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach3agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

## **ITEM 4                    DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR WIND TURBINES AND SATELLITE DISHES**

<b>WARD:</b>	All
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Ms Dale Page Planning and Community Development
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	102705, 101515, 81513
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1            Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment Policy Attachment 2            Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy Attachment 3            Foxtel Installer Products Domestic List

---

### **PURPOSE**

For Council to re-examine certain existing provisions contained in the City's planning policies on satellite dishes, aerials and radio equipment and small scale renewable energy systems, specifically regarding the size of satellite dishes exempt from planning approval and the height requirements and noise requirements for wind turbines.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ160-08/12 refers), Council requested a report to examine the development standards relating to height and noise requirements for wind energy systems and the size of satellite dishes which are exempt from planning approval.

Research has been undertaken and it was found that the current policy standard of exempting satellite dishes 90 centimetres or less in diameter is consistent with the industry standard for domestic satellite dishes for pay television.

In regard to the provisions for wind turbines, the standards outlined in the City's Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy are consistent with other local government policies. As concern has been expressed regarding the blade clearance for pole mounted wind turbine, a clearance of three metres from the blade to the natural ground level is proposed. However, this clearance distance is suggested only and not based on an industry standard or similar local government policy.

As such, it is recommended that the existing Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment Policy be retained without modifications and the Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy be modified to include a blade clearance distance of three metres. As a minor modification to the policy is proposed, it is also recommended that the policy be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days.

## BACKGROUND

The City has recently undertaken a review of the Policy Manual. As part of the review the Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment Policy and the Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy were reviewed. Minor modifications were made to these policies which included format improvement and wording changes to improve consistency and clarity. Subsequently the policies were required to be advertised for a period of 21 days in accordance with Council's resolution made at its meeting held 20 March 2012 (CJ032-03/12 refers).

Following the public consultation period, during which no submissions were received, Council was requested to adopt the policy as final at its meeting held on 21 August 2012 (CJ160-08/12 refers).

Council resolved as follows:

"2 *DEFERS consideration of the following policies to the next meeting of the Policy Committee to be held on Monday 12 November 2012:*

- 2.1 *Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy forming Attachment 1 to Report CJ160-08/12 in order to examine the development standards related to wind energy systems, including noise impact; and*
- 2.2 *Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment Policy forming Attachment 2 to Report CJ160-08/12 to provide further information regarding the size of satellite dishes for which applications for planning approval is exempt;"*

## DETAILS

### Satellite Dishes

The City's Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy provides standard requirements for satellite dishes. The policy states the erection of a satellite dish is exempt from requiring planning approval when:

- A satellite dish is located on the roof and has a diameter of not greater than 0.9 metres;
- A satellite dish (combined dish and support) is located at existing ground level and is 2.4 metres or less in any dimension. The dish is to be located so as not to be visible from any street or adjoining property;
- A maximum of one satellite dish and one form of radio equipment is permitted exclusive of a domestic antenna. Where additional equipment is sought an application for planning approval is required.

In reviewing the policy specifically in regard to the size of satellite dishes, the City contacted an independent satellite dish installer as well as Foxtel to determine what the industry standards were for roof mounted satellite dishes. Comment provided from the installer indicated that satellite dishes for pay television were normally solid and a maximum of 85-90 centimetres in diameter with Foxtel dishes being 65-85 centimetres in diameter. This was reiterated by the consultant from Foxtel who indicated the Foxtel dishes were a maximum of 90 centimetres in diameter. Additionally, the Foxtel Installer Products Domestic list indicates the standard dishes to be 65 centimetres (Attachment 3 refers).

The independent installer commented that for domestic satellite dishes people generally select smaller solid dishes for pay television as they are preferable cost wise. The larger mesh dishes, which are usually ground mounted, are normally preferred on commercial sites or where inclement weather may interfere with the signal.

A review of other local government planning policies for satellite dishes was also undertaken. It was found that City of Stirling's Satellite Dish Policy indicates approval is required for a dish with a diameter of 0.9 metres or greater and the City of Vincent and the City of Subiaco permit a satellite dish with a diameter of less than one metre as a right. There are provisions in the City of Gosnells TPS 6 which exempt satellite dishes with a maximum diameter of one metre.

### Wind turbines

The City's Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy includes development requirements for wind turbines. One of the key requirements of the policy is the need for planning approval for all wind turbines. This means the applicant is required to demonstrate compliance with the policy requirements including height, diameter and noise standards in order for the application to be considered.

Research was undertaken to determine if other local government authorities had a policy guiding small scale renewable energy systems and if they addressed noise requirements for wind turbines.

The City of Stirling's Renewable Energy Systems Policy was found to closely align with the City's policy including the requirement for compliance with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*. The City of Cockburn and the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River Renewable Energy Systems policies also refer to compliance with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*.

The policy requirements relating to the height and diameter of wind turbines were also reviewed. Comparing the City's policy to the relevant policies from the Shires of Esperance and Augusta-Margaret River and the Cities of Stirling and Cockburn, it was found:

- The maximum height limit for pole mounted wind turbines within the Residential zone is one metre less than what is permitted by these other authorities (that is five metres rather than six metres);
- The development standards for blade diameter and setbacks were consistent with similar policies;
- The only clearances specified for the turbine blades applied to roof mounted systems. Where the clearance was stated, it was consistent with the one metre recommended in the City's policy.

It is understood concern has been expressed regarding safety clearances from the blades to the ground for pole mounted wind turbines. None of the policies reviewed prescribed a clearance for blades on pole mounted turbines.

The Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy is shown as Attachment 1.  
The Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems policy is shown as Attachment 2.

**Issues and options considered:**

Council has the option to:

- Advertise the amended Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy for public comment;
- Advertise the amended Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy for public comment with modifications; or
- Not support the advertising of the amended Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy for public comment.

**Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation**                      *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.*

Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* enables Council to prepare, amend and add to the local planning policies that relate to any planning and development matter within the Scheme area.

**Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:**                      Quality urban environment.

**Objective:**                      Quality built outcomes.

**Policy:**

City Policy - Satellite Dishes, Aerials, and Radio Equipment policy; and  
City Policy - Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems policy.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

Not Applicable.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Costs associated with advertising any proposed amendment to a local planning policy in the local newspaper, and notice of any final adoption of the amended policy, will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

Not Applicable. The modifications to the policies relate predominantly to the format and wording updates and improvements and do not alter the intent of the policies.

**Consultation:**

Clause 8.11 of DPS2 requires a new local planning policy or amendment to a local planning policy to be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days. The proposed amended policy would be advertised as follows:

- A notice published once a week for two consecutive weeks in the local newspaper;
- A notice and documents placed on the City's website.

## COMMENT

### Satellite Dishes

Minor modifications (formatting and wording improvements) were made to the City's Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment policy in line with the City's Policy Manual review. The policy was advertised for public comment in June 2012. No comments were received during this period.

Given the feedback from an installer and Foxtel indicates that domestic satellite dishes for pay television are normally 90 centimetres or less in diameter, it is not considered necessary to amend the policy to increase the permitted diameter. Any landowner wanting to install a larger roof mounted satellite has the right to apply for planning approval and any application would be considered on its merits.

### Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems

The issue of noise generated by wind turbines is complex as the level of noise produced by the system is influenced by the wind gusts being experienced which can vary at different times throughout the day as well as seasonally. However, the City's policy requires the applicant to demonstrate how the wind turbine will comply with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*.

As previously indicated, the City requires the applicant to demonstrate at the development application stage that the proposal will comply with the assigned noise levels under the noise regulations. If this cannot be demonstrated then the application is unable to be supported. If the development is approved and constructed and then noise complaints are received, the City would investigate the complaint in line with normal practices. The outcome of the investigation would determine if any further action is undertaken. In some instances, the noise may comply with the relevant noise levels, or where non compliance occurs at a certain time during the day (based on prevailing wind speeds), there is potential for the turbine to be switched off temporarily.

As there are a number of variables which may contribute to the level of noise generated by a wind turbine as well as a number of options for demonstrating compliance with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*, it is considered appropriate to retain the existing provision regarding noise, rather than specify a set of requirements.

As for a clearance height from the blades of pole mounted wind turbines, should Council wish to incorporate an additional development standard to guide this element, the clearance distance of three metres from natural ground level is suggested. This distance is based on the wall height of a single storey dwelling which on average varies from 2.5 metres to three metres (for example boundary wall). This is considered appropriate as the wind turbine needs to be clear of any impediments which might reduce the efficiency of the turbine. Given structures below this height, which are common on residential properties, could act as an impediment it is unlikely a lower blade clearance would be proposed by an applicant. It should be noted that this proposed height is not an industry endorsed standard or based on any engineering requirement for wind turbines.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**MOVED** Cr Hamilton-Prime, **SECONDED** Cr Ritchie that Council:

- 1**     **NOTES** the information regarding domestic satellite dish standards contained within this Report;
- 2**     **ADOPTS** as final the modified Satellite Dishes, Aerials and Radio Equipment Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report; and
- 3**     In accordance with Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* **ADVERTISES** the proposed amendment to the Small Scale Renewable Energy Systems Policy as detailed in Attachment 2 to this Report for public comment for a period of 21 days.

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 4 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach4agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

**ITEM 5                    CHILD CARE CENTRES POLICY REVIEW**

---

<b>WARD:</b>	All
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Ms Dale Page Planning and Community Development
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	85510, 101515
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1            Modified Child Care Centres Policy

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to consider advertising proposed amendments to the Child Care Centres policy for public comment.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At its meeting held on 15 May 2012 (CJ093-05/12 refers), Council requested a report on the Child Care Centres Policy be provided to the Policy Committee.

The Child Care Centres Policy provides guidance on the location, siting and design of Child Care Centres. A review of the policy has found it is generally operating well. It is considered, however, that updates are required in regard to the road classifications referenced in the policy, as well as format and text changes in line with the current review of the City's Policy Manual.

In addition, it is considered additional clarity can be provided in regard to the development requirements and locational criteria.

It is recommended that the modified Child Care Centres policy be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days.

**BACKGROUND**

At its meeting held on 15 July 2008 (CJ126-07/08 refers), Council adopted amendments to the Child Care Centres policy to bring the policy into line with community expectations and assist with the assessment of child care centre applications. The following issues were addressed in the amended policy:

- Amenity;
- Appropriate location;
- Traffic and car parking;
- Noise attenuation;
- Operating hours;
- Location of outdoor play areas.

The Child Care Centres Policy has been in operation for a number of years and the current review has found it generally continues to operate well.

At its meeting held on 15 May 2012 (CJ093-05/12 refers), Council resolved that a report be prepared on the Child Care Centres Policy with a view to including in the policy provisions to permit child care centres to be located within residential precincts subject to noise and traffic impact statements being submitted demonstrating that the proposal would not adversely impact the amenity of surrounding residences in terms of noise and traffic. This matter arose from a recent application to extend an existing child care centre in a residential precinct in Duncraig where, despite the proposal having merit and limited impact on adjoining neighbours, it did not meet the locational requirements of the existing policy.

## **DETAILS**

The proposed modifications to the Child Care Centres Policy are as follows:

- Additional wording within the policy in regard to the development requirements and locational criteria to:
  - Clarify that when a child care centre is proposed to be located next to residential properties, the applicant is required to demonstrate that the proposal will not unduly impact the surrounding uses, for example by way of noise or traffic impacts;
  - Clarify that a Traffic and Road Safety Impact Report is required for all new child care centres or expansion in capacity of existing centres;
  - Apply the operating time restrictions to child care centres that abut or are opposite a residential property.
- Update references to the Main Roads road hierarchy by including reference to District Distributor A and District Distributor B (previously only one category of District Distributor);
- Text and format changes in line with the current policy manual review.

The proposed modifications are outlined in Attachment 1.

### **Issues and options considered:**

Council has the option to:

- Advertise the amended policy for public comment;
- Advertise the amended policy for public comment with further modifications; or
- Not support the advertising of the modified policy for public comment.

### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Legislation**

*City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.*

Clause 8.11 of the DPS2 enables Council to prepare, amend and add to local planning policies that relate to any planning and development matter within the Scheme area.

**Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:** Quality urban environment.

**Objective:** Quality built outcomes.

**Policy**

Council Policy - Child Care Centres Policy.

This policy is the subject of this report.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

If the policy remains unchanged, the ability for the City to consider new applications for child care centres within the Residential zone is restricted. The proposed amendments will provide greater flexibility in the locating of child care centres in appropriate areas of the Residential zone.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Costs associated with advertising any proposed amendment to the policy in the local newspaper, and notice of any final adoption of the amended policy, will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

Not Applicable.

**Consultation:**

Clause 8.11 of DPS2 requires a new policy or amendment to a policy to be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days. The proposed amendment would be advertised as follows:

- A notice published once a week for two consecutive weeks in the local newspaper;
- A notice and documents placed on the City's website.

**COMMENT****Development requirements and locational criteria**

The proposed amendments to the policy are aimed at improving wording of the policy and do not change the objectives of the policy.

While it is preferred that Child Care Centres be located adjacent to non-residential uses such as shopping centres or medical centres, it is acknowledged that this is not always possible. Therefore, the policy is proposed to be amended to add a statement to the effect that, if a child centre is located adjacent to a residential property, the applicant must demonstrate that the proposal will not unduly impact or be impacted by the surrounding use (for example by way of noise, traffic and the like).

### Road Hierarchy

In reviewing this policy, the provisions of other local government policies were reviewed. Those policies reviewed utilised a similar methodology to the City's policy. In general, the policies aim to ensure child care centres do not unduly impact on surrounding uses, and encourage the centres to be located on Local Distributor Roads rather than District Distributor or Access Roads. The locating of child care centres in cul-de-sacs is also discouraged.

Since the last review of the Child Care Centres Policy, Main Roads Western Australia have updated the titles of roads within their road hierarchy. The roads previously identified as 'District Distributors' are now referred to as 'District Distributor A' or 'District Distributor B'. This does not change the policy provision that the preferred locations for Child Care Centres be Local Distributor roads in order to minimise impact on existing traffic flows and the amenity of residential properties.

### Format modification

In addition to the modifications identified above, to update the policy in line with the current review of the Policy Manual, a number of formatting and wording improvements are proposed. These proposed modifications do not change the intent or requirements of the policy. These proposed modifications are highlighted in red (additions) and black strikethrough (deletions) in Attachment 1.

It is recommended that the modified Child Care Centres Policy be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days.

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

### **MOVED Cr Chester, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Council:**

- 1 ADOPTS the proposed amendments to the Child Care Centres Policy as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report, for the purpose of public advertising; and**
- 2 In accordance with Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* ADVERTISES the proposed amendments to the Child Care Centre Policy for public comment for a period of 21 days.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 5 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach5agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

*Cr McLean left the Room, the time being 7.33pm.*

*The Chief Executive Officer left the Room, the time being 7.36pm.*

## **ITEM 6                    DRAFT CONSULTING ROOMS POLICY**

**WARD:**                    All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:**    Ms Dale Page  
Planning and Community Development

**FILE NUMBER:**        102788, 101515

**ATTACHMENTS:**      Attachment 1        Draft Consulting Rooms Policy

---

### **PURPOSE**

For Council to consider advertising the draft Consulting Rooms Policy for public comment.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2 (DPS2)* includes 'Consulting Rooms' as a use class within the zoning table. However, DPS2 provides no further guidance regarding the development of consulting rooms. In addition, the draft Local Planning Strategy includes an action to prepare a Consulting Rooms policy.

A draft policy has been prepared to provide guidance on the establishment of consulting rooms to ensure they do not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. The draft policy provides guidelines on the location, car parking design, building design and landscaping of consulting rooms. The draft policy applies to consulting rooms within the Residential, Special Residential and Urban Development zones that contain residential development as it is within these areas that they are most likely to have an impact on residential amenity.

It is recommended that the draft policy be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days.

### **BACKGROUND**

At its meeting held on 16 February 2010 (CJ007-02/10 refers), Council adopted a draft Local Planning Strategy (LPS) for the City. The LPS contains a strategy and action relating to consulting rooms as set out below:

*Strategy    Encourage the establishment of local medical centres and consulting rooms in appropriate locations.*

*Action      Prepare a local planning policy on medical consulting rooms to provide guidance on appropriate locations, preservation of residential character and amenity, design, traffic and parking.*

This report presents a draft policy for consideration.

## DETAILS

Consulting rooms is defined under DPS2 as:

***“consulting rooms”*** means a building used by no more than one health consultant for the investigation or treatment of human injuries or ailments and for general patient care.

DPS2 identifies ‘consulting rooms’ as being able to be considered for approval in the following zones:

Residential zone	D (discretionary).
Mixed Use zone	P (permitted).
Business zone	P (permitted).
Commercial zone	P (permitted).
Civic and Cultural zone	D (discretionary).
Special Residential zone	D (discretionary).

Consulting rooms are not permitted in the following zones:

- Private Clubs/Recreation zone.
- Service Industrial zone.
- Rural zone.

The draft policy has been prepared to provide guidelines for the establishment of consulting rooms in the Residential, Special Residential and Urban Development zones only. Key aspects of the draft policy include:

- Outlining that consulting rooms that contribute to the concentration of consulting rooms along a street will generally not be supported;
- Outlining that battle-axe lots and lots at the head of cul-de-sacs be avoided due to the constraints of those sites;
- Requiring all parking to be provided on-site and in such a way that it does not detract from the streetscape;
- Requiring the building to maintain a residential appearance and outlining that variations to DPS2 setback requirements may be considered to achieve this;
- Not permitting the verge to be paved in order to discourage parking and requiring the verge area to be landscaped;
- Outlining that applications for all new consulting rooms will be advertised for public comment.

The draft policy is shown as Attachment 1.

### Issues and options considered:

Council has the option to:

- Advertise the draft policy for public comment,
- Advertise the draft policy for public comment with modifications; or
- Not support the advertising of the draft policy for public comment.

**Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation**                      *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2.*

Clause 8.11 of the DPS2 enables Council to prepare, amend and add to local planning policies that relate to any planning and development matter within the Scheme area.

**Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:**                      Quality urban environment.

**Objective:**                        Quality built outcomes.

**Policy:**

Council Policy - Draft Consulting Rooms Policy.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

If there is no policy in place, there is the risk that consideration and approval of consulting rooms may occur in an ad hoc manner with no ability to adequately defend decisions in the State Administrative Tribunal.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Costs associated with advertising the draft policy in the local newspaper and notice of final adoption of the policy will be approximately \$810.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

Not Applicable.

**Consultation:**

Clause 8.11 of DPS2 requires a new policy or amendment to a policy to be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days. The proposed amendment would be advertised as follows:

- A notice published once a week for two consecutive weeks in the local newspaper;
- A notice and documents placed on the City's website.

**COMMENT**

The provision of small consulting rooms in close proximity to medical facilities and commercial centres is common throughout the City, with consulting rooms providing a valuable service to the community. However, there are potential impacts on nearby residents such as traffic and loss of amenity that need to be carefully considered.

A policy has therefore been developed to provide guidance on the establishment of consulting rooms to ensure that when they are proposed within residential areas they do not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. The policy applies to the Residential, Special Residential and Urban Development zones, and structure plans areas that contain residential development.

It is recommended that the draft policy be advertised for public comment for a period of 21 days.

### **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**MOVED Mayor Pickard, SECONDED Cr Hollywood that Council:**

- 1 ADOPTS the draft Consulting Rooms Policy as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report for the purpose of public advertising; and**
- 2 In accordance with Clause 8.11 of the *City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2* ADVERTISES the draft Consulting Rooms Policy for public comment for a period of 21 days.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 6 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach6agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

## **ITEM 7                      COMMUNITY FACILITIES – BUILT POLICY - MAJOR REVIEW**

**WARD:** All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr Jamie Parry  
Governance and Strategy

**FILE NUMBER:** 101265

**ATTACHMENTS:** Attachment 1            Revised Community Facilities – Built Policy  
Attachment 2            Revised Terms and Conditions for Hire of  
City Facilities and Reserves

---

### **PURPOSE**

For Council to consider proposed major amendments to the Community Facilities – Built Policy as a result of the Policy Manual Review process.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The current Community Facilities – Built Policy was originally adopted in 2005 (CJ206-10/05 refers), as an outcome of the last Policy Manual Review process.

In its current format the policy combines policy statements on; requests for new or alterations to existing community facilities; child protection clearances; hire arrangements; and alcohol management provisions. Many of these provisions are considered either more applicable to other policies, a duplication of existing legislative provisions or operational in nature.

If their removal is supported, it is recommended that the residual aspects of the policy be used as the basis of a new policy that focuses on the discrete issue of considering applications for new or alterations to existing community facilities.

Elements of the policy relating to alcohol management are recommended to be incorporated into the Alcohol Management Policy (presented as a separate report to the Policy Committee) child protection clearances will be covered by existing legislation, while hire arrangements are considered operational.

It is recommended that Council adopt the amended Community Facilities – Built Policy (to be renamed the Requests for New or Capital Upgrades to Existing Community Buildings Policy), as shown in Attachment 1.

### **BACKGROUND**

A review of the Policy Manual was conducted in 2011 to assess all current policies against the following criteria:

- 1 Consistency — with regard to language, style and format.
- 2 Relevance — in terms of new plans and strategies that now supersede previously endorsed positions within existing policies.

- 3 Duplication — identified sections of policies that duplicate other policies, City plans and strategies, local laws, and/or State legislation.
- 4 Operational content — identified sections of policies deemed as being too operational and therefore more appropriate to be incorporated into a City protocol or operational plan.

As a result of the review process, a standardised policy format was developed and current policies were categorised as requiring either:

- Minor amendments (changes that do not impact on the application of the policy); or
- Major amendments (significant changes that alter the City's position on an issue or matter).

The Community Facilities – Built Policy was identified as requiring major amendments, based on a preliminary review of its relevance and last review date. This report outlines the proposed amendments to this policy and the justification for the changes.

## DETAILS

### *Former Policies*

The Community Facilities – Built Policy is a consolidation of several policies identified during the 2005 Policy Manual Review process. Below is an outline of the history of these policies, their relevance within the current Community Facilities – Built Policy and a recommendation for their proposed removal or retention within the revised policy, outlined in Attachment 1.

- Condition of Hire for City of Joondalup Facilities Child Protection Policy (CJ269-11/04 refers).

Introduced in 2004, this policy required community groups with members under the age of 18 to provide the City with a copy of the organisation's Child Protection Policy in order to secure a permanent booking within a City facility.

In 2005, the provisions were consolidated into the current Community Facilities – Built Policy as part of the Policy Manual Review process. In 2006 the State Government's *Working With Children (Criminal Record Checking) Act 2004* came into effect and the policy was amended again to reflect the new requirements under the Act until the five year phase in period for the legislation was complete (CJ168 – 09/06 refers).

On 1 January 2011, the phase in period expired and the State Government became fully responsible for administering all legislative requirements pertaining to working with children. While the legal obligations under the Act reside with the Department of Child Protection, WALGA recently circulated information requesting local governments to consider promoting compliance with the Act to their facility hirers. This is considered best achieved through the incorporation of a statement within the City's Terms and Conditions of Hire for City Buildings, Parks, Reserves and Beaches, as hirer's are more likely to refer to an operational document than a policy to obtain awareness of external legal obligations.

Given the promotional rather than policy-oriented nature of the provision and its duplication of existing legislation, it is considered unnecessary to be retained within the Community Facilities – Built Policy.

Recommendation: Child protection provisions within the Community Facilities – Built Policy be removed and reflected in the City’s Terms of Conditions of Hire for City Buildings, Parks, Reserves and Beaches (as shown in Attachment 2).

- Lending Authority or Loan Guarantor for Sporting Clubs or Other External Organisations Policy (CJ205 - 08/04 refers).

This policy was adopted by the Joint Commissioners in 2004 as a result of a decision in 2003 for the City to write off a significant debt for the Wanneroo Basketball Association Inc. (CJ57 – 04/03 refers). To avoid a similar situation in the future, the policy articulated the City’s decision not to enter into any agreements with sporting clubs or other external organisations to act as a lending authority or provide guarantees for loans raised by these groups.

This provision is still relevant and consistent with financially sustainable practices across local governments today.

Recommendation: Loan and guarantee provisions within the Community Facilities – Built Policy be retained.

- Procurement of Council Buildings Policy (CJ213 – 06/99 refers).

Introduced by the former City of Wanneroo, this policy provided guidance on the circumstances in which new City buildings or additions to existing buildings would be considered and approved by the City. The current Community Facilities – Built Policy features many elements of this former policy, particularly with regard to aligning proposals to the City’s strategic objectives and the requirement to undergo a formal assessment process when submitting an application.

Recommendation: Procurement and upgrade provisions within the Community Facilities – Built Policy be retained and reviewed to reflect current City practices (as shown in Attachment 1).

- Consent to Alter Council Leased Premises Policy (CJ281 – 08/01 refers).

This policy was adopted by Council in 2001 with the objective of delegating authority to the Chief Executive Officer to approve alterations or additions to leased Council premises, where the market value was less than \$20,000. This aimed to reduce delays associated with obtaining Council approval for minor works and was resolved by Council to be incorporated into the Register of Delegation of Authority to formalise the authorisation.

In 2005, the value of the delegation was increased to \$50,000 as part of the Policy Manual Review process (CJ206-10/05 refers), however, a resolution of Council to approve the increased value was not obtained when the amendment to the Policy was adopted. In 2006, a review of the Register of Delegation of Authority identified the delegation for deletion, justifying that it was operational in nature (CJ208-11/06 refers). As a result of Council adopting the amended Register in 2006, the delegation no longer applies.

Lease agreements are generally executed under common seal and as such, the agreement is established between the local government as an entity and the lessee. Therefore, for the Chief Executive Officer to make decisions under lease agreements, a delegation of authority is required, unless Council permission is obtained for the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a lease agreement on behalf of the local government. This extends to supporting alterations to leased premises prior to the submission of a building and/or development application, in accordance with most of the City's current lease agreements.

In most circumstances, requests for alterations to leased buildings are presented and approved by Council in the following manner:

- 1 Through a Community Sport and Recreation Facility Fund (CSRFF) application, in which Council would endorse the application and a subsequent building and/or development application would be submitted to the City for approval under existing delegated authorities; or
- 2 The City partially or fully funds a refurbishment through its obligations under a lease agreement and the project is listed on the Capital Works Program, which is presented to Council.

In either of these scenarios, a delegation is not applicable as the Council would be presented with the projects for endorsement.

A third scenario is that a lessee fully funds alteration works, which requires support from the City before submitting a building and/or development application, in accordance with individual lease agreements. This scenario does not occur often and the circumstances in which prior support would be required can vary between leases. Notwithstanding, in most cases the Council would need to approve the request in the absence of a delegation of authority.

In light of this authorisation gap, it is suggested that the provision be retained in the revised version of the Community Facilities – Built Policy, but it is generalised to refer to such requests being dealt with in accordance with individual lease agreements; given that the lease agreement is the mechanism to which the approval process is determined and that not all lease agreements are the same. It is further suggested that in adopting the revised policy, Council also re-establishes a delegation of authority for the Chief Executive Officer to approve alterations or additions to leased City premises for an amount not exceeding \$50,000. This seeks to reflect the significant increase in building costs since the original delegation of \$20,000 was established in 2001.

The City currently implements a comprehensive process to assess requests for new, or upgrades to, existing community facilities. For proposals to be supported they must align with the City's strategic objectives, demonstrate low levels of adverse impacts on the community and environment and identify sufficient financial capacity to support the project. In exercising powers under delegation, the City would apply its current assessment processes to ensure beneficial outcomes are achieved on behalf of the Council.

**Recommendations:** 1 Alterations to leased premises provisions within the Community Facilities – Built Policy be retained and reviewed to relate the application of approval processes to individual lease agreements.

- 2 A new delegation of authority is established to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to approve alterations or additions to leased City premises for an amount not exceeding \$50,000 and incorporate the delegation into the City's Register of Delegation of Authority.

- Leisure Facilities Capital Works Funding Policy (CJ021 - 02/03 refers).

This policy was adopted by Council in 2003 to complement the City's Formal Facilities Assessment Process that is used for assessing Community Sport and Recreation Facility Fund (CSRFF) Applications (now referred to as the Community Facilities Assessment Process).

The policy outlined the eligibility and funding criteria for community and sporting groups to apply for capital works projects. Most of the content was procedural in nature and duplicated the supporting assessment process. As such, most of the policy content was removed when consolidated into the Community Facilities – Built Policy in 2005, except for several high level needs assessment criterion. For example: financial impacts, community benefits, projected needs, sustainability outcomes, as described above in relation to alterations to leased facilities.

Recommendation: That high level needs assessment criterion for community building upgrade requests be retained within the Community Facilities – Built Policy.

- Storage and Consumption of Alcohol at Community Recreation Facilities and Reserves Policy (CJ213 – 06/99 refers).

Introduced by the former City of Wanneroo, this policy outlined the circumstances in which alcohol could be sold and/or stored in City facilities and on City reserves. Much of the original content of this policy was transferred to the current Community Facilities – Built Policy in 2005 and still remains.

Given that Council adopted an Alcohol Management Policy in 2011 (CJ159 - 09/11 refers), it is considered appropriate that all alcohol management related provisions contained within the current Community Facilities – Built Policy be transferred to this policy. A complementary report on this matter is being presented to the Policy Committee.

Recommendation: That alcohol management related provisions within the Community Facilities – Built Policy be removed and incorporated into the Alcohol Management Policy.

### **Residual Elements of the Policy**

Should the above recommendations be supported, the residual elements of the Community Facilities – Built Policy relate only to requests for new or upgrades to existing community facilities. As such, it is proposed that the title of the policy be amended to reflect this discrete policy matter, namely, Requests for New or Upgrades to Existing Community Facilities Policy.

As outlined in Attachment 1, an application statement and definitions have been included in the revised policy to limit the scope to sport and recreation facilities, clubrooms, community centres and community halls. The term “capital upgrades” has also been introduced throughout the policy to replace references to “extensions and alterations” and reflect more recent terminology utilised by the City.

The proposal categories remain the same, however, a fourth category has been introduced to account for proposals that are fully funded by a hirer or lessee. The category also reflects current application and assessment processes.

With regard to the original proposal categories, the revised policy makes general reference to alignment with strategic objectives and master planning principles, rather than identify specific strategic documents. It also outlines some of the key assessment criteria that must be addressed as part of the application process.

Finally, an additional provision has been included to reference that minimum standards apply to City managed facilities and that any requests over and above these standards are the responsibility of the applicant to provide. This provision is currently contained within the Management of Community Facilities Policy, which will be presented to Council for repeal following the adoption of the Property Management Framework. It proposed that minimum standards will be incorporated into the City’s Building Asset Management Plan 2010-2030 as part of the general asset management planning review in 2012/2013 to align with the Department of Local Government’s Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework.

#### **Issues and options considered:**

Council can either choose to:

- 1 Adopt the proposed amendments to the Community Facilities – Built Policy, as outlined in Attachment 1;
- 2 Request further modifications to the Community Facilities – Built Policy; or
- 3 Retain the Policy in its current format.

It is recommended that Option 1 be adopted by Council.

#### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation** Elements of the Community Facilities – Built Policy are informed by the following pieces of legislation:

- *Local Government Act 1995.*
- *Building Code of Australia.*
- *Access to Premises Standards 2010.*

#### **Strategic Community Plan**

**Key Theme:** Community wellbeing.

**Objective:** Quality facilities.

**Policy:**

This report outlines the outcome of a review of the current Community Facilities – Built Policy.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

In order to remain transparent and to facilitate appropriate decision-making processes, it is imperative that policies reflect the current positions of Council and work practices at the City. If not effectively maintained, there are risks associated with potentially misleading the community through publicly available, unreviewed policies.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Amendments to the Community Facilities – Built Policy will not have financial implications on the City.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

The revised Community Facilities – Built Policy demonstrates the incorporation of sustainability principles into the assessment process for proposals for new and capital upgrades to existing community buildings. This includes the consideration of social, financial and environmental impacts prior to supporting applications for capital works projects.

**Consultation:**

The revised Community Facilities – Built Policy informs internal processes and therefore, it is not recommended that it be released for public consultation.

**COMMENT**

In reviewing the Community Facilities – Built Policy the City proposes reverting previous consolidation efforts to re-establish a policy with a discrete purpose and objective. The decision to reverse the approach acknowledges that in 2005, the City's policy and planning framework was less sophisticated than it is today and as such, many of the current provisions within the policy are now superseded by new plans, policies and legislation.

In order to remain relevant and reflective of the City's current policy and planning environment, the Community Facilities – Built Policy has been significantly amended and redefined as policy that deals specifically with the issue of assessing requests for new, or upgrades to, existing community facilities.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Absolute Majority.

*Cr McLean returned to the Room, the time being 7.37pm.*

*The Manager Planning Services retired from the meeting, the time being 7.38pm.*

**MOVED Cr Ritchie, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Council:**

- 1 ADOPTS the revised Community Facilities – Built Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report (to be renamed the Requests for New or Upgrades to Existing Community Facilities Policy); and**
- 2 BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, DELEGATES to the Chief Executive Officer the authority to approve of alterations and additions to City premises by the lessee, where the cost is less than \$50,000, subject to the exercise of the delegation being reported to the Audit Committee on an annual basis.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 7 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach7agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

## **ITEM 8                    DRAFT PROPERTY MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK – VARIOUS POLICIES**

<b>WARD:</b>	All	
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Mr Jamie Parry Governance and Strategy	
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	101409, 43387, 46747, 63627, 101271, 101279, 101265, 23039, 89513, 101515	
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1	Council Report – Draft Property Management Framework
	Attachment 2	Draft Property Management Framework
	Attachment 3	Draft Inventory of City Freehold Property <i>(Please Note: This attachment is only available electronically)</i>
	Attachment 4	Inventory of (Managed) Crown Property <i>(Please Note: This attachment is only available electronically)</i>
	Attachment 5	Draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy
	Attachment 6	Comparison of Facility Hire Subsidies (Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy versus draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy)
	Attachment 7	Management of Community Facilities Policy (current)
	Attachment 8	Setting Fees and Charges Policy (current)
	Attachment 9	Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy (current)
	Attachment 10	Amended Schedule of Fees and Charges (proposed)

### **PURPOSE**

For the Policy Committee to be informed on various policy amendments required as a result of the draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 1 refers) proposed to be presented to Council at its meeting to be held on 20 November 2012.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 1 refers) is intended to provide the City with a guide to managing all property under the City's ownership, care and control. It contains specific requirements for the classifying of property and its usage.

The draft Property Management Framework has implications for policies of the City of Joondalup. It is considered appropriate that the Policy Committee note the policy proposals prior to the item being considered by Council at its meeting to be held on 20 November 2012, in accordance with the Policy Committee's role.

The report to be submitted to Council is provided as Attachment 1. This report, while providing a brief overview of the draft Property Management Framework, focuses primarily on the policy implications of the framework. Reference should be made to the attached report for further information regarding the framework proper.

It is recommended that the Policy Committee notes the report to Council on the draft Property Management Framework and the proposed amendments to associated policies.

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Joondalup manages 148 facilities over 19,000 square metres of land either as freehold or managed property which is reserved or dedicated under the *Land Administration Act 1997*. This property has been set aside for a diversity of purposes, such as recreation, public open space, drainage and administrative or infrastructure purposes.

In previous years, property management arrangements for City-owned and managed property have been approached on an ad-hoc basis. This has resulted in varying management methods and inconsistent leasing, licensing and facility hire conditions including the application of subsidised use.

The attached draft framework (Attachment 2 refers) takes a broad approach and addresses the myriad of issues involved in property management. It is intended to provide a consistent and concise methodology for the future.

## **DETAILS**

The draft Property Management Framework provides the City with a guide to managing all property under the City's ownership, care and control. The draft framework takes into account the City's statutory obligations and the desire to promote the wellbeing of all people in the community through support of recreational and community groups and the provision of high quality and accessible facilities.

The objectives of the draft framework are as follows:

- 1 To define the classifications for which City-owned and managed property is held.
- 2 To establish the categories and associated principles under which City-owned and -managed property may be used and occupied.
- 3 To promote equitable, effective and sustainable management practices for the use and occupation of City-owned and -managed property.

The report to be presented to Council (Attachment 1 refers) examines the following issues and options (for further details refer to the attached Report):

- Classification of Property.
- Property Utilisation by Groups.
- Standard Tenure Arrangements — Leases and Licences.
- Review of the Property Management Framework.

### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications:**

**Legislation:** Legislative implications for the draft Property Management Framework are referred to in detail in the Council Report - Draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 2 refers).

**Strategic Community Plan:**

- Key Theme:** Financial sustainability.
- Objective:** Effective management.
- Key Theme:** Quality urban environment.
- Objective:** Quality open spaces.
- Key Theme:** Community wellbeing.
- Objective:** Quality facilities.

**Policies:**

The draft Property Management Framework has implications for a number of City of Joondalup policies; these are described below.

**Management of Community Facilities Policy (current):**

The current City Policy - Management of Community Facilities (Attachment 7 refers) provides specific guidelines for the development of lease/licence arrangements with pre-school centres, surf life saving clubs and groups that contributed to the cost of building a facility specifically.

These guidelines have been re-drafted and standardised as part of the draft Property Management Framework and it is therefore recommended that this policy be revoked in its entirety.

**Setting Fees and Charges Policy (current):**

The current Council Policy — Setting Fees and Charges (Attachment 8 refers) describes the various fees and charges that the City is permitted to raise. Namely, fees and charges are permitted for City-provided 'goods' and 'services'. It is considered that this is adequately provided for under the *Local Government Act 1995*, and is therefore unnecessary to repeat in a Council policy.

The Setting Fees and Charges Policy also describes the basis for hire fees. Namely, that hire fees for 'inside venues' will be based on 100% cost recovery, and that hire fees for 'outside venues' will be based on 20% cost recovery. In practice, this is generally not applied (such fees are usually much less than 100% and 20% respectively). Again, it is considered that this is adequately provided for under the *Local Government Act 1995*, and is therefore unnecessary to repeat in a Council Policy.

The policy also provides guidelines for developing lease agreements. These guidelines have been re-drafted and standardised as part of the draft Property Management Framework.

It is therefore recommended that this policy be revoked in its entirety.

**Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy (current):**

The current City Policy - Hire of Community Facilities and Venues (Attachment 9 refers) outlines the subsidised hire fees that are available for some not-for-profit community groups. These subsidies have been re-drafted and expanded upon in a new policy (draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy). It is therefore recommended that this policy be revoked in its entirety.

**Facility Hire Subsidy Policy (draft):**

The draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy (Attachment 5) is a new policy which has been developed to align with the principles and objectives of the draft Property Management Framework. This draft policy builds on the current Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy to provide greater subsidised use to not-for-profit community groups in the City.

The objectives of the draft policy are:

- To provide guidance on determining the extent of subsidy to be offered to groups hiring City-managed facilities.
- To ensure facility hire subsidies are applied in a consistent, transparent and equitable manner.

The intention of the draft policy is for the City to subsidise the cost of facility hire charges for City-managed facilities for local not-for-profit community groups and groups from educational institutions if the group is able to demonstrate that at least 50% of its active members/participants reside within the City of Joondalup.

A comparison of the facility hire subsidies provided by the draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy and the current Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy is provided as Attachment 5.

**Risk Management Considerations:**

Risk management considerations for the draft Property Management Framework are referred to in detail in the Council Report - Draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 2 refers).

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Financial/budget implications for the draft Property Management Framework are referred to in detail in the Council Report - Draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 2 refers).

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable.

**Sustainability Implications:**

Sustainability implications for the draft Property Management Framework are referred to in detail in the Council Report - Draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 1 refers).

**Consultation:**

Consultation in relation to the draft Property Management Framework is referred to in detail in the Council Report - Draft Property Management Framework (Attachment 1 refers).

**COMMENT**

The draft Property Management Framework provides the City with a guide to managing all property under the City's ownership, care and control. The draft framework takes into account the City's statutory obligations and the desire to promote the wellbeing of all people in the community through support of recreational and community groups and the provision of high quality and accessible facilities. The draft framework also recognises the City's obligations to support not-for-profit community groups through subsidisation.

The City's current practices relating to leasing/licensing and facility hire have been approached on an ad-hoc basis. Without a broad framework to operate under, this has resulted in varying management methods and inconsistent leasing/licensing and facility hire conditions. With a Property Management Framework, it is anticipated that the City will be able to apply a consistent and concise methodology to property management.

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

*The Chief Executive Officer returned to the Room, the time being 7.43pm.*

*Cr Chester left the Room, the time being 7.56pm, and returned at 7.59pm.*

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Committee NOTES:

- 1 the report to Council on the draft *Property Management Framework*, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report;
- 2 the draft *Property Management Framework*, as detailed in Attachment 2 to this Report;
- 3 the draft *Inventory of City Freehold Property*, as detailed in Attachment 3 to this Report;
- 4 the *Inventory of (Managed) Crown Property*, as detailed in Attachment 4 to this Report;
- 5 the following policy proposals being presented to Council at its meeting to be held 20 November 2012:
  - 5.1 ADOPTION of the draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy, as detailed in Attachment 5 to this Report;
  - 5.2 NOTING of the Comparison of Facility Hire Subsidies (Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy versus draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy), as detailed in Attachment 6 to this Report;
  - 5.3 REVOCATION of the current Management of Community Facilities Policy, as detailed in Attachment 7 to this Report;
  - 5.4 REVOCATION of the current Setting Fees and Charges Policy, as detailed in Attachment 8 to this Report; and
  - 5.5 REVOCATION of the current Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy, as detailed in Attachment 9 to this Report.

**MOVED Cr Hamilton-Prime, SECONDED Cr Ritchie that the Policy Committee NOTES:**

- 1** the report to Council on the draft *Property Management Framework*, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report with the following additions;
  - 1.1** **REQUESTS** the administration to identify leases to be set at a Peppercorn rental;
- 2** the draft *Property Management Framework*, as detailed in Attachment 2 to this Report;
- 3** the draft *Inventory of City Freehold Property*, as detailed in Attachment 3 to this Report;
- 4** the *Inventory of (Managed) Crown Property*, as detailed in Attachment 4 to this Report;
- 5** the following policy proposals being presented to Council at its meeting to be held 20 November 2012:
  - 5.1** **ADOPTION** of the draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy, as detailed in Attachment 5 to this Report subject to Table 1 - Matrix for determining facility hire subsidies with the following additions:
    - 5.1.1** Any subsidy provided to Adult Recreation or Sporting Groups is provided directly to the local group;
    - 5.1.2** The City reserves the right that if a group is booking a facility and it is not being utilised it may charge that group for the unutilised booking of that facility;
  - 5.2** **NOTING** of the Comparison of Facility Hire Subsidies (Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy versus draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy), as detailed in Attachment 6 to this Report;
  - 5.3** **REVOCAION** of the current Management of Community Facilities Policy, as detailed in Attachment 7 to this Report;
  - 5.4** **REVOCAION** of the current Setting Fees and Charges Policy, as detailed in Attachment 8 to this Report; and
  - 5.5** **REVOCAION** of the current Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy, as detailed in Attachment 9 to this Report.

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

***An electronic link has been provided for each Attachment individually as follows:***

Attachment 1 - Council Report – Draft Property Management Framework

*Appendix 8 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach8minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 2 - Draft Property Management Framework

*Appendix 10 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach10minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 3 - Draft Inventory of City Freehold Property

*(Please Note: This attachment is only available electronically)*

*Appendix 11 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach11minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 4 - Inventory of (Managed) Crown Property

*(Please Note: This attachment is only available electronically)*

*(Please Note: Due to the size of this attachment it has been uploaded separately to the agenda)*

*Appendix 12 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

Attachment 5 - Draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy

*Appendix 13 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach13minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 6 - Comparison of Facility Hire Subsidies (Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy versus draft Facility Hire Subsidy Policy)

*Appendix 14 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach14minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 7 - Management of Community Facilities Policy (current)

*Appendix 15 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach15minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 8 - Setting Fees and Charges Policy (current)

*Appendix 16 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach16minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 9 - Hire of Community Facilities and Venues Policy (current)

*Appendix 17 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach17minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

Attachment 10 - Amended Schedule of Fees and Charges (proposed)

*Appendix 18 refers - To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:*

[\*Attach18minPolicy121112.pdf\*](#)

**ITEM 9 ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY - MAJOR REVIEW**

---

<b>WARD:</b>	All
<b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b>	Mr Charlie Reynolds Infrastructure Services
<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	101257, 101515
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Attachment 1 Asset Management Policy

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to consider proposed amendments to the Asset Management Policy to align with the Department of Local Government's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework and the City's new strategic objectives under the Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Asset Management Policy was first introduced in 2007 (CJ048-03/07 refers) as a result of the City joining the WALGA-developed Western Australian Asset Management Improvement Program (WAAMI). The program sought to facilitate improved asset management practices across Western Australian local governments.

The current objective of the Asset Management Policy is to ensure the City implements a coordinated and sustainable approach to asset management. There have been no amendments to the policy since its original adoption in 2007.

Following the introduction of the Department of Local Government's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework and the adoption of the City's Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022, the Asset Management Policy has since been reviewed.

As a result of the review the policy has been significantly revised to reflect the City's new strategic objectives, the Department of Local Government's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework and current best practice standards.

*It is recommended that Council ADOPTS the revised Asset Management Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.*

**BACKGROUND**

In 2010, the Department of Local Government released its Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework to guide and strengthen the strategic planning and reporting capacity of local governments within Western Australia.

One of the key components of this framework is asset management. The Department released supplementary planning guidelines in 2011 to assist local governments to achieve best practice standards for asset management in accordance with the Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework.

During this period the City also commenced a process to review its Policy Manual. Given the significance of asset management to strategic planning activities, a decision was made to postpone the review of the Asset Management Policy until the City's Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022 was adopted by Council.

As a result of Council's adoption of the Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022 at its October 2012 meeting (CJ210-10/12 refers), the Asset Management Policy has been reviewed to:

- Reflect the City's new standardised policy template;
- Reflect the City's new strategic objectives under the Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022 as they relate to asset management;
- Align with the Department of Local Government's Asset Management Framework and Guidelines;
- Acknowledge international standards for asset management practices; and
- Consider example policies from leading local governments with regard to asset management.

This report presents the outcomes of the review and suggests significant changes to the Asset Management Policy for the Policy Committee's consideration.

## **DETAILS**

The City's infrastructure assets include roads, storm water drainage, buildings, parks, footpaths and car parks and represent a significant investment by the City to support modern living in our community. The City's asset portfolio is within approximately \$800 million.

The City's Asset Management Policy provides guidance and high level principles in the coordination of asset management planning and delivery.

### **Policy History**

The Asset Management Policy was first introduced to Council in 2007 (CJ048-03/07 refers), after the City joined the Western Australia Asset Management Improvement Program (WAAMI). This program was developed by a local government working group comprising the Western Australian Local Government Association and the then Department of Local Government and Regional Development amongst others.

The program aimed to facilitate asset management improvement in Western Australian local governments via three core elements:

- Building awareness;
- Providing tools;
- Developing a self-assessment and improvement framework.

In accordance with the requirements of the WAAMI Program, Council adopted an Asset Management Policy in 2007 (CJ048 - 03/07 refers), to define a vision for asset management, establish key asset management decision-making principles and guide the City in maximising infrastructure performance for the lowest 'whole of life' cost.

The Asset Management Policy has not been subject to review since its inception in 2007.

## Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022

The City's new Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022 imbeds statements and objectives pertaining to effective asset management across several key themes within the document. Most evidently, the City has committed to the following objectives that will have direct implications on the manner in which asset management activities are undertaken in the future, which include:

- Quality built outcomes - For the City's commercial and residential areas to be filled with quality buildings and appealing streetscapes.
- Integrated spaces - To have integrated land use and transport planning that provides convenient and efficient movement across the City.
- Quality facilities- To provide facilities of the highest quality which reflect the needs of the community now and into the future.
- Effective management - To conduct business in a financially sustainable manner.

These objectives apply to all asset classes including roads, buildings, drainage, fleet, and parks, as well as minor asset groups such as bridges, paths and others.

In summary, strategic initiatives within the Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022, as they relate to asset management, support the following key principles:

- Demographic considerations.
- Enduring and relevant designs.
- Agreed service levels.
- Long-term funding capacity.
- Community values.
- Utilisation.
- High standards of liveability.

In order to reflect these new directions and terminology, the above principles have been considered for incorporation in some way within the revised Asset Management Policy provided at Attachment 1.

## Asset Management Guidelines and Framework

According to the Department of Local Government's Asset Management Guidelines and Framework, an Asset Management Policy outlines:

*"...a local government's asset management objectives, targets and plans. It establishes a platform for service delivery and provides the framework that enables the Asset Management Strategy and Plans to be produced. The Asset Management Policy must support a 'whole of life' and 'whole of organisation' approach to asset management.*

*The local government administration develops the Asset Management Policy with the Council based on its priorities and community needs."*

The revised version of the Asset Management Policy provided at Attachment 1 takes into consideration the key features proposed in the guidelines above, particularly with regard to a long-term management (or 'whole of life'), defining service levels and demonstrating cost-effectiveness in planning decisions. This is also consistent with eastern-states local governments and the International Infrastructure Management Manual, which highlight these key principles and features.

### **Proposed Amendments**

As a result of research, benchmarking and strategic alignment activities, the following amendments are recommended to the Asset Management Policy:

- Amend the objective to better reflect the purpose of the policy;
- Amend the policy statement to remove background information and outline the City's commitment to maintaining and managing assets in accordance with best practice standards, taking into consideration principles contained within the Strategic Community Plan 2012-2022 and the Department of Local Government's Asset Management Guidelines and Framework;
- Realign the format of the policy to the new standardised policy template; and
- Amend the details section of the policy to update the high-level principles upon which assets are managed by the City, based on recent benchmarking and research exercises into current asset management practices.

### **Issues and options considered:**

With regard to the Asset Management Policy, Council can either choose to:

- 1 Adopt the proposed amendments to the Asset Management Policy, as outlined in Attachment 1;
- 2 Adopt the Asset Management Policy with modifications; or
- 3 Retain the Asset Management Policy in its current format.

It is recommended that option 1 is adopted by Council.

### **Legislation/Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Legislation:** Not Applicable.

#### **Strategic Community Plan:**

**Key Theme:** Financial sustainability.

**Objective:** Effective management.

#### **Policy:**

This report considers the review of the Asset Management Policy.

### **Risk Management Considerations:**

This policy has an objective to minimise risk through a co-ordinated approach to asset management.

### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

The manner in which the Asset Management Policy guides City activities will impact on the financial costs associated with the planning, acquisition, maintenance, renewal, replacement and disposal of asset infrastructure.

The policy directs the City to take a long-term view on the planning and management of assets to ensure that expenditure is affordable and aligned to pre-determined service levels.

**Regional Significance:**

It is acknowledged that some of the City's infrastructure will be provided on a regional scale however, the regional nature of an asset will not impact on the manner in which it is managed according to the Asset Management Policy.

**Sustainability implications:**

The Asset Management Policy is underpinned by general principles relating to sustainability, particularly with regard to the financial costs of managing infrastructure which must be balanced against the social benefits of its provision.

**Consultation:**

Not Applicable.

**COMMENT**

The review of the Asset Management Policy will provide a catalyst for all asset planning documents to be re-evaluated and compared to the Department of Local Government's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework.

As such, it intends to be a high level policy that covers general principles as they relate to all asset classes. Further work will be conducted later this year in reviewing the current Asset Management Plan and Asset Management Strategy in alignment with the revised Policy.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**MOVED Mayor Pickard, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Council ADOPTS the proposed amendments to the Asset Management Policy, as detailed in Attachment 1 to this Report.**

**The Motion was Put and**

**CARRIED (6/0)**

**In favour of the Motion:** Cr Gobbert, Mayor Pickard, Crs Chester, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood and Ritchie.

*Appendix 9 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach9agnPolicy121112.pdf](#)*

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

Nil.

## **REQUESTS FOR REPORTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION**

Cr Hamilton-Prime requested a report be presented to a future meeting of the Policy Committee with regard to the development of a new policy concerning parking for bicycles, motorbikes and scooters in multi-storey residential buildings and mixed use buildings within the City of Joondalup.

## **CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Deputy Presiding Member declared the Meeting closed at 8.20pm, the following Committee Members being present at that time:

Cr Liam Gobbert  
Mayor Troy Pickard  
Cr John Chester  
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime  
Cr Kerry Hollywood  
Cr Teresa Ritchie