



City of
Joondalup

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON 23 APRIL 2002**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No:	Item	Page
	OPEN AND WELCOME	1
	ATTENDANCES	1
	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	2
	APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE	22
	DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTEREST/INTEREST AFFECTING IMPARTIALITY	22
	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	
C49-04/02	MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING, 9 APRIL 2002	23
	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR WITHOUT DISCUSSION	
	ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	23
	COMPUTER VOTING A NATIONAL FIRST	23
	CURRAMBINE PRIMARY SALUTES ANZACS	23
	OFFICIAL WAR HISTORY DONATED TO JOONDALUP LIBRARY	24
	WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY	24
C50-04/02	PETITIONS	
	PETITION IN RELATION TO NEW SQUASH CENTRE – MARMION SQUASH CLUB – [22209 02730]	24
	PETITION IN RELATION TO THE SPEED OF VEHICLES USING HEATHERTON MEWS, HILLARYS – [45712]	24
C51-04/02	REQUEST FOR SECOND PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	25

REPORTS

CJ085 – 04/02	SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS EXECUTED BY MEANS OF AFFIXING THE COMMON SEAL - [15876]	25
CJ086 – 04/02	REVIEW OF CORPORATE CODE OF CONDUCT - [09358].....	26
CJ087 – 04/02	WARRANT OF PAYMENTS - 31 MARCH 2002 – [09882].....	29
CJ088 – 04/02	FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 MARCH 2002 – [07882]	31
CJ089 – 04/02	TENDER NO. 029-01/02 CONSTRUCTION OF A ROUNDABOUT AT INTERSECTION OF HODGES DRIVE & CONSTELLATION DRIVE, OCEAN REEF – [51521]	32
CJ090 – 04/02	DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT – [07032]	35
CJ091 – 04/02	KINROSS NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN – PORTION OF LOT 9000 - CORNER SELKIRK AND CONNOLLY DRIVES, KINROSS – [20514]	36
CJ092 – 04/02	PROPOSED 56 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS AND TWO COMMERCIAL UNITS AT LOT 502 & 503 (105) GRAND BOULEVARD CNR HAMPTON COURT & SHENTON AVENUE, JOONDALUP – [75469]	41

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CJ093 – 04/02	ESTABLISHMENT OF 2002/03 BUDGET COMMITTEE - [76514 13020 55055]	48
---------------	---	----

C52-04/02	MOTION TO ADJOURN MEETING – [02154] [08122]	52
-----------	--	----

C53-04/02	CBD ENHANCEMENT PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE – [53469]	55
-----------	--	----

C54-04/02	PROPOSED BUSINESS INCUBATOR – LOT 502 COLLIER PASS, JOONDALUP FOR THE NORTH WEST METRO BUSINESS ASSOCIATION – [43965]	57
-----------	---	----

C55-04/02	MOTION TO GO BEHIND CLOSED DOORS	61
-----------	---	----

C56-04/02	CONFIDENTIAL – STREETSIDE BENCHES PROPOSED SETTLEMENT – [45612] [45924]	61
-----------	---	----

RESUMPTION OF STANDING ORDERS	62
--	----

MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

C57-04/02	NOTICE OF MOTION NO 1 - CR C MACKINTOSH.....	62
C58-04/02	NOTICE OF MOTION NO 2 - CR A WALKER	63
C59-04/02	NOTICE OF MOTION NO 3 - CR WALKER	67

PERSONAL EXPLANATION – CR C BAKER	71
--	----

CONGRATULATIONS	71
------------------------------	----

DATE OF NEXT MEETING	71
-----------------------------------	----

SECOND PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	71
--	----

CLOSURE	72
----------------------	----

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP, ON TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2002

OPEN AND WELCOME

The Mayor declared the meeting open at 1900 hrs.

ATTENDANCES

Mayor

J BOMBAK, JP

Elected Members:

Cr D CARLOS	Marina Ward	
Cr C BAKER	Marina Ward	
Cr A NIXON	North Coastal Ward	<i>to 2031 hrs</i>
Cr J F HOLLYWOOD, JP	North Coastal Ward	<i>Absent from 2027 hrs to 2028 hrs</i>
Cr A WALKER	Pinnaroo Ward	
Cr P ROWLANDS	Pinnaroo Ward	<i>from 1940 hrs</i>
Cr T BARNETT	South Ward	
Cr M O'BRIEN, JP	South Ward	<i>Absent from 2027 hrs to 2028 hrs</i>
Cr A L PATTERSON	South Coastal Ward	<i>Absent from 2207 hrs to 2210 hrs</i>
Cr G KENWORTHY	South Coastal Ward	
Cr J HURST	Whitfords Ward	
Cr C MACKINTOSH	Whitfords Ward	

Officers:

Acting Chief Executive Officer:	D DJULBIC	
Acting Director, Corporate Services and Resource Management:	A SCOTT	
Acting Director, Planning & Community Development:	C TERELINCK	
Manager, Marketing, Communications & Council Support:	M SMITH	
Manager, Infrastructure Management Services:	P PIKOR	
Senior Administration Officer, Infrastructure & Operations:	B SILLENCE	<i>to 2205 hrs</i>
Publicity Officer:	L BRENNAN	
Committee Clerk	J AUSTIN	
Minute Clerk:	L TAYLOR	
Minute Clerk:	G KELLY	

There were 17 members of the Public and 1 member of the Press in attendance.

In Attendance

Mr Nick Manifis, Walman Software

Mr Philip Baker, Director Church Public Affairs

The Mayor welcomed Mr Philip Baker as this evening's invited guest.

Mr Philip Baker advised he was a representative of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. He brought best wishes from the State President, Mr Paul Lekias and informed the meeting of various facts about the Mormon Church including the fact that there are 110,000 Mormons in Australia at the present, with approximately 12,000 living in Western Australia. It is also the fastest growing Christian Church in Australia.

He presented elected members with a CD, including a set of library reference material packages to be placed in the Joondalup Library. These packages have been placed in most major universities and City libraries throughout Australia and New Zealand.

Mr Baker thanked Council for inviting him tonight and opened the meeting with a prayer.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following questions, submitted by Mr A Bryant, Craigie, were taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Q1 I am a member of the Council Committee in respect to senior citizens that meets at night. Would it be possible for the disabled parking bays to be supplied with lights?

A1 The installation of additional lighting will be investigated.

Q2 On page 4 of tonight's agenda, Crs Hurst, Mackintosh, Walker and Carlos and the Executive Committee of Management of the Whitfords Senior Citizens Association and the Association of Independent Retirees are nominated to form part of the Project Team to negotiate the relocation of the library service. I am Vice President of the Association of Independent Retirees and have not been contacted in regard to joining that Committee.

A2 Preliminary contact was made with Councillors and other contacts who are members or associates of the Senior Citizens Group, and it was intended that a meeting be called to run through the notional proposal. The intention to make the meeting arrangements was overtaken by the Special Electors' meeting, and as a consequence of the resolution, the future of the project needs further investigation. A report will be presented to the Council during June giving an update on the status of the issue, as well as addressing the resolutions.

The following questions, submitted by Mr R de Gruchy, Sorrento, were taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Q1 What are the corporate overheads for Craigie Leisure Centre alone?

A1 Corporate Overheads allocated to the “Activity 866 – Leisure Centres – RANS” includes all Centres managed by RANS (Craigie Leisure Centre, Sorrento/Duncraig and Ocean Ridge). The corporate overhead costs allocated to this Activity relate to the costs of managing the contract with RANS. As such, costs are not able to be isolated for Craigie Leisure Centre.

Q2 *The business plan presented to Councillors prior to them taking the decision on agreeing to a ten year lease of the three leisure centres by RANS clearly shows an official opening date of March 2002. If the agreement with RANS is different to the business plan, how many Councillors are aware of that fact? I would like to be allowed to examine this agreement and accordingly I seek Council’s approval to view it in its entirety.*

A2 Variations have been identified between the “Business Plan for a Major Land Transaction – The Lease of the City of Joondalup Leisure Facilities” document which was presented to Council on 19 December 2000, and the RANS Contract. The Business Plan states that the upgrade to the children’s play area and fitness facility would be completed by certain specified dates. The contract agreement between the City and RANS Management is not specific in this respect.

The RANS Management Group have completed a needs assessment study and are now progressing the development phase for the fitness centre.

The following question, submitted by Mrs M Macdonald, Mullaloo, was taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002

Q1 *As far as I can see, you have only stopped precinct planning in four suburbs. Your press statement indicated that there were 18 suburbs that were still subject to precinct planning. Does precinct planning still exist in respect to those 18 suburbs?*

A1 The Council is not proceeding with the precinct planning exercise in any suburb in the City.

The following question, submitted by Mrs M Zakrevsky, Mullaloo, was taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Q1 *I refer to a petition that was part of the 2 April 2002 briefing session agenda under outstanding petitions. That petition requests installation of boom gates or retractable bollards for Neil Hawkins Park, Joondalup. What is the underlying reason for this request by the petitioners?*

If it is the intention to keep out vehicles at all times or at certain times in Neil Hawkins Park, could Councillors give consideration to a number of other carparks where antisocial behaviours is occurring?

A1 The petitioners refer to increasing problems occurring in the park associated with vandalism, illicit drug use, racing of motor vehicles and a general disturbance of the peace. It was requested that the park be closed to vehicular traffic after 8.00 pm each evening, with more frequent security patrols being conducted in addition to the installation of a boom gate, retractable bollards or similar devices being used in an attempt to alleviate the problem.

The City will consider these requests as they arise and the need for gates or bollards will be assessed on an individual basis.

The following questions, submitted by Ms S Hart, Greenwood, were taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Q1 A couple of meetings ago I asked what the word 'note' meant and you told me to go home and look it up in my dictionary. Can I please ask someone to investigate that previous question as it was not recorded in the minutes and I have not received any paperwork?

A1 This question was answered at the Council meeting held on 26 February 2002 and the minutes of that meeting reflect the response accordingly. A letter was forwarded to Ms Hart advising her of the responses to all her questions from that meeting.

Q2 Can I please have an itemised account (excluding staff time) of the Greenwood, Kingsley and Mullaloo Special Electors' meetings?

A2 Costs associated with the holding of the Special Meetings of Electors held at Greenwood, Kingsley and Mullaloo are as follows:

	Greenwood	Kingsley	Mullaloo	Total
Chairs/Tables & Stage	-	1,396.00	2,434.00	3,830.00
Hire of Venue	140.80	160.00	-	300.80
Lighting	-	1,063.65	498.00	1,561.65
Security	240.45	480.90	526.70	1,248.05
Sound Recording	610.00	672.50	799.00	2,081.50
Video Recording	500.00	500.00	-	-1,000.00
			Total	<u>10,022.00</u>

The following question, submitted by Mr S Magyar, Heathridge, was taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Re: Report on Mindarie Regional Council submitted to Briefing Session held 2 April 2002

Q1 If that Report was dealt with as a green paper, was the Report marked Private and Confidential and if so under what provisions of the Local Government Act?

A1 The report was dealt with as a green paper and as permitted by clause 7.2 of the City's Standing Orders was marked confidential. As the briefing session is not a constituted meeting of the Council or of a committee that is constituted under the Local Government Act 1995, no decisions are made within this forum. Therefore the relevant sections of the Act relating to closing meetings of a committee or the Council do not relate to these forums.

The following questions, submitted by Mr M Sideris, Mullaloo, were taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

Q1 Please advise when the height restriction of three storeys for commercial zoned property sites was amended and what are they today?

A1 There is no current building height restriction for commercially zoned land. Draft Amendment 10 includes a proposal for building height limits, however, this has not yet been adopted.

Q2 What public consultation process was used and when was it advertised?

A2 Amendment 10 was subject to public consultation in accordance with statutory requirements, in this case, the Town Planning regulations. The amendment was advertised for 45 days, from 28 November 2001 – 9 January 2002.

Q3 When was it presented to Council?

A3 The amendment was adopted by Council at its meeting on 23 October 2001 (CJ226–07/01).

Q4 Advise how a currently defined ‘beach front shop’ use can be considered as a ‘mixed use village’?

A4 The draft Centres Strategy considered a total view of the desired location and distribution of retail centres throughout the City, recognising existing sites and also planning for the future. The “Village Centre” classification for the Mullaloo Tavern site was derived from its relationship to the local area and proximity/separation from other Centres in the surrounding areas.

Q5 Provide the definition of what short-term accommodation is. A motel and a hotel and a reference to these definitions?

A5 The Residential Planning Codes define a “dwelling” as a building used for permanent habitation by up to six people, whereas a “residential building” is defined as a building which is used for temporary accommodation by two or more people. “Motel” and “Hotel” have a separate definition in the District Planning Scheme (DPS2), as follows:

“Hotel: means any land or buildings used for the overnight accommodation of patrons and may include facilities for consumption of beverages or a restaurant, or a betting agency operated in accordance with the Totalisator Agency Betting Board Act 1960, or facilities for entertainment, but does not include a bed and breakfast facility, and which may be the subject of a hotel licence granted under the provisions of the Liquor licensing Act 1988.”

“Motel: means premises used to accommodate patrons in a manner similar to a hotel but at which special provision is made for the accommodation of patrons with motor vehicles and which does not operate with a Hotel or Limited Hotel Licence, or a Cabaret Licence or a Tavern Licence or a Special Facility Licence”

- Q6 Has any or all of these definitions been adopted by Council, and if so when?*
- A6 The definition of “Residential Building”, “Dwelling”, “Motel” and “Hotel” are a part of District Planning Scheme No.2 (DPS2). DPS2 was adopted in November 2000.
- Q7 Why, under the District Planning Scheme No.2, a residential zoned site is subjected to more stringent planning requirements than a commercial site?*
- A7 Development standards differ for different zonings. There are requirements that apply to a commercial site that would not be applicable to a residential site. The planning intentions for commercially zoned land are quite difference to residential zoned land, and the development standards in the Scheme reflect this.
- Q8 Advise why in the planning scheme there is no distinction or consideration given to differences in a commercial site in a defined business/commercial/industrial area and when it is adjoining to a residential area?*
- A8 The Scheme sets out setback requirements for non-residential buildings which are similar to those applied for residential buildings (particularly when the residential buildings are substantial in bulk).
- Q9 When did the Mullaloo Precinct Plan not become a precinct plan?*
- A9 The Council’s view has been that the Mullaloo Concept Plan is a project of small scale, with easily identified design objectives, compared to the precinct plan which focused on generating employment and major issues associated with revitalisation of district centres.

The following question, submitted by Mr K Zakrevsky, Mullaloo, were taken on notice at the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002:

- Q1 Relating to my earlier question regarding the Whitford Library - Page 5 “should negotiations result in the library being relocated into the shopping centre it is Council’s intention that that part of the building which would be vacated, shall be subject to refurbishment”. At the meeting it was specifically related to the library that there would be full discussion with the public and all costs be presented. Why was this information not provided to the Councillors in order that they may debate the issue?*
- A1 The information was provided in an attachment to the Agenda item, and the Agenda item made clear reference to the detailed resolutions passed at the Special Electors’ meeting.

The following questions were submitted by Ms Paula Clark, Greenwood:

- Q1 Who was responsible for instigating the meeting between the Mayor, Chief Executive Officer and Minister for Local Government?
- Q2 *Who invited the Hon Ken Travers to attend this meeting?*
- Q3 *Who prepared the agenda for the meeting?*

- Q4 Who placed the issue of Special Electors' meetings on the agenda?*
- Q5 Who put forward the proposal to amend the Local Government Act to increase the number of electors required to sign a petition to call a Special Electors' meeting to 1% of electors.*
- Q6 At the time of the meeting with the Minister for Local Government, did the Mayor or Chief Executive Officer consider that 100 electors being able to call a Special Electors' meeting was too low a figure for the City of Joondalup and if so why?*
- Q7 Do the Mayor or Chief Executive Officer still consider that 100 electors being able to call a Special Electors' meeting is too low and if so why?*
- Q8 Do the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer still believe that the number of electors required to call a Special Electors' meeting should be 1% of electors and if so why?*
- Q9 If the answer to question 8 is no, what do the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer consider to be the appropriate figure?*
- Q10 Do the Mayor or Chief Executive Officer believe that any of the four Electors' meetings to have been requested this year to have been called for any reason other than that contained in the petition and if so what do they believe to be the other reasons?*
- Q11 Do the Mayor or Chief Executive Officer believe anyone had malicious reasons for requesting any of the four Electors' meetings called this year?*
- Q12 What further action do the Mayor or Chief Executive Officer intend to take to try and have the number of electors changed from 100 to a higher figure?*

A1-12 These questions will be taken on notice.

The following question was submitted by Ms Paula Clark, Greenwood:

- Q1 What did the Special Electors' meeting for the senior citizen's at Whitfords cost?*
- A1 Costs associated with the staging of the Special Electors' meeting for the senior citizen's at Whitfords amounted to \$480.00 for the hire of the sound/tape recordist. (Costs associated with staff overtime have not been included).

The following questions were submitted by Mr Michael Caiacob, Mullaloo:

- Q1 At what date did Council's liaison with the tavern developers and consultants commence?*
- A1 It is not possible to recall the exact day that negotiations with the new tavern owners commenced.

Q2 Your reply to my Question 4 at the Council Meeting held on 9 April 2002 “define relaxed” within the meaning of Clause 4.16.3” stated that there was no finite limit on the relaxation of the height requirement with “no finite limits” does this mean that the height of a building may be unrestricted if an individual proposal is of quality deserving reward (merit)?

A2 The amendment suggests that two storeys is the normal limit, but that variations may be allowable.

Q3 Define the merits required by a proposal to obtain the non-finite limit of relaxation in regards to height requirements Clause 4.16.3?

A3 As stated in the Amendment 10 documentation (which was subject to public advertising), proposed Clause 4.16.3 states:

“If the Council is of the opinion that a proposed expansion or partial redevelopment of an existing centre is of such a small scale as to excuse the preparation of a Structure Plan, such expansion or partial redevelopment may be approved in the absence of an Agreed Structure Plan. In any such case, the built form will be encouraged where possible to adopt a ‘main street’ style. Development should contribute significantly to the improvement of amenity in the area and should promote a safe, convenient and attractive environment for the community. The following development standards will apply:

- (a) any building should have a zero setback to front and side boundaries with attention drawn to the improvement of streetscape.*
- (b) Building height is to be no greater than two storeys, however that constraint may be relaxed for buildings situated at prime locations and designed of landmark quality.*
- (c) Car parking may be provided up to 20% less than the requirement under Table 2. Where possible, car parking may be provided in the form of embayed parking within the road reserve, using the cash in lieu provisions contained in Clause 4.11.”*

The Scheme report also describes reasons for the Clause, in the following terms:

“A key objective of the Centres Strategy is to promote the revitalisation and remodelling of existing centres, where practical along ‘main street’ principles, as integrated, mixed use, safe, attractive and vibrant centres that provide for a community focus. As part of this objective, a proposal has been prepared to include new development standards in Part 4 of the Scheme that will achieve this aim in summary as follows:

- acknowledge Table 1 of the City of Joondalup Centres Strategy that provides a strategic guide to the functions that apply to each level in the hierarchy of centres.*
- Provide for the compulsory use of structure plans where a new centre is to be developed or an existing centre redeveloped.*

- *Promote built form in the ‘main street’ style of development using design principles outlined in Liveable Neighbourhoods (2001).*
- *Provide for an alternative development standard reflecting ‘main street’ principles where small scale or partial expansion of an existing centre is proposed.”*

Q4 Question No 6 from meeting 9 April 2002 has not been written down completely. The reply provided to question 6 does not answer the question. Please reply to this question provided previously.

A4 We have no knowledge of any further detail to your previous question. The answer was provided to the question that was asked.

Q5 Question No 8 from meeting 9 April 2002 has not been answered. (The City of Joondalup should be aware of all building components required by a submission in order to make an informed decision.)

A5 There has been no application for any media or telecommunication towers or infrastructure. If this were to be subsequently submitted, the provision of the Commonwealth Telecommunication Code would apply.

Q6 Reference my question 9 Council Meeting 9 April 2002. What assessment and determination will be forthcoming and when, in regards to possible communication towers or satellite dishes at or on the proposed Mullaloo Tavern redevelopment site?

A6 Please refer to the answer to Question 5. In dealing with the proponent, we will endeavour to find out if any infrastructure is proposed and this will be forwarded for your information.

Q7 Within the City of Joondalup, prior to additional loads being placed on public parking by the future reduction of Table 2 requirements by 20%, will the cost or has the cost per bay of cash in lieu of parking increase?

A7 Cash in lieu of parking rates are reviewed regularly. There is no proposal for cash in lieu payment as a component of the application.

Q8 My question 11 from Council Meeting 9 April 2002 has not been answered in full.

A8 We are not aware of any other detail required for this response.

Q9 In regard the previous lapsed submission from the Mullaloo Tavern site redevelopment what was the nature of insufficient detail that meant the submission could not be determined?

A9 Some sketch plans were prepared but not to the standard required to allow a development application to be determined. District Planning Scheme No.2 includes a section describing the extent of detail required to facilitate an application being considered.

- Q10 How many requests for additional information and clarification have been made by the City of Joondalup in regard to the Mullaloo Tavern site redevelopment proposal and has the required information been provided?*
- A10 Two requests have been made to cover all the additional information required from the architect. A response was received to the first request, however, insufficient detail was provided. Additional information was then requested on 12 March 2002. To date we have not received a further response, although dialogue with the designers is ongoing.
- Q11 Please explain in laymen terms your reply to previous question 13 from Council Meeting 9 April 2002?*
- A11 The land is held in many ownerships in the Sorrento area, and it is difficult to foresee a scenario where all owners would agree to consolidation of the land, and the submission of an integrated redevelopment proposal. In reality, this limits the development potential of the area.
- Q12 In regards to the Mullaloo Tavern redevelopment proposal, what dates did the traffic engineer's parking and traffic studies commence and finish?*
- A12 An initial traffic management report was received with the development application. The architects were then requested to prepare a further parking survey. Two separate parking surveys were conducted by Sinclair Knight Merz. The first survey was purely for the Tavern and was carried out on Friday and Saturday 18 & 19 January 2002 between 9.00am – 9.00pm. This represented the peak weekday and weekend operating times for the Tavern. The second survey was for the Mullaloo beach and Tom Simpson carparks. This was carried out on Saturday 9 February 2002 between 9.00am – 6.00pm.
- Q13 In regards to the Mullaloo Tavern redevelopment proposal, were the engineers' traffic and parking studies conducted during a medium to hot summer or a mild summer by coastal standards?*
- A13 It was noted on the survey carried out for the Mullaloo Beach and Tom Simpson carparks that the weather during the survey period was “*fine and hot – with a maximum temperature in the mid 30s*”. This was classified by the consultants as a peak summer day.
- Q14 In regards to the Mullaloo Tavern redevelopment proposal, did the engineers' traffic and parking studies include or encapsulate any major events on the park, at the surf club, community hall or beach or any of the major peak use days such as Australia Day, Christmas or New Year's Eve and day for use in the proposed parking strategy. If so which events and what dates and times?*
- A14 The two surveys carried out were not undertaken on any of the days mentioned above, however, were carried out at peak operating times for the Tavern itself, and under peak summer conditions for the carpark surveys.

Q15 In order to eliminate the problems arising from excavation, underpinning and compaction at the Mullaloo Tavern site, will the City of Joondalup impose conditions upon any development to ensure and insure the structural integrity of existing dwellings in the immediate vicinity?

A15 The Local Government Act obliges a contractor to take the necessary steps to protect adjoining properties where works are proposed within three metres of a common property boundary. If the project proceeds, the City will request that early dialogue with the immediate neighbours occur, prior to commencement of any earthworks.

Q16 Is the report for the Special Electors' Meeting held at Tom Simpson Park proceeding on schedule? What date is the report expected?

A16 The report is being prepared. It is anticipated that it will be presented to the Council meeting of 21 May.

The following questions were submitted by Ms Marie Macdonald, Mullaloo:

Q1 Why was the outstanding report for Special Meeting of Electors held at Mullaloo not listed as an outstanding item on the Agenda for last week's briefing session?

A1 The minutes of the Special Meeting of Electors' held at Mullaloo were presented to Council at its meeting held on 9 April 2002. At that meeting it was resolved to seek a further report addressing the recommendations carried at the Special Electors' meeting.

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002 were not completed until Monday, 15 April 2002 whereas the draft agenda for the Briefing Session held on 16 April 2002 had already been distributed to Elected Members' and the public on 12 April 2002. Therefore there was not sufficient time to include any outstanding items arising from 9 April 2002 Council meeting to be included on the draft agenda for the Briefing Session held on 16 April 2002.

Q2 The reports on Kingsley and Greenwood Electors' meeting were listed as coming back in May. Why was not a date given as there appears to be only one Council meeting for May under the new system? Does Council intend to deal with this item behind closed doors at the strategy meeting?

A2 The response given was that these reports will be presented to Council in May 2002. As there will only one Council meeting during that month the report will be presented on 21 May 2002. Any recommendations from that report will be dealt with by Council at that Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Q3 The Centres Strategy clearly lists a category that is smaller than a village called Local Shops. Why was I told in an answer to my question that a Village Centre was the lowest order? Would it have been more appropriate for Mullaloo Tavern to be Local Shops, as that would have doubled its net lettable retail area. One of the reasons given for the Tavern being a Village Centre was that it needed to have enough net lettable retail area to be able to have a supermarket there. Mullaloo has a more than adequate supermarket. There are supermarkets nearby at Beldon, Ocean Reef and Whitfords Shopping Centre and there is little space for parking expansion. Why would one be needed at the Tavern site?

A3 Village Centre is the lowest order of “Centre” in the Strategy, although there is a category for Local Shop which is described in the Retail Strategy. The consultant’s recommendation, which was endorsed by the Council, was that a Village Centre was the most appropriate order of Centre for this location. There is no proposal for the establishment of a supermarket on the Mullaloo Tavern site. The Village Centre classification is intended to provide for a range of services and facilities with easy access from a residential neighbourhood.

Q4 *Is there a current Structure Plan which covers the Mullaloo area? Is Council in the process of preparing a new structure plan?*

A4 No to both questions.

Q5 *I was told that the plan handed out to people at the Mullaloo Electors’ meeting was not part of the Precinct Planning process. Mullaloo Precinct is mentioned in its legend. When did the area stop being part of the Precinct Planning process? I have documents stating that this area of Mullaloo is part of the Precinct Planning process. It was on the Council’s Internet site under that heading. Has precinct planning ceased to exist for the 18 suburbs the Mayor, in his press release, indicated were still subject to precinct planning? If so can you please state at which Council meeting this motion was passed? Do you have another name for precinct plans? Are you calling them structure plans?*

A5 The Mullaloo Concept Plan was undertaken as a small scale pilot project, with community input. Council then moved to broaden its approach to examine precinct planning at a district level (including the Warwick district). At its meeting on 12 February 2002, Council resolved to:

- “1 hereby forthwith ABANDONS the current Precinct Action Planning concepts for the suburbs of Warwick, Greenwood, Kingsley and Woodvale in its entirety;*
- 2 ESTABLISHES a comprehensive community consultation process for any future precinct planning for any suburb in the City of Joondalup before releasing any precinct action plan papers;*
- 3 NOT consider any changes proposed by any future concept plan or discussion paper to the status quo of any suburb unless there is clear and demonstrable community support following a full, informative and comprehensive community consultation process in any suburb likely to be affected by any such plan;*
- 4 AGREES to consider all the decisions made at the recent Special Meetings of Electors held in Greenwood and Kingsley on 7 and 11 February 2002 respectively at its ordinary meeting scheduled to be held on 26 February 2002 at the Council Chambers, Joondalup;*

- 5 *ENDORSES the Mayor's views as reported in last Saturday's 9 February 2002 edition of The West Australian newspaper that in respect of the Kingsley, Greenwood, Warwick and Woodvale draft precinct concept plans "these ideas which staff had put forward will not be going ahead in any way, shape or form."*

There is no other term for the Precinct Planning process.

- Q6 *Iluka Structure plan, currently out for public consultation, shows an area with dotted lines which is subject to future planning. Given that this area has been subdivided and consists of relatively new housing what planning would be needed in this area?*
- A6 Planning guidelines may be developed in the future to facilitate the most appropriate form of development, which meet community objectives and provide a very high measure of amenity and function, and which are appropriate for the identified area of Iluka.

The following questions were submitted by Mr Michael Baird, Duncraig:

- Q1 *There was \$84,446 surplus from the 2000/2001 works programme for development of dry parks and associated median and verges, and there will probably be a similar surplus this year. Council has given two distinctly different answers on the reallocation of such surpluses:*

- *24 October 2000 – "If surplus funds become available at the end of these projects, they will be utilised to irrigate the next park listed in the Capital Works Program, or as determined by the Dry Park & Median Committee."*
- *25 July 2001 – "Surplus funds are carried forward only where works are incomplete. All unexpended funds at completion of works return to General Revenue for reallocation."*

Which is the correct answer, and why the confusion?

- Q2 *Why was there no replacement park in the 2001/2002 Budget for Cinq Ports park, which was completed at Main Roads expense early 2000. The number of parks previously budgeted for reticulation in 2001/2002 went from 7 to 6 and funding was reduced from \$310,226 down to \$266,063?*
- Q3 *Why the dramatic increase in the budgeted cost for Portree Park from \$47,353 in 2000 up to \$68,340 in 2001 – a staggering increase of 44%, all the more amazing given that no other park estimate increased at all?*
- Q4 *Why was Killen Park a small .5 hectare wasteland with no evidence of community usage or request for improvement prioritised for reticulation in the 2000/2001 Budget when other larger parks (which have a history of community usage and have presented petitions for improvement) could have been reticulated for a corresponding \$38,000 figure – for example Macaulay and Wentworth parks?*

Q5 Why was Killen Park budgeted for \$38,825 when it is proposed to use an existing bore literally over the road? A \$38,825 estimate to complete this work is nonsense.

Q6 When is Joondalup Council going to introduce a comprehensive and contemporary Policy for Upgrading Distributor Roads and Unirrigated Parks similar to that established by City of Wanneroo last year?

Q7 A main tenet of the City of Wanneroo's policy is that:

“All distributor roads, both median and verges, be developed without the use of irrigation, other than establishment watering by watertruck or temporary mains water supply.”

When is City of Joondalup going to realise its present vision of a reticulated and grassed Marmion Avenue and its tributaries is unrealistic, and concentrate the reticulated grass in neighbourhood parks where it will at least be walked on.

Q8 If Council does not have the time to investigate the anomalies/errors in budget estimates, such as the phantom bores for Wanbrow and Cinq Ports parks, the 44% cost increase in Portree park, the \$13,200 cost for horizontal boring associated with Wanbrow park and the \$38,825 costing for Killen park. Can Infrastructure Management Services provide me the detail to substantiate these figures in conjunction with the contract figures already in the public domain:

- The work performed and costed by Underground Services associated with Wanbrow park.*
- The materials and trenching work associated with Wanbrow park and the Marri park extension.*
- The materials and trenching work (estimated and actual) associated with Portree park.*
- The materials, horizontal boring and trenching work (estimated and actual) associated with Killen park.*

Q9 Can Council explain how play equipment was allocated for Wentworth and Tuart parks in the 2000/2001 Budget but is not even on the horizon for Macaulay park:

- Residents petitioned for Wentworth park (.5 hectare) February 2000, and the park was allocated play equipment in the 2000/2001 budget.*
- Tuart park (.46 hectare) has no record of any community request, but was allocated new equipment in the 2000/2001 budget.*
- Residents petitioned for Macaulay park (.63 hectare) April 2000, but it remains not even on the 5 year plan, with a comment 'the provision of additional play equipment at Macaulay park will only compound the dry park situation as the area is not utilised during summer'.*

- Q10 Can a policy for allocation of play equipment be established, so that such anomalous treatment doesn't arise in the future, with consideration given to community request/need, age and quality of existing facilities and proximity of alternative facilities.*
- Q11 The last minutes, on the public record, of the Dry Parks, Median & Verge Committee is for the meeting 20 July 2001. Has the committee met since and, if so, why have the minutes not been put on the public record.*
- Q12 How does Council feel that their actions in the last several months reflect the warm, fuzzy ideals of the Strategic Plan 2000/2005 – 'effective communication...public participation...involvement...consultation' etc.*
- The proposal to require 1000 ratepayer signatures for special meetings.*
 - The proposal to institute 'Strategy' meetings behind closed doors.*
 - The proposal to limit the public record of Committee meetings.*
 - The proposal for ratepayers to finance defamation actions of Councillors and staff.*

Q1-12 These questions will be taken on notice.

Mr R de Gruchy, Sorrento:

- Q1 The contract signed by the City of Joondalup and RANS Management Group refers to a Strategic and Capital Improvement plan that is to be prepared by RANS each year in February and presented to the City of Joondalup within 21 days after the end of February. Has this been done? Has the Leisure Centre Strategic Management Group been made aware of it? Could I have access to it please?*
- Q2 The Business Plan allows RANS to increase fees at Sorrento, Duncraig and Ocean Ridge Leisure Centres by a maximum of 5% on 1 July 2002. Why have RANS increased fees from 8 April 2002?*
- Q3 The reply to a question asked by me on 26 March 2002 stated that a consultant engaged by RANS made a presentation to the City outlining their plans for a \$1M extension to the gym area at the Craigie Leisure Centre. Has this been presented to Councillors (in particular the Leisure Centre Strategic Management Group Councillors)? When will it be available for examination by the public?*
- Q4 The Business Plan clearly shows an official opening date of March 2002 for the extension to the gym area at Craigie, however, the contract signed by the City of Joondalup and RANS states no later than 31 January 2003. Why has this extension been allowed? Were Councillors aware of this change?*
- Q5 The business plan refers to a bond of \$184,000 that is clearly intended to remain in force for the duration of the term of the lease. Why is it then that the contract signed by the City of Joondalup and RANS stipulates that this bond is to be repaid to RANS not later than 14 days after the completion of Project 1 which is to be no later than 31 January 2003? What safeguard will the City of Joondalup have in place that will be a substitute for the \$184,000 bond?*

Q6 Attendance figures for the last 6 months of 2000 and 2001 show a decrease in numbers of 104819. This represents a drop in patronage of 29.48%. Would Council please supply a breakdown of both figures into the various categories (ie spectators, swim, gym, basketball, aerobic etc) to pinpoint exactly where attendances have dropped off?

Q7 The Business Plan indicates a rental income of \$7876 in its first year of operation. In answer to a question I raised on 26 February 2002 I was advised that only \$1704 had been collected to date. Would Council please advise the current total amount of rent received from RANS for the three leisure centres?

A1-7 These questions will be taken on notice.

Q8 When is Council going to repair the fire damage to the two meeting rooms that occurred 9 months ago to the Sorrento Duncraig Leisure Centre?

A8 The City has been working with the RANS Group and the insurance company is obtaining quotes to commence the repairs.

Mr A Bryant, Craigie:

Q1 Warrant of Payments Attachment A , Page 6 of 11 – Item 14 March 2002 - \$140.00 to Lakeside Orthodontist Centre and Page 10 of 11 – Item 19 March 2002 - \$9,431.12 to Wanneroo Caravan Centre. Can Council explain why these amounts have been paid?

A1 This question will be taken on notice.

Mr M Collier, Woodvale:

Q1 Please explain why unlit street lights within the City of Joondalup are not replaced?

A1 The City has a contract with Western Power for the provision of street lighting which includes a maintenance component. If street lights are not working they should be reported to Western Power for repair.

Q2 Whose responsibility is it to inform Western Power of unlit street lights?

A2 It is the responsibility of the public and the City to report any lights that may not be functioning. It is a requirement of the contract that the lights be repaired. The City will contact Western Power regarding the unlit street lights.

Ms S Hart, Greenwood:

Q1 Has the City received my submission on the parks and reserves policy?

A1 This question will be taken on notice

Q2 From the meeting on 9 April 2002, I did not receive the paperwork referred to. Can I have a copy sent to me?

A2 Yes.

Q3 *Why was the meeting with the Minister attended by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer called 'informal'?*

A3 This question will be taken on notice.

Q4 *Is the City concerned with the fact that a lot of ratepayers attend Special Electors' meetings and the costs for staging such meetings?*

A4 This question will be taken on notice.

Q5 *Is it the City's policy to videotape Special Electors' meetings?*

A5 This question will be taken on notice.

Q6 *Why does the price for the provision of a stage and chairs differ by \$1100 from Mullaloo to Kingsley Special Electors' meetings?*

A6 The difference in the price between Kingsley and Mullaloo was because a different company was used. The chairs used at Mullaloo were in compliance with safety regulations. The supplier used was the only company, that the City found, that could supply the safety chairs.

Q7 *Why does the lighting at Kingsley and Mullaloo differ by \$500?*

A7 Less lighting was used as lighting already existed in the park.

Q8 *The security for Greenwood was \$240.45; Kingsley \$480.90 and for Mullaloo \$526.70. Were the security staff employees of the City or contractors and why the difference in price?*

A8 Security staff were provided by NGS who supply Citywatch officers to the City. The prices differ because the City anticipated more people to attend Kingsley than Greenwood and the security staff was increased accordingly, also the duration of the meetings was a factor.

Q9 *Can you tell me what a full-page advertisement costs to put into the Community News in relation to the three full-page advertisements that the City put into the paper during the precinct planning issue?*

A9 This question will be taken on notice.

Q10 *When Councillors took up their positions, is it true that it was decided to trial briefing sessions for a period, and then trial standing committees for the same period?*

A10 A trial was undertaken for briefing sessions. Council then made a decision to continue with the briefing sessions. The City did not decide to trial standing committees.

Q11 Are Councillors aware that there was a workshop this week on the parks and reserve policy?

A11 People who made submissions recently on that subject have been invited to workshop their ideas with the City.

Q12 Are Councillors aware that there were 13 submissions accepted as submissions by the City?

A12 The workshops were specifically to draw any additional comments and provide an opportunity for members of the public who made submissions to provide further comments directly to the officers that would be preparing the reports.

Q13 I was informed by the City that my submission on the parks policy was being dealt with as a petition. There were 56 submissions from the Greenwood Preservation Group and one person was invited to attend. Is that what the City calls public consultation?

A13 When dealing with petitions the City deals with the lead petitioner.

Q14 Is it acceptable public consultation that 8 people were invited to a workshop on the reserve policy when there were 56 submissions from the Greenwood Preservation Group and none were invited?

A14 The public consultation process encompasses the invitation to comment at the start of the process. The release of the draft policy was advertised in the local newspaper, dialogued with any community members that chose to telephone and discuss the issue and in this case the invitation for those people who made submissions to come and workshop their ideas. The City can only go by the response rate. It will be taken on notice whether 56 individual submissions were received or whether it was a petition.

Q15 Could you please let the ratepayers know when the next step is before it goes to Council?

A15 Council will keep the ratepayers informed.

Cr Rowlands entered the Chamber, the time being 1940 hrs.

Mr L Hawkes, Carine:

Q1 Re Notice of Motion No 1 - Cr Mackintosh. If Council considers, in any way, funding Councillors or employees actions against people through courts will you give the electors of the City of Joondalup the same financial assistance should we decide to take action against Councillors or employees of Council for what we consider to be inappropriate statements or actions that they have taken in carrying out their duties?

A1 Mr Hawkes comments will be taken on board as this is a matter for Council to consider this evening.

Mr M Sideris, Mullaloo:

Regarding answers given to questions delivered at the last Council Meeting.

Q1 Regarding the response given on the height restrictions within the City. If there are no current building height restrictions within the current guidelines for the City of Joondalup, why were there two and three storey height restrictions in the early 1970's and not in our current planning schemes?

A1 Council from time to time may adopt or alter policies to complement the Town Planning Scheme. The current height limitations are adopted as a Council policy. They are not a finite limitation. There are height restrictions that apply to residential development and they relate back to natural ground level. The policies are refined occasionally and are intended to reflect changing community expectation, changing subdivision design, changing choices for style of housing.

Q2 Is there a State Government policy dealing with height restrictions along the coastal strip?

A2 As far as the City is aware there is not. However, the City is aware that the State takes those factors into consideration when they look at applications along the coast line.

Q3 When did Council amend its policy for height restrictions?

A3 The Height Policy in its current form goes back about 15 months. It was revised at that time to clarify the interpretation of natural ground level for residential development.

Q4 Please advise when the height restriction of three storeys for commercial zoned properties at property sites was amended and what are they today?

A4 This question will be taken on notice.

Q5 What is the definition of hotel, motel and short term accommodation. Based on the response given, is the proposed development for the Mullaloo Beach Tavern based on this definition? Is the proposal a motel development based on your guidelines and if so why isn't defined as a motel and presented for public consultation?

A5 The development incorporates a number of land use classes and those classes are described in the District Planning Scheme, which is the information we have given to Mr Sideris. In discussions with the application it is proposed that those different components of the development would operate separately and potentially under separate ownerships from a business point of view and it hasn't been classified as a motel or a hotel to this date.

Q6 When did the Mullaloo Precinct Plan not become a precinct plan?

A6 This question will be taken on notice.

Ms C Woodmass, Kingsley:

Q1 Are Councillors aware that this meeting is the only opportunity that ratepayers have to ask questions that are put on public record?

A1 It is also possible to submit a question in writing and that question will be responded to in writing. Ratepayers also have the opportunity to ask questions at briefing sessions?

Q2 What are the reasons for the motion of defamation to be put forward tonight?

A2 Tonight is a discussion only on an amendment to the current policy.

Q3 In the motion it states that legal representation for present and former elected members and staff of the City. How long will they be classed as former members?

A3 Council will discuss this when the item is considered later in the meeting.

Q4 In the West Australian today (23 April 2002) on page 29 a reference was made to the Department of Local Government's model legal policy on the same issue. Was each Councillor provided with a copy of this policy?

A4 The article appearing in today's edition of the West Australian was e-mailed to elected members earlier today.

Q5 Why has Council waited until it was broken in the media to circulate that policy?

A5 Council was not aware of the policy. It was circulated as some guidelines in 2000. The policy developed by the Department of Local Government really accords with administration's advice that is attached to the Notice of Motion proposed by Cr Mackintosh.

Q6 Why is it necessary to hold closed door meetings?

A6 There is a number of reasons to have confidential sessions. They may impact on Council from a legal perspective. For example, this evening we have a matter before Council that is a confidential item that may result in litigation. It is important for Council to keep the contents of that litigation confidential as it may result in legal proceedings.

Q7 Who is developing the Parks and Reserve policy?

A7 The Parks and Reserves policy is being developed by Planning and Community Development.

Mr S Magyar, Heathridge:

Q1 What can the City's security patrol do when a resident contacts them after hours with a complaint about a neighbour making too much noise?

A1 Council employs an acoustic consultant to assist with after hours noise complaints. The authorised officers in terms of issuing instructions are the environmental officers who are employed by the City.

Q2 How long should a resident have to wait to be provided with noise monitoring equipment?

A2 Council will take the details of that complaint on board. The intention is that people receive a same day service.

Q3 Is the Administration intending to provide a report to the Councillors regarding the inquiry into the former City of South Perth and also the Ombudsman report regarding the findings between the Town of Cambridge and the City of Perth?

A3 Council has obtained both those reports and Administration is currently assessing them with a view to putting a report to Council on both matters.

Q4 Cr Walker's Notice of Motion regarding the 100 signatures. The last paragraph reads "However if the motion is moved and seconded, the motion may be duly amended." Is the amendment of motions covered under Standing Orders?

A4 Yes.

Q5 Does the Standing Orders say that an amendment can only be valid if the amendment maintains the original intent of the motion? For example if a particular number is mentioned in a motion and that number is very specific, to change that number would be deemed to negate or change the intent of such a motion?

A5 Standing Orders 4.3 – "Needs to be relevant and not negate". The ruling on Standing Orders is with the Mayor. An amendment can take various forms, certain words can be omitted, certain words may be omitted therefrom and substituted with others, certain words may be deleted.

Ms Paula Clark, Greenwood:

Q1 Why were my questions, submitted yesterday, taken on notice?

A1 The questions were taken on notice as some of the questions are seeking an opinion of the Chief Executive Officer who is not present this evening.

Mrs M Zakrevsky, Mullaloo:

Q1 Regarding last Thursday's one hour information session on public reserves which I attended. Is an information session, the words that was used in the letter, deemed a workshop?

A1 This question was taken on notice.

Ms S Hart, Greenwood:

Q1 Why was I not told at our Greenwood meeting that Mullaloo was not under precinct plan?

A1 This question will be taken on notice.

Mr M Caiacob, Mullaloo:

Q1 Can I have the definition and difference between a submission and a petition?

A1 Submissions can be individual letters or multiple copies of individual letters that are signed and sent to Council separately. A petition commences with a standard paragraph or a paragraph that expresses an opinion and it then contains a number of pages, depending on the number of petitioners, who each support that statement or objection or opinion.

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**Leave of absence previously approved:**

Cr Mackintosh	25 March – 19 April 2002
Cr P Kadak	3 April – 24 May 2002
Cr T Barnett	20 April – 28 April 2002
Cr A Patterson	8 May – 13 May 2002

Apology - Cr P Kimber

Late Apology – Cr Rowlands

DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTEREST/INTEREST THAT MAY AFFECT IMPARTIALITY

Cr O'Brien declared a financial interest in Item CJ087-04/02 – Warrant of Payments (Voucher No 38576 Chubb Security Australia Pty Ltd) – 31 March 2002 as Chubb Security has taken over an FAI Extra Watch security at his residence.

Cr Hollywood declared a financial interest in Item CJ087-04/02 – Warrant of Payments (Voucher No 38339) – 31 March 2002 this being refund of a cross-over deposit.

Mayor Bombak declared a non-financial interest that may affect his impartiality in C54-04/02 as he is a member of the North West Metro Business Association.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**C49-04/02 MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING, 9 APRIL 2002**

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Kenworthy that that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 9 April 2002 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR WITHOUT DISCUSSION**ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Chief Executive Officer Denis Smith has been subpoenaed to appear as a witness in a court case in NSW. In his absence, the Director of Infrastructure and Operations, Dave Djulbic will be standing in for tonight's meeting.

COMPUTER VOTING A NATIONAL FIRST

Tonight, the City of Joondalup creates history with the introduction of our new computer voting system for elected members' forum vote. Joondalup is believed to be the first Local Government in Australia to introduce the electronic voting system. Using laptops, Councillors will now be able to view meeting agendas and register their votes at the touch of a key. On a large screen behind me, the public can immediately see motions made by each Councillor.

The system has been trialed at the City of Joondalup Briefing Sessions and elected members and observers alike have been very impressed. This progressive electronic voting system provides greater accountability and public access for the residents of the City of Joondalup. It also puts us at the forefront of technology – and fits in well with our position as a learning city.

CURRAMBINE PRIMARY SALUTES ANZACS

Last week I was privileged to attend a moving tribute to Anzac Day by the 780 children of Currambine Primary School. Because Anzac Day falls during the school holidays, the school held its Anzac ceremony on Friday, 19 April 2002 and the children and teacher, Dawn Chester, are to be congratulated on their efforts.

As a highlight of the ceremony, 16 doves (which headed home for Bateman) were released as the universal symbol of peace. The doves were released to the tune of Louis Armstrong's "What A Wonderful World" which almost had everyone in tears. The choir sang "Amazing Grace" accompanied by a bagpipe player from the WA Police Pipe Band.

World War II veteran, Mr Basil Best of North Beach spoke to the children. The City of Joondalup was represented by myself and Councillors John Hollywood and Andrew Nixon.

OFFICIAL WAR HISTORY DONATED TO JOONDALUP LIBRARY

Also in the spirit of Anzac Day, the Joondalup library has just acquired the full twelve-volume set of the “Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918”.

The Library and Information Service of Western Australia has made this classic publication available to the community. These books record the participation of Australia in the battles of the Great War – in Egypt, Gallipoli, France and Palestine. The photograph record of the war contains 753 photos supplied under very strict restrictions by the official military photographers of the day.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

The City has had a great response from schools to its World Environment Day Eco Challenge. Schools have been invited to develop sustainable environmental projects over the coming months and then show case them at World Environment Day on 5 June 2002.

Students will come from all over the City to enjoy a day of activities and exhibits. Schools expressing an interest include Joondalup, Mullaloo Heights, Springfield, Currambine, Eddystone and Woodvale Primary schools and Greenwood High School. The students projects will be on show for at least a week at the Joondalup Library for community members to enjoy.

PETITIONS

C50-04/02 PETITIONS SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING – 23 APRIL 2002

1 PETITION IN RELATION TO NEW SQUASH CENTRE – MARMION SQUASH CLUB – [22209 02730]

A 123-signature petition has been received from the Mullaloo Squash Centre signed by users of the centre with reference to the following questions:

- 1 do you believe the government should use ratepayers money to build a new squash centre for an individual club, which would have a damaging effect on the two centres within a close proximity, when numbers clearly show that all players could easily be absorbed within the remaining two centres of Mullaloo and North Beach; or
- 2 should the \$900,000 be used to promote squash, which would benefit all 32 clubs in WA and the sport as a whole?

This petition will be referred to Planning and Community Development for action.

2 PETITION IN RELATION TO THE SPEED OF VEHICLES USING HEATHERTON MEWS, HILLARYS– [45712]

A 7-signature petition has been received from residents of Heatherton Mews, Hillarys requesting Council’s assistance with the increasing problem of speeding traffic in their locality.

This petition will be referred to Infrastructure and Operations for action.

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Hurst that the petitions relating to the:

- 1 new Squash Centre – Marmion Squash Club;**
- 2 increasing problem of speeding traffic in Heatherton Mews, Hillarys;**

be received and referred to the appropriate Business Units for action.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

C51-04/02 REQUEST FOR SECOND PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

MOVED Cr Hollywood, SECONDED Cr Baker that, in accordance with Clause 3.2 of the City’s Standing Orders Local Law, a second public question time be permitted prior to the close of this evening’s meeting in order that members of the public may ask questions in relation to decisions made at this meeting.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

**CJ085 – 04/02 SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS EXECUTED BY
MEANS OF AFFIXING THE COMMON SEAL -
[15876]**

WARD - All

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 1

PURPOSE

To provide a listing of those documents executed by affixing the Common Seal for noting by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following is a list of documents sealed under the Common Seal of the City of Joondalup from 12.03.02 to 19.03.02, not previously listed.

Document: Agreement
Parties: City of Joondalup and W P C Parker
Description: S70A Ancillary Accommodation – 5 Blight Court, Kingsley
Date: 12.03.02

Document: Lease
Parties: City of Joondalup and Silver Chain Nursing Association
Description: Kingsley Community Centre, 11 Moolanda Boulevard, Kingsley
Date: 12.03.02

Document: Copyright
Parties: City of Joondalup and Wendy Kargi
Description: Recording of historical importance – Wendy Kargi
Date: 14.03.02

Document: Legal Consent
Parties: City of Joondalup and Department of Land Administration (DOLA)
Description: Modification easement Lot 1 Brechin Court, Duncraig
Date: 14.03.02

Document: Copyright
Parties: City of Joondalup and Janet McKenzie
Description: Recording of historical importance – Janet McKenzie
Date: 19.03.02

Document: Lease
Parties: City of Joondalup and Minister for Education
Description: Marmion and Duncraig Pre-Primary Centres
Date: 19.03.02

Document: Copyright
Parties: City of Joondalup and Graham Glick
Description: Recording of historical importance – Graham Glick
Date: 19.03.02

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Patterson, SECONDED Cr Carlos that the schedule of documents executed by means of affixing the common seal be NOTED.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

CJ086 – 04/02 REVIEW OF CORPORATE CODE OF CONDUCT - [09358]

WARD - All

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 2

PURPOSE

To review the Corporate Code of Conduct.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Act 1995 requires all local governments to have in place a code of conduct that sets various standards to be observed by elected members, committee members and employees. The Local Government Act requires that each local government review its

code of conduct within 12 months of its ordinary elections. With the recent City's ordinary election being held in May 2001, it is now opportune for the review to be performed.

In order to perform the review, input was sought from applicable stakeholders, along with comparisons with similar documents from similar organisations. The review proposes some changes to the current code in order to provide a more complete document for those affected by its operation.

BACKGROUND

The Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) was introduced on 1 July 1996. An intended result with the introduction of the new Act was to allow for greater accountability of local governments to their communities. As a result of this, the Act requires every local government to prepare and adopt a code of conduct to be observed by elected members, committee members and employees.

A local government is to review its code of conduct within 12 months of each ordinary election and make such changes to the code of conduct, as it considers appropriate. The last ordinary election for the City was held in May 2001. The former City of Wanneroo first adopted a code of conduct in April 1997, that code was subsequently adopted by the new City of Joondalup and has been reviewed in accordance with the legislation.

DETAILS

Section 5.103 of the Act states:

- 1 Every local government is to prepare and adopt a code of conduct to be observed by council members, committee members and employees.
- 2 A local government is to review its code of conduct within 12 months after each ordinary elections day and make such changes to the code, as it considers appropriate.
- 3 Regulations may prescribe the content of, and matters in relation to, codes of conduct and any code of conduct or provision of a code of conduct applying to a local government is of effect only to the extent to which it is not inconsistent with regulations.

Regulations 34B and 34C of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 are the relevant regulations referred to in section 5.103(3). These regulations require a code of conduct to cover such issues as:

- Procedures for the acceptance of token gifts or acts of hospitality;
- Requirement to disclose at a Council or Committee meeting 'interests' that may affect impartiality (this requirement has been included in the revised set of standing orders local law that is currently being advertised).

The intent of the code is to provide a framework for behaviour that must be observed to ensure that, in the best interests of the local community and the public generally, the highest ethical standards are practised by elected members and employees of the City of Joondalup.

As a result of the legislative requirement to review the current code of conduct, input was sought from elected members and senior employees of the City. The review also included research into other similar documents from other organisations, which included the Code of Ethics developed by the Public Sector Standards Commission.

The revised draft copy of the code of conduct is attached for information, with the altered sections highlighted in italics.

The main changes to the document relate to:

- Rewrite of the introduction;
- Inclusion/rewrite of Values and Ethical Principles;
- Inclusion of relationships between elected members and employees;
- Inclusion of appointments to external committees;
- Inclusion of defamation clause;
- Further explanation on communication and public relations; and
- Additional section relating ‘Whistleblower’ protection.

COMMENT/FUNDING

The review has not suggested major changes to the existing code of conduct; it has merely attempted to refine the document to better guide those affected by the code for good public administration.

Since the introduction of the requirement for local governments to adopt codes of conduct, there have been a number of concerns raised within the industry regarding the lack of ‘teeth’ the codes have in order to deal with breaches of the code.

It is interesting to note that as a result of these industry concerns and to make the code legally enforceable by way of a penalty for non-compliance would; the City of Perth has incorporated the enforceable provisions of the code into a local law. This proposal by the City of Perth is to ensure that where the standards of behaviour expected by the code of conduct are not met, then appropriate penalties are enforced. The City of Nedlands has also enabled penalties for breaches of its Code of Conduct by linking it to its Standing Orders Local Law. Under the current situation within the industry, codes of conduct across the industry contain minimal (if any) penalty provisions.

The code does not override or affect the legislation applicable to local government, but merely provides a framework of expected behaviour. The proposed revised code of conduct is submitted for the Council’s consideration.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION: That:

- 1 the City's Code of Conduct, as amended and forming Attachment 1 to Report CJ086-04/02 be ADOPTED by Council;
- 2 a further review of the Code of Conduct be PERFORMED, paying particular attention to the ability to include penalty provisions for breaches of the Code.

MOVED Cr O'Brien, SECONDED Cr Baker that Council:

- 1 **NOTES Report CJ086-04/02 and Councillors commitment to review the Code of Conduct considers there is no need to amend the current Code of Conduct and submits that position to the Department of Local Government in compliance with Section 5.103 of the Local Government Act 1995;**
- 2 **REFERS the Code of Conduct to the Standing Orders Review Committee for the 2002/2003 review, with a further report on the recommendations being submitted to Council for further consideration.**

Discussion ensued, with Cr O'Brien suggesting that elected members continue to operate under the existing Code of Conduct until such time as a further review has been undertaken.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendix 1 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach1brf160402.pdf](#)

Cr O'Brien declared a financial interest in Item CJ087-04/02 – Warrant of Payments (Voucher No 38576 Chubb Security Australia Pty Ltd) –31 March 2002 as Chubb Security has taken over an FAI Extra Watch security at his residence.

Cr Hollywood declared a financial interest in Item CJ087-04/02 – Warrant of Payments (Voucher No 38339) – 31 March 2002 being refund of a cross-over deposit.

Crs O'Brien and Hollywood left the Chamber, the time being 2027 hrs.

**CJ087 – 04/02 WARRANT OF PAYMENTS - 31 MARCH 2002 –
[09882]**

WARD - All

CJ020416_BR.F.DOC:ITEM 3

PURPOSE

The Warrant of Payments as at 31 March 2002 is submitted to Council to be noted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the cheques drawn on the funds during the month of March 2002. It seeks Council's approval for the payment of the March 2002 accounts.

DETAILS

FUNDS	VOUCHERS	AMOUNT
		\$ c
Director Resource Management Advance Account	038305-038879	4,897,247.29
Municipal	000302A-000309	7,150,002.34
	TOTAL \$	12,047,249.63

The difference in total between the Municipal and Director of Resource Management Advance Account is attributable to the direct debits by the Commonwealth Bank for bank charges, credit card charges, investments and dishonoured cheques being processed through the Municipal Fund.

It is a requirement pursuant to the provisions of Regulation 13(4) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 that the total of all other outstanding accounts received but not paid, be presented to Council. At the close of March 2002, the amount was \$635,136.01

The cheque register is appended as Attachment A to this Report.

CERTIFICATE OF THE DIRECTOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This warrant of accounts to be passed for payment, covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$12,047,249.63 which is to be submitted to each Councillor on 23 April 2002 has been checked and is fully supported by vouchers and invoices which are submitted herewith and which have been duly certified as to the receipt of goods and the rendition of services and as to prices, computations and casting and the amounts shown are due for payment.

ALEXANDER SCOTT
Manager Financial Services

J B TURKINGTON
Director Corporate Services & Resource Management

CERTIFICATE OF MAYOR

I hereby certify that this warrant of payments covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$12,047,249.63 submitted to Council on 23 April 2002 is recommended for payment.

.....
Mayor John Bombak

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Carlos, SECONDED Cr Hurst that Council APPROVES for payment the following vouchers, as presented in the Warrant Of Payments to 31 March 2002, Certified by the Mayor and Director Corporate Services & Resource Management and totalling \$12,047,249.63.

FUNDS	VOUCHERS	AMOUNT
		\$ c
Director Resource Management Advance Account	038305-038879	4,897,247.29
Municipal	000302A-000309	7,150,002.34
	TOTAL \$	12,047,249.63

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendix 2 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach2brf160402.pdf](#)

Crs O'Brien and Hollywood entered the Chamber, the time being 2028 hrs.

CJ088 – 04/02 FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 MARCH 2002 – [07882]

WARD - All

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 4

PURPOSE

The March 2002 financial report is submitted to Council for noting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The March 2002 report shows a variance of \$4.6m when compared to the Revised Annual Budget for the year to date. This variance reflects differences attributable to the timing of revenue and expenditure and does not represent net savings for the year.

This variance can be analysed as follows-

- The **Operating** position shows an Operating surplus of \$1.9m to budget at the end of March 2002 due to revenue received in arrears of \$0.2m and the underspending in Labour and Materials & Contracts of \$2.1m.

- **Capital Expenditure** for the year-to-date is \$0.8m and is below the year-to-date budget of \$1.1m, a variance of \$0.3m at the end of March 2002.
- **Capital Works** expenditure for the year-to-date amounted to \$6.3m against a year-to-date budget of \$8.7m, a variance of \$2.4m at the end of March 2002. However, the City has committed expenditure through raised purchase orders of \$2.49m. A number of high value projects, including the Council depot land and design (\$3.2m), Currambine community centre construction (\$0.9m), and Collier Pass road works (\$0.6m) may not be commenced in the financial year.

DETAILS

The financial report for the period ending 31 March 2002 is appended as Attachment A to this Report.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Walker that the Financial Report for the nine month period ending 31 March 2002 be NOTED.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendix 3 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach3brf160402.pdf](#)

CJ089 – 04/02 TENDER NO. 029-01/02 CONSTRUCTION OF A ROUNDABOUT AT INTERSECTION OF HODGES DRIVE & CONSTELLATION DRIVE, OCEAN REEF – [51521]

WARD - Marina

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 5

PURPOSE

To seek approval for the acceptance of Pavement Technology Ltd as the successful tenderer for Tender Number 029-01/02 – Construction of a roundabout – Intersection of Hodges Drive and Constellation Drive, Ocean Reef.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the 2001/2002 Capital Works Program (Black Spot Projects Program), Total Budget funds of \$200,000 were listed for the construction of a single lane roundabout at the intersection of Hodges Drive and Constellation Drive in Ocean Reef.

The \$200,000 was in accordance with the State Blackspot Funding arrangement, one third City of Joondalup contribution two-thirds contribution from State Government.

This roundabout is anticipated to improve traffic flow and enhance traffic safety at this intersection.

In order to meet the Capital Works construction timeframe this project has been programmed for construction by an external Civil Engineering Contractor. Accordingly a public tender was advertised on Saturday 9 March 2002 and closed on Wednesday 27 March 2002.

The tenders have been evaluated and it is recommended that Pavement Technology Ltd be considered as the successful tenderer for a total lump sum price of \$186,842. plus GST (including Provisional sum of \$51,034.70).

The tender price is within the Budget allocation of \$200,000 for this project.

BACKGROUND

As part of the 2001/2002 Capital Works Program (Black Spot Projects Program), Council has listed the construction of a single lane roundabout at the intersection of Hodges Drive and Constellation Drive in Ocean Reef. This project was successful in gaining State Black Spot funding for 2001/2002 subject to the funding arrangement, one-third City of Joondalup contribution (\$66,667) to two-thirds contribution from State Government (\$133,333).

This roundabout is anticipated to improve traffic flow and enhance traffic safety at this intersection.

The design layout is shown on Attachment 1 of this Report.

In order to meet the Capital Works construction timeframe this project has been programmed for construction by an external Civil Engineering Contractor.

Accordingly a public tender was advertised on Saturday 9 March 2002 and closed on Wednesday 27 March 2002.

DETAILS

At the close of tenders, four tenders had been received from the following Civil Engineering Contractors.

Tenderer	Locality	Price Offered
Pavement Technology Ltd	Canning Vale	\$186,842.00
Works Infrastructure Pty Ltd	Redcliffe	\$217,885.00

Densford Pty Ltd	Osborne Park	\$269,860.00
Malavoca Pty Ltd	Welshpool	\$272,695.50

The tender prices above do not include GST.

The lowest tender price includes provisional sums of \$51,034.70

Under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system based on the following selection criteria as specified in the Tender Information Document (TID).

- Lump Sum Price
- Construction methodology and Safety Management Policy
- Construction Programme
- Previous experience in carrying out similar works
- Tenderers Resources
- Contract approach including Quality Management Policy

POLICY 2.4.6 – PURCHASING GOODS AND SERVICES

The City's Policy on Purchasing Goods and Services encourages the participation of local business in the purchasing and tendering process, however no local companies were able to be considered as none of the tenderers were local businesses.

TENDER EVALUATION

By applying the above evaluation method, it is recommended that Pavement Technology Ltd be awarded the tender for the lump sum price of \$186,842.00 (including Provisional sums of \$51,034.70) excluding GST.

The lowest priced tenderer has met all the tender criteria and is experienced in this type of work, accordingly they were considered by the TEC as the best value submission.

Financial Implications:

Account No:	Project No.6311	Project No.6319	
Budget Item:	Black Spot Projects	Black Spot Projects	
Budget Amount: Municipal		State Black Spot	Total
	\$66,667	\$133,333	\$200,000
Contract Amount:			\$ 186,842.00

The recommended tenderer's price is within the budget allocation for this project.

On this basis it is recommended that Pavement Technology Ltd be awarded the tender for the lump sum price of \$186,842.00 exclusive of GST. (including Provisional sums of \$51,034.70).

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

Cr Nixon left the Chamber, the time being 2031 hrs.

MOVED Cr Patterson, SECONDED Cr Kenworthy that Council:

- 1 ACCEPTS the tender from Pavement Technology Ltd for Contract 029-01/02 - Construction of a Roundabout – Intersection of Hodges Drive and Constellation Drive, Ocean Reef for the lump sum price of \$186,842 exclusive of GST;**
- 2 AUTHORISES the signing of contract documents.**

Discussion ensued. To queries raised by Cr Carlos, Acting Chief Executive Officer advised 2/3rd of the funding was being provided by the State Black Spot Funding Program and 1/3rd by the City of Joondalup. One of the criteria for funding from this program is that this money be expended this financial year.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendix 4 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach4brf160402.pdf](#)

CJ090 – 04/02 DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT – [07032]

WARD - All

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 6

PURPOSE

To submit items of Delegated Authority to Council for noting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a resumé of the Development Applications processed by Delegated Authority from 1 to 31 March 2002.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Patterson, SECONDED Cr Kenworthy that Council NOTES the determinations made under delegated authority in relation to the applications described in Report CJ090-04/02.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendix 5 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach5brf160402.pdf](#)

**CJ091 – 04/02 KINROSS NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE
STRUCTURE PLAN – PORTION OF LOT 9000 -
CORNER SELKIRK AND CONNOLLY DRIVES,
KINROSS – [20514]**

WARD – North Coastal

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 7

PURPOSE

The Kinross Neighbourhood Centre Structure Plan is brought before Council for consideration of final adoption in accordance with Part 9 of the City's District Planning Scheme No. 2 (DPS 2)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Structure Plan has been prepared to determine the overall detailed land use and form of development within the Centre (Attachment 1). The subject land is divided into three land use areas being, Residential, Civic and Cultural and Commercial. Specific objectives and criteria are proposed to guide the rationale and framework for future subdivision and development of the land. Refer to Attachment 2 of this Report.

The Structure Plan was considered by Council at its meeting on 12 February 2002 where it was resolved to adopt it for the purposes of advertising for public comment. Nine (9) submissions were received, including seven (7) from government agencies.

The Department of Transport (DOT) recommended that bus bays be provided on Selkirk Drive adjacent to the Centre's entrance.

Objections were raised to the Structure Plan in the two submissions from members of the local community. Objections were raised on the grounds that the Centre would detrimentally affect the amenity of the surrounding residential area.

The subject site is already zoned for commercial, business, civic and cultural and residential purposes. The Structure Plan does not propose any additional land uses, it simply proposes to relocate the existing land use zones on the site to enable the Centre to be redesigned. The amenity impact is unlikely to be increased as a result.

It is recommended that Council resolves that the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre Structure Plan is satisfactory subject to minor modifications (addition of bus bays on Selkirk Drive) and submits it to the Western Australian Planning Commission for adoption and certification.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location:	Kinross
Applicant:	Taylor Burrell on behalf of Peet & Co
Owner:	Burns Beach Management Pty Ltd
Zoning:	DPS: Residential (R40), Business (R20), Commercial (R20), Civic and Cultural (R20)
	MRS: Urban

Strategic Plan:	<p><u>Key Result Area – Lifestyle</u></p> <p><i>Strategy 2.1</i> – Rejuvenate our suburbs</p> <p><i>Strategy 2.3</i> – Foster opportunities for cultural development and involvement</p> <p><i>Strategy 2.5</i> – Work with the community and key organisations to enhance safety and security</p> <p><i>Strategy 2.7</i> – Encourage provision of a range of innovative and quality facilities, services and recreational activities which achieve the physical, social, cultural and intellectual well-being of the community, both locally and regionally.</p> <p><u>Key Result Area – Economic Vitality</u></p> <p><i>Strategy 3.1</i> – Establish alliances with key stakeholders to identify opportunities to encourage and promote economic growth.</p>
------------------------	--

Site History

A concept plan was prepared in 1993 by Hames Sharley, in consultation with the City, for the development of the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre. The existing zoning of the site reflects that plan.

Rationale

The applicant advises that the previously endorsed concept plan no longer reflects contemporary design principles ('main street principles'), and places the Neighbourhood Centre in a location with poor exposure to the 'movement economy' (ie traffic along Connolly Drive). The applicant advises that there is a need for the Centre to be relocated and redesigned in order to improve its viability, and that this in turn will better guarantee an acceptable level of shopping service for the community.

Amendment No. 11

Amendment No 11 to the City's DPS 2 proposes to rezone the subject site from the 'Residential', 'Business', 'Commercial' and 'Civic and Cultural' zones to the 'Centre' zone and to remove the Residential Density coding.

The Centre Zone is intended to accommodate existing and proposed business centres varying in size from small neighbourhood centres to large multi-purpose regional centres and provides for the coordinated planning and development of these centres where the Council considers that an Agreed Structure Plan is necessary.

Under the Centre Zone, no subdivision and development is permitted, unless a Structure Plan is prepared and adopted in accordance with Part 9 of the Scheme, and the proposed subdivision and development is in accordance with that Structure Plan.

Previous Council Decisions

Amendment No. 11 to the City's DPS 2 was considered at Council's meeting on t 12 February 2002 (CJ023-02/02) where it was resolved to finally adopt it without modification. The Amendment is currently being considered by the WAPC.

The Kinross Neighbourhood Centre Structure Plan was also considered at Council's meeting on the 12 February 2002 (CJ024-02/02) where it was resolved to adopt it for the purposes of advertising for public comment.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

Part 9 of the City's DPS 2 relates to the preparation and adoption of Structure Plans. Clause 9.6 state that the Council shall consider all submissions received and within sixty (60) days of the date or the latest date specified in the notice given under clause 9.5 shall do one or other of the following:

- (a) refuse to adopt the Structure Plan;
- (b) resolve that the Structure Plan is satisfactory with or without modifications which the Council may require the proponent to make and submit three copies to the Commission for adoption and certification in the form illustrated in Schedule 8 to this Report.

Consultation:

The Structure Plan was advertised for public comment for a period of twenty eight (28) days (21 February – 21 March 2002).

Policy Implications:

City of Joondalup's Centres Strategy (adopted as Council Policy)

The City's Centres Strategy sets out the City's desired approach to the distribution, size and nature of Centres within the City of Joondalup.

The City's Centres Strategy identifies the subject Centre as a Village Centre. With respect to Village Centres, the Centres Strategy recommends that:

- The Council progressively include Village Centres and peripheral areas, about 100 metres wide, in a ‘Centre’ zone in the Town Planning Scheme as structure plans are approved.
- The Council consider any proposals for expansion of a Centre or the establishment of mixed business in peripheral areas in the context of an approved structure plan based on ‘main street principles’.

WAPC’s Statement of Planning Policy No. 9 – Metropolitan Centres Policy Statement for the Perth Metropolitan Region

The principal purpose of the policy is to provide a broad regional planning framework to coordinate the location and development of retail and commercial activities in the metropolitan region. It is mainly concerned with the location, distribution and broad design criteria for the development of commercial activities at the regional and district level. Local Planning Strategies prepared by local governments will provide more detailed guidance for planning and development control at the local level.

Strategic Implications:

The redesign and relocation of the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre will increase its exposure and ensure that it reflects current urban design principles, thereby having economic and lifestyle benefits.

COMMENT

The Structure Plan was advertised for a period of twenty eight (28) days (21 February-21 March 2002) during which time nine (9) submissions were received. Seven (7) of these submissions were received from government agencies and two (2) were received from members of the local community. The submissions have been summarised and addressed in Attachment 3 to this Report.

No objection was raised to the Structure Plan from government agencies however the DOT recommended that bus bays be provided on Selkirk Drive adjacent to the Centre’s entrance and that the existing bus stops be relocated accordingly. The provision of bus bays will reduce the amount of on-street parking however there is considered to be sufficient land for parking on site. It is recommended that the Structure Plan be modified to include provision for bus bays to be provided on Selkirk Drive in the vicinity of the Centre to ensure its maximum accessibility by public transport.

Objections were raised to the Structure Plan in the two (2) submissions received from members of the local community. Objections were raised on the grounds that the Centre would detrimentally affect the amenity of the surrounding residential area. However, the subject site is already zoned for commercial, business, civic and cultural, and residential purposes. The Structure Plan does not propose any additional land uses, it simply proposes to relocate the existing land use zones on the site to enable the centre to be redesigned. The impact on amenity is unlikely to be increased as a result.

The Structure Plan requires on-street parking to be provided on Selkirk Drive and these are shown on the development and illustrative plans. The configuration and number of these bays may vary once a detailed assessment has been undertaken. It is therefore recommended that this provision be modified to refer to these being provided to the satisfaction of the City.

The existing zoning of the site reflects a concept plan which was prepared for the Centre in 1993 by Hames Sharley. The Centre is also identified in the City's Centres Strategy, and the Structure Plan reflects the longstanding intention to facilitate development of the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre.

There is currently no commercial land within the eastern section of Kinross. Commercial land is considered desirable to service the local community.

The redesign and relocation of the Kinross Neighbourhood Centres will increase its exposure and ensure that it reflects current urban design principles, thereby having economic and lifestyle benefits.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Hollywood, SECONDED Cr Walker that Council:

1 Pursuant to Clause 9.6 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2, RESOLVES that the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre Structure Plan is satisfactory subject to the following modifications and submits it to the Western Australian Planning Commission for adoption and certification:

(a) inserting the following new provision 6.1.2 xx as follows:

“Bus bays shall be provided on Selkirk Drive in the vicinity of the Centre and existing bus stops on Selkirk Drive shall be relocated where necessary in accordance with the Department of Transport's requirements and to the City's satisfaction.”

(b) Provision 6.1.2 xix being modified to read as follows:

“On-street parking shall be provided along Selkirk Drive to the satisfaction of the City and may be credited to the Commercial Centre's parking requirement.”

2 subject to certification of the Structure Plan by the Western Australian Planning Commission, ADOPTS the Kinross Neighbourhood Centre Structure Plan as an Agreed Structure Plan and authorises the affixation of the Common Seal to, and the signing of, the Structure Plan documents.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendices 6, 6a & 6b refer

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach6brf160402.pdf](#)
[attach6abrf160402.pdf](#) [Attach6bbrf160402.pdf](#)

**CJ092 – 04/02 PROPOSED 56 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS AND TWO
COMMERCIAL UNITS AT LOT 502 & 503 (105)
GRAND BOULEVARD CNR HAMPTON COURT &
SHENTON AVENUE, JOONDALUP – [75469]**

WARD - Lakeside

CJ020416_BRF.DOC:ITEM 8

PURPOSE

The development proposal is referred to Council for determination due to the plot ratio discretion requested and the significance of the landmark development site at the corner of Grand Boulevard, corner Hampton Court and Shenton Avenue

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application has been received for a 2/3-storey building which also includes a basement level, consisting of 56 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units. The units include 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units.

The proposal was discussed at a recent Council briefing session, and this proposal represents a major variation to the plans presented at that time.

Council discretion is sought in this instance as the proposal exceeds the plot ratio requirement by a minor amount.

The proposed development presents an interesting urban façade, along Grand Boulevard and Shenton Avenue. The development is considered appropriate for the location and compatible with the surrounding land uses, which includes the Joondalup Health Campus. Traffic and pedestrian issues associated with the proposal have been adequately addressed. The proposal provides for adequate communal open space, car parking for residents and the public, pedestrian footpaths, landscaping and fencing. The variation in relation to the plot ratio requirement is considered within acceptable limits and it is recommended that Council exercises discretion under District Planning Scheme No 2 to vary the plot ratio requirement. Approval is therefore recommended.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Lots 502 & 503 (105) Grand Boulevard corner of Shenton Avenue and Hampton Court, Joondalup

Applicant: Prestige Developments

Owner: TRG Properties Pty Ltd

Zoning: **DPS:** Centre

MRS: Central City Area

The subject lot forms part of a recently subdivided piece of land to the west of the Joondalup Health Campus. The subject land slopes slightly in a south-north direction with one of the lots being serviced by a right-of-way (ROW). A Western Power sub-station is located adjacent to the Shenton Avenue frontage.

The lots are a significant landmark along the northern approach to the City Centre (along Grand Boulevard).

On 6 March 2002 all elected members were notified of the original proposal for 58 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units at the above site. The proposal was presented at the Council Briefing Session on 19 March 2002 for further discussion. The proposal was considered to be acceptable in terms of scale and design and appropriate for the location. It was also determined at the Briefing Session that the matter could be dealt with under delegation authorised by the Council to the Director Planning & Community Development in consultation with the Mayor. Notwithstanding, the proposal has now been revised and accordingly, the proposal is presented for Council's consideration.

Two (2) units from the original 58 multiple units have now been deleted from the revised proposal that were to be placed over the adjoining Western Power site. The applicant is currently negotiating with Western Power to construct the 2 additional units over the Western Power site. However, due to time constraints, the applicant/owner has decided to provide a revised plan of 56 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units, which is the subject of this report.

The proposal was considered under delegation on 27 March 2002. The proposal was not determined as it was modified from the proposal shown to elected members at the Briefing Session on 19 March 2002.

The revised proposal of 56 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units has now been referred to Council for determination at the request of the applicant/owners.

DETAILS

Proposal and Discretion Sought

The site is located at the corner of Grand Boulevard, Shenton Avenue and Hampton Court in Joondalup. The site falls within the City North precinct within the Joondalup City Centre where one of the preferred uses is residential and commercial. Development within this area is subject to the provision of the Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) and the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM).

The proposal consists of the following elements:

- 56 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units within a 3-storey building and a basement level consisting of a combination of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. The 2 residential units above the Western Power substation site have been deleted at this stage, pending further discussion with Western Power. The building is to be brick and tile with the ground floor units of non load-bearing walls which can be removed at a later stage should there be a need for commercial tenancies.

- The proposed density is R-152 under the R-Codes.
- A total of 71 carbays has been provided on site.
- All pedestrian access is off Grand Boulevard, Hampton Court and Shenton Avenue with all vehicle access to the site off Hampton Court only.
- The proposal incorporates communal open space in the form of a swimming pool and gymnasium and also includes balconies and a verandah for both commercial units which encroach into the footpath area.

The plot ratio which applies to the above two lots is 1.0m. The applicant is requesting a variation to the maximum plot ratio to be increased from 1.0m to 1.08m. The applicant has provided the following summarised information in support of the overall proposal:

- The plot ratio is less than the recently approved Nottinghill development in Joondalup which had a plot ratio of 1.15m.
- Adequate car parking is provided in compliance with the required car parking standard for city centre uses.
- Commercial units have been provided with pedestrian shelters.
- The development is brick and tile with “classical” and “Victorian” elements.
- Communal open space is provided in the form of a swimming pool and a gymnasium.
- This is a quality development which would encourage more people to live in the City.

Statutory Provision:

Clause 4.5 of DPS2 allows discretion to be exercised to vary the plot ratio from 1.0m to 1.08m where it is considered that variation would be appropriate, having due regard for the amenity of the occupiers/users or landowners in the locality, future development of the locality, the merits of the proposal and orderly and proper planning principles.

COMMENT

Plot Ratio

The proposed plot ratio of 1.08 is considered a minor increase to the maximum plot ratio of 1.0 permitted within the City North precinct and is supported on that basis. The proposal has basically complied with all other statutory requirements, except for the plot ratio requirement.

Residential Density

There is currently no stated residential density for the general City uses on the subject lots. The proposed 56 multiple dwellings are equivalent to an R-Code density of R-152. The above density is higher than most of the recent residential developments in City North as well as the Central Business District where the developments around the R-100 to R-130 density mark have been approved. The proposed density of R-152 is considered acceptable for the above site in its current form in terms of number of units, size, design and height of buildings. It furthermore encourages more residential development within the City centre which may in turn contribute to a multiplying effect for other related businesses in the area.

Urban Design

The current proposal is a combination of residential and commercial development. The lots front onto Grand Boulevard, Shenton Avenue and Hampton Court and adjoins the Joondalup Health Campus and should in time provide opportunity for conversion to commercial uses for the ground floor units, when demand arises.

It is to be noted that the elevation facing Shenton Avenue could have been better designed if the Western Power site was included in the current proposal. It is, however, acknowledged that as the Western Power site is on a different title, the City does not have the legal right to impose control conditions on a third party.

Setbacks and Car Parking

The proposed setbacks are in accordance with the residential development requirements for City North which includes nil front, side and rear setback. The maximum height of buildings in this area is 3-storeys, however, under exceptional circumstances, higher developments may be considered.

Car Parking Table Based on DPS2 Requirements

Current Use	Car Parking Provisions	No of Bays Required	No of Bays Provided
(2) Commercial units - 88m ²	1 carbay per 30m ²	3	4
56 multiple units	1 bay per multiple unit	56	67
Totals		59	71

One disabled carbay has been provided for the public within the lot. Three verge carbays have also been proposed by the owners at their cost. Secured car parking is provided for the residential units. The applicant has also provided two carbays for some of the residential units.

Environmental Health Requirements

Ventilation for the undercroft carpark is to be in compliance with Australian Standards. A noise consultant's report is to be submitted for all installations, activities and processes to the satisfaction of the City. Particular areas of concern are mechanical services and noise associated with the swimming pool, gymnasium and ventilation of the car park.

Adequate bin storage areas have been provided in accordance with the Council's Health Local Laws. The applicant has, however, been advised of the concerns relating to the distance to the bin area from the furthest residential unit. The applicant is requested to provide adequate fencing and toilet facilities for the public swimming pool, in accordance with the relevant state legislation.

Conclusion

The above proposal is considered to have satisfied DPS2 and the JCCDPM in terms of objectives, urban design, car parking and preferred uses within this precinct. The proposal achieves the continuous urban wall effect along Grand Boulevard, Shenton Avenue and Hampton Court. The proposal is indicative of the continued interest and confidence in the provision of inner city housing and commercial mixed use developments within the Joondalup City Centre. The proposal will increase the residential population within the city centre and also maintain the flexibility of future ground floor commercial opportunities. The development is compatible with the surrounding land uses including the provision of safe vehicular and pedestrian movement. On balance, the proposed variation to the plot ratio requirement is considered reasonable for the above development and approval is therefore recommended for the reasons stated in the report.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Walker that Council:

- 1 EXERCISES discretion in relation to Clause 4.5 of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determines that:**
 - (a) the variation of the plot ratio from 1.0m to 1.08m is appropriate in this instance;**

- 2 APPROVES the application dated 6 February 2002 and revised plans received on 25 March 2002 submitted by Prestige Developments on behalf of the owner TRG Properties Pty Ltd and the application dated 11 April 2002 submitted by Western Power Corporation for 56 multiple dwellings and 2 commercial units at Lots 502, 503 and 857 (105) Grand Boulevard, corner Shenton Avenue and Hampton Court, Joondalup subject to the following conditions:**
 - (a) the parking bay/s, driveway/s and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Offstreet Carparking (AS2890) and AS 2890.5 (on street parking). Such areas are to be constructed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City prior to the development first being occupied. These works are to be done as part of the building programme;**
 - (b) one (1) disabled carparking bay located convenient to the building entrance and with a minimum width of 3.2 metres, to be provided to the satisfaction of the City. Provision must also be made for disabled access and facilities in accordance with the Australian Standard for Design for Access and Mobility (AS 1428.1);**
 - (c) Lots 502 and 503 to be amalgamated into a single lot to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning and Environmental Services;**

- (d) all stormwater to be discharged to the satisfaction of the City. The proposed stormwater drainage system is required to be shown on the Building Licence submission and be approved by the City prior to the commencement of construction;
- (e) the driveway/s and crossover/s to be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the City before occupation of development;
- (f) car bay grades are generally not to exceed 6% and disabled car bay/s are to have a maximum grade of 2.5%;
- (g) the footpath treatment in the adjoining road reserve to be continued to the property boundary to match the existing paving and at a grade of 2% rising from the kerblines, prior to the development first being occupied;
- (h) any roof mounted or free standing plant or equipment such as air conditioning units, satellite dishes or radio masts to be located and screened so as not to be visible from beyond the boundaries of the development site;
- (i) should the development be staged, temporary landscaping and fencing must be installed prior to the development being occupied to the satisfaction of the City;
- (j) submission of a Construction Management Plan detailing phasing of construction, access, storage of materials, protection of pedestrians, footpaths and other infrastructure;
- (k) all fencing to be designed and constructed in accordance with the attached extract from the Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual and thereafter be maintained to the satisfaction of the City;
- (l) a suitably screened bin storage area is to be provided prior to the development first being occupied, in the location on the approved plans. Such an area must be constructed with a concrete floor, graded to a 100mm industrial floor waste gully connected to sewer and be provided with a hose cock;
- (m) no obscure or reflective glazing being used in the dwellings facing onto Grand Boulevard;
- (n) the boundary wall(s) and/or parapet wall(s) being of a clean finish and made good to the satisfaction of the City;
- (o) future residents being notified in writing by the proponent that the City North Precinct is planned to become a vibrant and bustling city centre comprising a mix of land uses where street level activity may occur of an intensity not normally associated with a traditional suburban residential environment;

- (p) the submission of an acoustic consultant's report demonstrating to the satisfaction of the City that the proposed development is capable of containing all noise emissions in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act;**
- (q) details marked in red on the approved plans;**
- (r) landscaping and reticulation to be established in accordance with the approved plans prior to the development first being occupied and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City;**
- (s) the lodging of detailed landscape plans, to the satisfaction of the City, for the development site and the adjoining road verge(s) with the Building Licence Application. For the purpose of this condition a detailed landscaping plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and show the following:**
 - (i) the location and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs within the carpark area;**
 - (ii) any lawns to be established;**
 - (iii) any natural landscape areas to be retained; and**
 - (iv) those areas to be reticulated or irrigated.**
- (t) the façade of the Western Power substation on Lot 857 being upgraded to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.**

Footnotes:

- (i) You are advised that plans submitted for a Building Licence must show the full width of the verge and any street furniture, traffic islands, statutory services, road gullies, crossovers on the opposite side of the road, the existing site levels, design levels of all proposed development and including levels on top of the kerb at the crossover.**
- (ii) A Mechanical Services Plan, signed by a suitably qualified Mechanical Services Engineer.**
- (iii) to certify that any mechanical ventilation particularly for the undercroft carparking complies with AS1668.2.**
- (iv) With respect to (c) above, the amalgamation of lots is to be created and new titles issued prior to lodgment of a building licence.**
- (v) A separate application being made to the City for approval to commence development and sign licence prior to the installation of any advertising signage.**
- (vi) For the purposes of this approval the car parking ratio was calculated based upon one carbay per multiple dwelling and 1 carbay per 30 m² of commercial floor space.**

- (vii) **Compliance with the Building Code of Australia provisions for access and facilities for people with disabilities may not discharge an owner's or developer's liability under the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission has developed guidelines to assist owners and developers in designing developments which may satisfy the requirements of the DDA. Copies of the guidelines may be obtained from the Disabilities Services Commission, 53 Ord Street, West Perth, telephone 9426 9200.**
- (viii) **Applicant is advised that plans and specification for public swimming pool to be submitted to the Executive Director Public Health for approval.**
- (ix) **Compliance with BCA requirements.**
- (x) **It is recommended that an additional bin storage area be provided for residents living furthest from the proposed bin storage area.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Appendices 7 & 7a refers

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [attach7brf160402.pdf](#)
[Attach7abrf160402.pdf](#)*

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**CJ093 – 04/02 ESTABLISHMENT OF 2002/03 BUDGET
COMMITTEE - [76514 13020 55055]**

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To seek Council's approval on the establishment of a Budget Committee to oversee the development of the Draft 2002-2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends that Council:-

- establishes a Budget Committee to oversee the development of the Draft 2002-2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan;
- appoints all Elected Members as representatives of the Budget Committee; and
- sets a quorum for the Budget Committee of 8 members

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the practice adopted last year (CJ192-06/01) it is proposed to establish a Budget Committee to oversee the compilation of the 2002/03 Draft Budget and Principal Activities Plan. This mechanism is considered the most appropriate to familiarise Elected Members with the various budget components. This would enable Councillors to make budgetary decisions in a formalised manner with motions being moved and seconded in order for issues to be voted upon. The Committee's recommendations would in turn be forwarded to Council for further consideration and final adoption.

DETAILS

The provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 enable a Committee to be established comprising of 3 or more persons. As was the case last year the Committee could be established comprising of all elected members.

The Local Government Act 1995 only requires that those committees with delegated powers be opened to the public. It is envisaged that the proposed committee will not be delegated any decision making ability, and merely make recommendations to the Council.

Local Government (Administration) Regulation 1996, No 11 details the following is to be the contents of a meeting of a Council or Committee:

- “(a) the names of the members present at a meeting;
- (b) where a member enters or leaves the meeting during the course of a meeting, the time of entry or departure, as the case requires, in the chronological sequence of the business of the meeting;
- (c) details of each motion moved at the meeting, the mover and the outcome of the motion;
- (d) details of each decision made at the meeting;
- (da) written reasons for each decision made at the meeting that is significantly different from the relevant written recommendation of a committee or an employee as defined in Section 5.70 (but not a decision to only note the matter or to return the recommendation for further consideration);
- (e) a summary of each question raised by members of the public at the meeting and a summary of the response to the question; (where appropriate)
- (f) in relation to each disclosure made under Section 5.65 and 5.70 in relation to the meeting, where the extent of the interest has also been disclosed, the extent of the interest.”

It is important to note that prior to submitting a recommendation to the Council, a motion by the Committee must be moved and seconded (if appropriate) and then duly voted upon. This will give a clear indication of the proposed committee recommendation to the Council.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION: That Council, BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

1 ESTABLISHES a Budget Committee to oversee the development of the Draft 2002-2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan;

2 APPOINTS the following representatives to the Budget Committee:

Mayor J Bombak, JP
Cr P Kadak
Cr P Kimber
Cr D S Carlos
Cr C Baker
Cr A Nixon
Cr J F Hollywood, JP
Cr A Walker
Cr P Rowlands
Cr T Barnett
Cr M O'Brien, JP
Cr A L Patterson
Cr G Kenworthy
Cr J Hurst
Cr C Mackintosh

3 SETS a quorum for the Budget Committee of 8 members.

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY:

1 **ESTABLISHES a Budget Committee to oversee the development of the Draft 2002-2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan;**

2 **APPOINTS the following representatives to the Budget Committee:**

**Mayor J Bombak, JP
Cr P Kadak
Cr P Kimber
Cr D S Carlos
Cr C Baker
Cr A Nixon
Cr J F Hollywood, JP
Cr A Walker
Cr P Rowlands
Cr T Barnett
Cr M O'Brien, JP
Cr A L Patterson
Cr G Kenworthy
Cr J Hurst
Cr C Mackintosh**

- 3 SETS a quorum for the Budget Committee of 8 members.**
- 4 encourages the Budget Committee to use its best endeavours to ensure that the 2002/2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan will not result in an increase in the rates to be paid by our ratepayers for the 2002/2002 financial year;**
- 5 reprioritises the Performing Arts Centre project by deferring the same until such time as its proponents are able to clearly identify and demonstrate to our ratepayers where the estimated \$28m required to build the facility is coming from;**
- 6 redirects the \$2m (and accrued interest) held in the Performing Arts Centre Capital Reserve Account (“the Fund”) to be expended on purposes that will benefit the broader local community by:**
 - (a) applying half of the Fund for general expenditure purposes so as to exclude, negative or diminish the need for a rates increase to our ratepayers;**
 - (b) applying the remaining one half of the Fund to what our community has identified as being more important areas of expenditure in our community including but not limited to:**
 - (i) protecting and improving our environment;**
 - (ii) improving facilities and funding for our local senior citizens;**
 - (iii) improving parks, public open spaces, footpaths, cycle paths, public verges and median strips and bus shelters for our local people;**
 - (iv) improving sporting facilities for local sporting groups;**
 - (v) developing safer traffic treatments around our schools for children and families;**
 - (vi) increasing the funds available for Council’s Community Grants Scheme;**
 - (vii) reviewing the application of the minimum payment provisions of the Local Government Act 1995;**
 - (viii) enhancing the City’s community consultation programmes and procedures;**
 - (ix) fulfilling other core responsibilities that clearly fall within the fundamental obligations of a local government body to help our local ratepayers, children, families, senior citizens and the boarder community.**

The motion as Moved Cr Baker, Seconded Cr O'Brien was moved as one. During discussion on the matter, Cr Walker requested that each part of the motion be voted upon separately.

Discussion ensued.

Mayor Bombak requested Cr Hollywood apologise for remarks made as these reflected adversely on Cr Baker's integrity.

Cr Hollywood offered sincere apologies for remarks made.

MOVED Cr Hurst, SECONDED Cr Walker that the Motion BE NOW PUT.

The Motion was Put and

LOST

C52-04/02

MOTION TO ADJOURN MEETING – [02154] [08122]

MOVED Cr Hurst, SECONDED Cr Baker that in accordance with clause 5.1 of the City's Standing Orders the meeting be adjourned for ten (10) minutes, reconvening at 2128 hrs.

The Motion to Adjourn was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council:

- 1 ESTABLISHES a Budget Committee to oversee the development of the Draft 2002-2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan;**

Discussion ensued.

The Motion was Put and

**CARRIED BY AN
ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council:

- 2 APPOINTS the following representatives to the Budget Committee:**

**Mayor J Bombak, JP
Cr P Kadak
Cr P Kimber
Cr D S Carlos
Cr C Baker
Cr A Nixon
Cr J F Hollywood, JP
Cr A Walker
Cr P Rowlands
Cr T Barnett
Cr M O'Brien, JP**

Cr A L Patterson
Cr G Kenworthy
Cr J Hurst
Cr C Mackintosh

The Motion was Put and

**CARRIED BY AN
ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council:

3 SETS a quorum for the Budget Committee of 8 members;

The Motion was Put and

**CARRIED BY AN
ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council:

4 ENCOURAGES the Budget Committee to use its best endeavours to ensure that the 2002/2003 Budget and Principal Activities Plan will not result in an increase in the rates to be paid by our ratepayers for the 2002/2003 financial year;

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Baker, Hurst, Kenworthy, Mackintosh, O'Brien, Patterson, Rowlands and Walker

Against the Motion: Crs Carlos and Hollywood

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Council:

5 reprioritises the Performing Arts Centre project by deferring the same until such time as its proponents are able to clearly identify and demonstrate to our ratepayers where the estimated \$28m required to build the facility is coming from;

The Motion was Put and

LOST

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Crs Baker, Kenworthy, O'Brien and Rowlands

Against the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Carlos, Hollywood, Hurst, Mackintosh, Patterson and Walker

Manager, Corporate Finance advised the changing of the nature of the Reserve Account is dealt with under Section 6.11 (1) of the Local Government Act 1995.

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr O’Brien that Council:

- 6 redirects the \$2m (and accrued interest) held in the Performing Arts Centre Capital Reserve Account (“the Fund”) to be expended on purposes that will benefit the broader local community by:
- (a) applying half of the Fund for general expenditure purposes so as to exclude, negative or diminish the need for a rates increase to our ratepayers;
 - (b) applying the remaining one half of the Fund to what our community has identified as being more important areas of expenditure in our community including but not limited to:
 - (i) protecting and improving our environment;
 - (ii) improving facilities and funding for our local senior citizens;
 - (iii) improving parks, public open spaces, footpaths, cycle paths, public verges and median strips and bus shelters for our local people;
 - (iv) improving sporting facilities for local sporting groups;
 - (v) developing safer traffic treatments around our schools for children and families;
 - (vi) increasing the funds available for Council’s Community Grants Scheme;
 - (vii) reviewing the application of the minimum payment provisions of the Local Government Act;
 - (viii) enhancing the City’s community consultation programmes and procedures;
 - (ix) fulfilling other core responsibilities that clearly fall within the fundamental obligations of a local government body to help our local ratepayers, children, families, senior citizens and the boarder community.

The Motion was Put and**LOST**

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Crs Baker, Kenworthy, O’Brien and Rowlands

Against the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Carlos, Hollywood, Hurst, Mackintosh, Patterson and Walker

**C53-04/02 CBD ENHANCEMENT PROJECT STEERING
COMMITTEE - [53469]**

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

To appoint stakeholder group representatives as members to the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee, in accordance to the resolution detailed in the minutes of the 9 April 2002 Council Meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends that Council:

- 1 appoints by an absolute majority the following positions of the invited stakeholder groups to the CBD enhancement project steering committee, being:**
 - a) The Joondalup Business Association – President**
 - b) The Perth Area Consultative Committee – Small Business and Economic Development**
 - c) The Department of Training (North Metropolitan Employment Office) – Regional Employment Coordinator**
 - d) The North Metropolitan Business Enterprise Centre (BEC) – Manager**

BACKGROUND

At the 9th April 2002 Council Meeting it was resolved that Council:

- 1 ESTABLISHES a CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee to make recommendations to Council concerning broad priorities and financial monitoring of the CBD Enhancement Project and to recommend strategies for the project's financial self-sufficiency beyond the 2003/04 financial year;**
- 2 APPOINTS the following persons to the Committee detailed in (1) above, being:**
 - (a) Cr P Kadak and Cr P Kimber;**
 - (b) Cr C Baker, Cr A Patterson and Cr Walker**
- 3. INVITES a representative from each of the following stakeholder groups to be a member of the committee detailed in (1) above:**
 - The Joondalup Business Association;**
 - The Perth Area Consultative Committee;**
 - The Department of Training (North Metropolitan Employment Office); and**
 - The North Metropolitan Business Enterprise Centre (BEC)**

DETAILS

Correspondence has taken place inviting a representative from each of the stakeholder groups outlined in the council resolution, to appoint a member to the CBD Enhancement Steering Committee.

Each of the stakeholder groups was asked to confirm the position in their organisation to be appointed to this committee. Each of the stakeholder groups confirmed the following representatives:

- The Joondalup Business Association – President
The position is currently filled by MR Russell Poliwka
- The Perth Area Consultative Committee – Small Business and Economic Development
The position is currently filled by Marilyn Horgan
- The Department of Training (North Metropolitan Employment Office) – Regional Employment Coordinator
The position is currently filled by Leanne Drummond
- The North Metropolitan Business Enterprise Centre (BEC) – Manager
The position is currently filled by Tony Beard

COMMENT

Appointing the stakeholders group representatives by position rather than by person will avoid the task of re-appointing members to the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee as a result of employee/honorary role changes within the organisations.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 5.8 requires an Absolute Majority of Council to establish a committee in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995.

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Patterson that Council APPOINTS the following positions of the invited stakeholder groups to the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee, being:

- 1 The Joondalup Business Association – President**
- 2 The Perth Area Consultative Committee – Small Business and Economic Development;**
- 3 The Department of Training (North Metropolitan Employment Office) – Regional Employment Coordinator;**
- 4 The North Metropolitan Business Enterprise Centre (BEC) – Manager.**

The Motion was Put and

**CARRIED BY AN
ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

Mayor Bombak declared a non-financial interest that may affect his impartiality in C54-04/02 as he is a member of the North West Metro Business Association.

**C54-04/02 PROPOSED BUSINESS INCUBATOR - LOT 502
COLLIER PASS, JOONDALUP FOR THE NORTH
WEST METRO BUSINESS ASSOCIATION - [43965]**

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to request Council's approval for a variation to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan & Manual (JCCDPM) in relation to a development application for the Business Incubator.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Discussions have been ongoing for some time concerning the development of a business incubator behind the (former) Ansett Call Centre, off Collier Pass. An application has been received and the preferred site is within the JCCDPM area. Due to the age of the Structure Plan document, and altered planning intention for parts of the City Centre area (that have subsequently arisen), a variation to the Structure Plan in terms of preferred use is required to facilitate this development.

The JCCDPM suggests that the subject land be used for "residential and mixed uses", whereas the proposal comprises an "office" use.

District Planning Scheme No. 2 (DPS2) requires that the Council's approval be obtained where a Structure Plan provision is varied. It is recommended that the proposal be approved.

BACKGROUND

The JCCDPM was adopted in 1995 to guide the development of the Joondalup City Centre area. The document has the effect of a Structure Plan adopted under DPS2. The preferred business incubator site lies within the Central Business District area, immediately south of Collier Pass, and is within an area that the JCCDPM has described as "preferred for residential and mixed use".

The location of the site is shown on Attachment 1 to this report.

Due to its age, the JCCDPM does not reflect changes in planning intentions that resulted after 1995. A land exchange of broadacre land (including the application site) with land in the Lakeside area, between Landcorp and Edith Cowan University fundamentally altered the likely planning scenarios for each of the two parcels of land.

Discussions have been ongoing for some time concerning the development of an appropriate Structure Plan for the vacant land bounded by Collier Pass, Grand Boulevard and the railway line (which includes the application site) although, to date, structure planning has not been undertaken for the area. The development application incorporates the proposed extension of Barron Parade and the development of a 2025m² discreet parcel of land for the business incubator and associated parking.

Suburb/Location: Collier Pass, Joondalup
Applicant: North West Metro Business Association
Owner: Edith Cowan University
Zoning: DPS: Centre Zone
MRS: Central City Area

DETAILS

The development proposal includes a single storey building incorporating 26 offices, five large multi-purpose rooms, and a shared reception area. 31 carbays would be provided to service the building, with access from a new section to be added to Barron Parade (which is yet to be constructed). The proposal complies with the carparking development standards of the JCCDPM and would be consistent with the quality of buildings around the City Centre, particularly those used for commercial purposes. The extension of Barron Parade is proposed to include on-street parking to assist with ease of access for short-term visitors to the incubator.

Statutory Provision: DPS2 and the JCCDPM

Financial Implications:

The business incubator project has been partly sponsored by Council's contribution of approximately \$50,000, which has been separately funded from the current budget.

Strategic Implications:

The business incubator is an important joint venture project with major stakeholders in the City Centre, and will assist in the provision of infrastructure to nurture small businesses that may locate in the Joondalup City Centre area. The business incubator also provides an additional tangible example of the City's joint commitment to the economic development of Joondalup, and to the growing partnership with stakeholders in the area.

COMMENT

It was intended that a Structure Plan for land south of Collier Pass be prepared and endorsed before development proceeds on the englobo parcel of land, which is held in ECU ownership. However, the merits of this particular case, and the agreed need for the project, combined with its discreet location behind the former Ansett Call Centre, provide an adequate case for consideration of this proposal individually.

On its merits, it is recommended that the proposal be approved, and that the provisions of the JCCDPM be varied in this instance. Clause 4.5 of DPS2 allows the Council to vary Structure Plan provisions where the Council is satisfied that the proposal is in keeping with the desired planning intentions for the area, and accordingly the proposal is supported.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

MOVED Cr Baker, SECONDED Cr Rowlands that Council:

- 1 EXERCISES DISCRETION pursuant to Clause 4.5 of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determines a:**
 - (a) variation of the provisions of the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan & Manual (JCCDPM) to allow for a General City Use in lieu of a Residential/Mixed Use; and**

- 2 APPROVES the application submitted by Steve Mawson on behalf of Edith Cowan University, for a General City Use development, comprising a business incubator centre on Lot 502 (38) Collier Pass, Joondalup subject to the plans received on 1 March 2002, and following conditions:**
 - (a) road access and provision of essential services to be constructed to the development site to be to the satisfaction of the City and at the owners/applicants' expense;**
 - (b) the parking bays, driveways and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with Australian Standards for off-street car parking (AS2890) and the JCCDPM as appropriate. Such areas are to be constructed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City, prior to the development first being occupied. These works are to be done as part of the building programme;**
 - (c) one (1) disabled carparking bay located convenient to the building entrance and with a minimum width of 3.2 metres, to be provided to the satisfaction of the City. Provision must also be made for disabled access and facilities in accordance with the Australian Standard for Design for Access and Mobility (AS 1428.1);**
 - (d) an onsite stormwater drainage system with the capacity to contain a 1:100 year storm of a 24-hour duration is to be provided prior to the development first being occupied and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City. Alternatively, the stormwater can be disposed of via the City's existing stormwater disposal system. The proposed stormwater drainage system is required to be shown on the Building Licence submission and be approved by the City prior to the commencement of construction;**
 - (e) carparking bays are to be 5.4 metres long and a minimum of 2.5 metres wide. End bays are to be 2.8 metres wide and end bays in a blind aisle are to be 3.5 metres wide;**

- (f) any roof-mounted or free-standing plant or equipment such as air conditioning units, satellite dishes or radio masts to be located and screened so as not to be visible from beyond the boundaries of the development site;
- (g) should the development be staged, temporary landscaping and fencing must be installed to the undeveloped portion, prior to the development being occupied, to the satisfaction of the City;
- (h) submission of a construction management plan, prior to commencing construction, detailing phasing of construction, access, storage of materials, protection of pedestrians, footpath and other infrastructure, to be satisfaction of the City;
- (i) the lodging of detailed landscape plans, to the satisfaction of the City, for the development site and the adjoining road verges with the Building Licence Application. For the purpose of this condition, a detailed landscaping plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and show the following:
 - (i) the location and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs within the carpark area;
 - (ii) any lawns to be established;
 - (iii) those areas to be reticulated or irrigated.
- (j) landscaping and reticulation be established in accordance with the approved plans prior to the development first being occupied and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City;
- (k) the bin store is required to be relocated to carbay 30 to allow easier collection by refuse vehicles;
- (l) the canopy extending over the adjoining road reserve to be a minimum width of two metres and have a minimum ground clearance of 2.75 metres.

Footnotes:

- (a) Compliance with the Building Code of Australia provisions for access and facilities for people with disabilities may not discharge any owner's or developer's liability under the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission has developed guidelines to assist owners and developers in designing developments which may satisfy the requirements of the DDA. Copies of the guidelines may be obtained from the Disability Services Commission, 53 Ord Street, West Perth, telephone 9426 9200;
- (b) The existing site levels and design levels of all proposed development, including levels on top of the kerb at the crossover, are to be shown on the Building Licence Application.

- (c) **A separate planning application is required for any proposed signage.**
- (d) **The applicant is required to comply with the requirements of the Health Act, Regulations and Local Laws.**

Appendix 8 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach8min230402.pdf](#)

C55-04/02 MOTION TO GO BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

MOVED Cr Rowlands, SECONDED Cr Kenworthy that in accordance with Clause 5.6 of the City’s Standing Orders, the meeting be held behind closed doors to enable the Council to discuss C56-04/02 – Streetside Benches Proposed Settlement, being a matter of possible legal action.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Members of the public and press left the Chamber at this point, the time being 2140 hrs. Mayor Bombak advised the tape recording to be turned off at this time.

C56-04/02 CONFIDENTIAL-STREETSIDE BENCHES PROPOSED SETTLEMENT - [45612] [45924]

WARD - All

MOVED Cr Hurst, SECONDED Cr O’Brien that Council RESOLVES to make a “without prejudice offer” to Streetside Advertising in the terms outlined within Confidential Report C56-04/02.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Mackintosh, Hurst, Kenworthy, Patterson, O’Brien, Rowlands, Walker, Hollywood and Baker

Against the Motion: Cr Carlos

Senior Administration Officer, Infrastructure & Operations left the Chamber, the time being 2205 hrs.

RESUMPTION OF STANDING ORDERS

MOVED Cr Hurst, SECONDED Cr O'Brien that Standing Orders be RESUMED and the meeting be held with the doors open, the time being 2205 hrs.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Members of the public entered the Chamber at this point. In accordance with the City's Standing Orders Local Law, the Acting Chief Executive Officer read the Motion in relation to Item C56-04/02 - Streetside Benches Proposed Settlement.

MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

C57-04/02

NOTICE OF MOTION NO 1 - CR C MACKINTOSH

In accordance with Clause 3.12 of the Standing Orders Local Law, Cr C Mackintosh has given notice of her intention to move the following motion at the Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 23 April 2002:

“That Council considers amending Policy 2.2.8 “Legal Representation for Present and Former Elected Members and Staff of the City” to enable the “relevant person” defined therein to receive from the Council assistance against the costs of being involved in instituting and conducting legal proceedings for the tort or civil wrong known as Defamation arising from the carrying out of the official responsibilities or terms of employment of the relevant person and that all such assistance be approved by the Councillors of the City on a case by case basis.”

OFFICER'S COMMENT

It should be noted that the current policy relates solely to defending proceedings rather than initiating proceedings.

Defamatory Word

Words are defamatory of a person if they have a tendency to cause that person to be lowered in the estimation of others.

Words are not defamatory unless the person defamed is sufficiently identified.

However, there are circumstances where the law recognises that a person can be identified by particular individuals having knowledge of extrinsic facts. Extrinsic facts are those which would enable a person knowing those facts to identify the person defamed.

Defences

Truth is an absolute defence. This means that a person is not liable for defamation regardless of how damaging the statements published, provided the person can establish the truth of what was published.

The law recognises that in certain circumstances, a person who makes a defamatory statement is not liable if a defence of qualified privilege can be established. Qualified privilege is generally only available in circumstances where the defamatory statement is made in the discharge of some public or private duty, whether legal or moral, provided it is communicated to a person who has a reciprocal interest or duty in receiving the statement.

The defence of qualified privilege is lost if the person who made the defamatory statement does so with malice, does not have a genuine belief in the truth of the statement, or publishes the statement in a form which is excessive.

The City

It has been held in New South Wales that an elected governmental body such as a local authority may not institute proceedings for defamation, but this of course does not preclude individual councillors or officers from commencing proceedings.

It is considered that the City should not fund civil actions initiated by elected members or employees.

If individuals choose to pursue an action for defamation and they are able to substantiate the complaint, the Courts can provide the appropriate remedies available at law.

MOVED Cr Mackintosh, SECONDED Cr Baker that Council considers amending policy 2.2.8 “legal representation for present and former elected members and staff of the city” to enable the “relevant person” defined therein to receive from the council assistance against the costs of being involved in instituting and conducting legal proceedings for the tort or civil wrong known as defamation arising from the carrying out of the official responsibilities or terms of employment of the relevant person and that all such assistance be approved by the councillors of the city on a case by case basis.

Discussion ensued.

During discussion, Cr Patterson left the Chamber at 2207 hrs and returned at 2210 hrs.

The Motion was Put and

LOST

C58-04/02

NOTICE OF MOTION NO 2 - CR A WALKER

In accordance with Clause 3.12 of the Standing Orders Local Law, Cr Alison Walker has given notice of her intention to move the following motion at the Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 23 April 2002:

“That Council:

- 1 supports the right of its electors to participate in the decision making processes of Council by petitioning for a special electors meeting with the signature of 100 electors as detailed in the current Local Government Act, section 5.28;*
- 2 writes to the Minister for Local Government and informs him of Council decision not to support changing section 5.28 of the Local Government Act 1995.”*

OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Council at its meeting held on 9 April 2002 agreed that where notices of motion are submitted to the Council for consideration, an officer's report be included. The Department of Local Government supports this business process.

Statutory Provision:

Section 5.28 of the Local Government Act 1995 states:

- 1 A special meeting of the electors of a district is to be held on the request of not less than –
 - (a) 100 electors or 5% of the number of electors – whichever is the lesser number; or
 - (b) 1/3 of the number of council members.
- 2 The request is to specify the matters to be discussed at the meeting and the form or content of the request is to be in the prescribed form in accordance with regulations.
- 3 The request is to be sent to the Mayor or President.
- 4 A special meeting is to be held on a day selected by the Mayor or President but not more than 35 days after the day on which he or she received the request.

Since the split of the former City of Wanneroo on 1 July 1998, the City of Joondalup has held 11 special electors meetings:

Date of special electors meeting	No. of electors who signed petition requesting special electors meeting	Those present who signed attendance sheet	Nature of Request
14.9.98	182	28	The proposed cancellation of a portion of Reserve 30958 and 31016 Greenwood Primary School, Greenwood
2.11.98	220	117	To discuss the approval of a Mosque on location 12888 (64) Walter Padbury Boulevard, Padbury
24.11.98	197	3	Former Greenwood Primary School site. Failure of Report CJ213-10/98 to adequately address the resolutions of the Special Meeting of Electors held 14.9.98
8.3.99	141	108	As the one above
14.6.99	131	64	Structure Plan and implementation Study for Hillarys Boat Harbour

20.11.00	Request from Crs S Magyar, J Hollywood, D Carlos, A Walker & A Nixon (in accordance with section 5.28 (1)(b))	13	Future directions of the management of the City of Joondalup leisure services
11.7.01	121	62	Badrick Street issues
7.02.02	127	1103	Precinct Planning – Greenwood etc
11.02.02	172	1438	Precinct Planning – Kingsley
18.03.03	324	500	Tom Simpson Park issues, Mullaloo
25.03.02	197	115	Whitford Senior Citizens Centre and relocation of Whitford Library

Strategic Implications:

The City throughout its Strategic Plan makes statements that it will encourage public participation throughout the decision-making process.

COMMENT

The City has approximately 100,000 electors, which equates to the second largest local government within Western Australia. The 5% only applies to those local governments whose total number of electors does not exceed 2,000 in number.

Of the approximate 144 local governments within Western Australia, there are 67 local governments whose total electors exceed 2,000 electors where the 5% would not be applicable and would only require 100 electors to sign a petition requesting a special electors meeting. These figures reveal for example that the number within the Shire of Northampton requesting a special electors meeting is the same number as required within the City of Joondalup.

The cost for the City to convene special electors meeting varies depending on location. The cost for special electors meeting to be held within the Council Chamber would be minimal as the entire infrastructure is in place. However, where the meeting is convened outside the Council Chamber, costs increase due to the need to arrange the use of various infrastructures (sound recording equipment, lighting, hire of venue etc.).

The City strongly encourages public participation but is mindful that the Mayor and Councillors have been elected to the office of 'elected member' to represent the electors of the City and make decisions where required. It is evident from the figures of previous special electors meetings that the number of electors signing the petition compared to the number of electors attending the special electors meeting varies considerably.

While it is acknowledged and supported that the role of local government is to serve the electors of its district and to involve them in the decision-making process, the City needs to be aware that its decisions are to be made for the benefit of the entire City.

The City supports the ability for special electors meetings to be held, however the current requirements of the Act appear to be inconsistent across the industry in relation to the number of electors required to request a special electors meeting. It maybe more appropriate that the number of electors required to convene a special electors meeting be based on a percentage of the total number of electors per local government and that no ‘lesser’ amount be offered. This would mean that the number of electors required to request a special meeting of electors would be consistent for all local governments.

Due to the fact that the motion has been submitted by an elected member under ‘Notices of which previous motion has been given’, standing orders do not allow for a new motion to be put, therefore no recommendation has been made. However if the motion is moved and seconded the motion maybe duly amended.

MOVED Cr Walker, SECONDED Cr Carlos that Council:

- 1 supports the right of its electors to participate in the decision making processes of Council by petitioning for a special electors meeting with the signature of 100 electors as detailed in the current Local Government Act, section 5.28;**
- 2 writes to the Minister for Local Government and informs him of Council decision not to support changing section 5.28 of the Local Government Act 1995;**

AMENDMENT MOVED Cr Patterson, SECONDED Cr O’Brien that an additional Point 3 be added as follows:

- “3 also WRITES to Mr Ken Travers MLC, Member for the North Metropolitan Region and informs him that Council has rejected his plan to increase the minimum number of electors’ signatures required to requisition a Special Electors’ meting because his plan was formulated without public consultation and does not accord with the principle of democratic and accountable government.”**

Discussion ensued.

Cr Hollywood apologised for comments made which reflected on the integrity of both Mayor Bombak and the Chief Executive Officer.

The Amendment was Put and

CARRIED

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Amendment: Mayor Bombak, Crs Baker, Kenworthy, Mackintosh, O’Brien, Patterson, Rowlands and Walker

Against the Amendment: Crs Carlos, Hollywood and Hurst

Cr Mackintosh requested Points 1, 2 and 3 be voted upon individually. This was not pursued.

The Original Motion, as amended, being:

That Council:

- 1 supports the right of its electors to participate in the decision making processes of Council by petitioning for a special electors meeting with the signature of 100 electors as detailed in the current Local Government Act, section 5.28;**
- 2 writes to the Minister for Local Government and informs him of Council decision not to support changing section 5.28 of the Local Government Act 1995;**
- 3 also WRITES to Mr Ken Travers MLC, Member for the North Metropolitan Region and informs him that Council has rejected his plan to increase the minimum number of electors' signatures required to requisition a Special Electors' meeting because his plan was formulated without public consultation and does not accord with the principle of democratic and accountable government.**

was Put and

CARRIED

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Baker, Carlos, Hurst, Kenworthy, O'Brien, Patterson, Rowlands and Walker

Against the Motion: Crs Hollywood and Mackintosh

C59-04/02 NOTICE OF MOTION NO 3 - CR WALKER

In accordance with Clause 3.12 of the Standing Orders Local Law, Cr Alison Walker has given notice of her intention to move the following motion at the Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 23 April 2002:

“That Council commences the process to request the Minister for Lands to re-classify the bushland portion of Craigie Open Space to an class A nature reserve with the management order with the City of Joondalup.”

OFFICER'S COMMENT

The subject site is identified as Site 303 in Bush Forever (formerly Bush Plan) a document that aims to fulfil the government's commitment to prepare a strategic plan for the conservation of bushland on the Swan Coastal Plain of the Perth Metropolitan Region. Bush Forever is a policy position of the government that aims to guide future decision-making and to protect and manage Bush Forever Sites through implementation mechanisms.

In response, in May 1999, the Joint Commissioners resolved to investigate the future areas for use and conservation within the Craigie Open Space Reserve having regard to the existing functions, and natural assets and the future needs of the community.

The City engaged Ecoscape to prepare a study with the objective “to investigate land use options taking into consideration economic, social and environmental issues.”

At the Council meeting of 13 November 2001, it was resolved to advertise the document for a period of 42 days. The comment period was intended to close on 3 January 2002 however was extended for one (1) month. At the close of the advertising period, 12 submissions were received. The majority of the submissions support no further clearing of the site. In response to the issues raised, the authors of submissions are to be invited to workshop their views with City officer; following which the study will be considered by Council.

The Department of Land Administration advises that it is important the City carefully considers the implications of creating ‘A’ Class reserves. ‘A’ Class provides the greatest degree of protection for reserved lands, however, it does inhibit management given the lengthy administrative processes if any amendments are necessary. Amendments are required to be advertised for public comment and tabled before Parliament. The City currently has management orders over the subject site.

In light of the degree of management and control over the site currently and Craigie Open Space Study yet to be considered by Council, it is premature to proceed with a proposal to change the class of the reserve to ‘A’.

The land comprising Craigie Open Space is Reserve 38362, Location 10463 (29L) Britannia Way, Craigie and Reserve 32858, Locations 8889 and 12649, (751) Whitfords Avenue, Craigie. The City manages both reserves with Reserve 38362 being managed for the purpose of Public Recreation and Reserve 32858 being managed for the purpose of Recreation with power to lease. The land area of each reserve is 0.8886ha and 54.5500ha respectively. Craigie Leisure Centre and a skate park facility have been developed on the land and are located on Reserve 32858, Location 8889.

Suburb/Location:		Craigie Locations 8889 and 12649
Zoning:	DPS:	Regional Reserve - Parks and Recreation
	MRS:	Regional Reserve - Parks and Recreation Location 10463
	DPS:	Local Reserve - Parks and Recreation
	MRS:	Urban
Strategic Plan:		Lifestyle – Strategy 2.6 Promote and enjoy lifestyles that engender environmental, social and economic balance

Current Proposal or Issue

In accordance with Clause 3.12 of the Standing Orders Local Law, Cr Alison Walker has given notice of her intention to move the following motion at the Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 23 April 2002:

“That Council commences the process to request the Minister for Lands to re-classify the bushland portion of Craigie Open Space to an Class ‘A’ nature reserve with the management order with the City of Joondalup.”

Bush Forever

The subject site is identified as Site 303 in Bush Forever (formerly Bush Plan), a document that aims to fulfil the government’s commitment to prepare a strategic plan for the conservation of bushland on the Swan Coastal Plain of the Perth Metropolitan Region. Bush Forever is a policy position of the government that aims to guide future decision-making and to protect and manage Bush Forever Sites through implementation mechanisms.

The land has been formally assessed and listed in Bush Forever, recognising its major value as an area which forms part of a northern bush and heath land corridor comprising Hepburn Heights, Pinnaroo, Craigie and Woodvale. Craigie Open Space contains areas of Tuart-Jarra-Banksia woodland not present in many conservation reserves, and also a Quindalup dune system.

Bush Forever states that the boundaries of the areas to be protected may require further on site verification and confirmation. Subsequent formal proposals will be considered through the normal decision making process.

Craigie Open Space Study

In conjunction with the development of the final recommendations of the Bush Plan, the Joint Commissioners in May 1999 resolved to investigate the future areas for use and conservation within the Craigie Open Space Reserve having regard to the existing uses and functions of the Reserve, its natural assets and the future needs of the community.

The City engaged Ecoscape to prepare a study for Craigie Open Space. The brief was prepared and the objective of the study was set as follows, “to investigate land use options taking into consideration economic, social and environmental issues.”

At the Council meeting of 13 November 2001 it was resolved to advertise the document for a period of 42 days. The comment period closed on 3 January 2002, however, was extended for a further one (1) month. At the close of the advertising period 12 submissions were received. The majority of the submissions support no further clearing of the site. The study is yet to be considered by Council.

Statutory Provisions

Part 4 of the Land Administration Act (1997) deals with classification and management of reserves.

To reclassify Craigie Open Space as an ‘A’ Class reserve, a submission justifying the request is made to DOLA. DOLA then considers the matter and if in agreement requests the Minister for Lands to approve the reclassification. If DOLA opposes the proposal or disagrees with some particular element, it will liaise with the City accordingly.

If DOLA supports such the request, it is recommended that prior to it obtaining the Minister's approval, the City conducts a full referral process and the proposed amendment advertised for public comment (30 days). It is also recommended that after the initial request to DOLA to ascertain its support in principle, any formal request to DOLA be supported by a Council resolution.

DOLA advises that it is important the City carefully considers the implications of creating 'A' Class reserves. 'A' Class provides the greatest degree of protection for reserved lands, however, it does inhibit management given the lengthy administrative process if any amendments are necessary. Amendments are required to be advertised for public comment and tabled before Parliament.

The subject site is identified in Bush Forever which is a policy position of the government that aims to guide future decision-making and to protect and manage Bush Forever Sites through implementation mechanisms. In addition the majority of the site is reserved Park and Recreation under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, the purpose being to set aside land for parks and recreation. The City also manages the site for recreation purposes through management orders.

In light of the above which demonstrates that there is a degree of management and control over the site currently and given the fact the Craigie Open Space Study is yet to be considered by Council, it is premature to proceed with a proposal to change the class of the reserve to 'A'.

MOVED Cr Walker, SECONDED Cr Hollywood that Council COMMENCES the process to request the Minister for Lands to re-classify the bushland portion of Craigie Open Space to an class A nature reserve with the management order with the City of Joondalup.

Discussion ensued.

It was suggested a more detailed report be presented to Council outlining this issue, which would also include the matter of public consultation.

MOVED Cr Rowlands that the Notice of Motion as submitted by Cr A Walker lie on the table.

There being no Secorder, the Motion

LAPSED

The Motion as Moved by Cr Walker, Seconded Cr Hollywood was Put and

LOST

It was requested that the votes of all members present be recorded:

In favour of the Motion: Crs Hollywood, Walker and O'Brien

Against the Motion: Mayor Bombak, Crs Baker, Hurst, Mackintosh, Paterson, Kenworthy, Carlos and Rowlands

Appendix 9 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach9min230402.pdf](#)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION – CR C BAKER

Cr Baker sought leave to make a personal explanation pursuant to Clause 4.5 – Personal Explanation of the City’s Standing Orders Local Law.

Cr Baker advised that in relation to Notice of Motion – No 3 – Cr A Walker his intention in voting against the motion was on the clear understanding that a more detailed report would be presented to Council at a future Council meeting and that full community consultation would be undertaken with all residents of the City of Joondalup.

Mayor Bombak requested it be recorded that he voted against the motion due to the perceived lack of public consultation.

CONGRATULATIONS

Cr O’Brien congratulated staff on the introduction of Forum Vote enabling electronic voting to be undertaken by elected members in the Chamber.

Mayor Bombak offered congratulations to Mr David Djulbic in his role as Acting Chief Executive Officer at this evening’s Council meeting during the absence of Mr Denis Smith.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Council has been scheduled for **7.00 pm on Tuesday, 21 May 2002** to be held in the Council Chamber, Joondalup Civic Centre, Boas Avenue, Joondalup.

SECOND PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr S Magyar, Heathridge:

Q1 Regarding the Code of Conduct item which Council resolved not to accept the Officer’s recommendations for a new Code of Conduct that included a few additional provisions. One of the additional provisions that have not been included is Part 8 – Whistleblower’s Protection. What protection does any whistleblower in the City of Joondalup have now that the Code of Conduct doesn’t give them any protection?

A1 Whatever exists at law.

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the Meeting closed at 2245 hrs; the following elected members being present at that time:

J BOMBAK, JP
D CARLOS
C BAKER
J F HOLLYWOOD, JP
A WALKER
P ROWLANDS
M O'BRIEN, JP
A PATTERSON
KENWORTHY
J HURST
C MACKINTOSH