

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF SPECIAL ELECTORS MEETING HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON MONDAY 23 FEBRUARY 2004

ATTENDANCES

In Attendance:

CMR J Paterson – Chairman
CMR M Anderson
CMR S Smith
CMR A Fox

Officers:

Chief Executive Officer:	D SMITH
Director, Planning & Community Development:	C HIGHAM
Manager, Marketing, Communications & Council Support:	B ROMANCHUK
Manager Audit and Executive Services:	K ROBINSON
Co-ordinator, Planning Approvals:	G CATCHPOLE
Media Advisor:	L BRENNAN
Committee Clerk:	J HARRISON
Minute Clerk:	L TAYLOR

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr Laurie Green, State Manager, Hutchison Telecommunications
Ms Leah Nicol, Site Acquisition Manager, Hutchison Telecommunications
Mr Phil Knippe, Total Access Solutions

APOLOGIES

Cmr A Drake-Brockman – Deputy Chairman

There were 113 members of the public in attendance who signed the attendance record. *For Attendance lists, click here: [attendance smoe 230204.pdf](#)*

There was one member of the press in attendance.

ITEM OF BUSINESS

The Chairman of Commissioners opened the meeting at 1900 hrs, welcomed members of the public and thanked them for attending this Special Meeting of Electors.

The Chairman of Commissioners advised this meeting had been called following receipt of a 108-signature petition from residents of the City of Joondalup, to consider the following motions relating to the application by Hutchison Telecom to erect a phone tower in Kallaroo Park:

- 1 “This meeting of Electors calls upon the City of Joondalup Commissioners to reaffirm Council’s previous decision to reject the proposal from Hutchison totally and outright.”
- 2 “This meeting of Electors calls upon the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup to treat all ratepayers with the same consideration, and not see Kallaroo Park as a site of lesser importance or less sensitivity in the locating of phone towers to the local community.”
- 3 “This meeting of Electors calls upon the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup to recognise that Kallaroo Park is established in a residential area with young families.”
- 4 “This meeting of Electors calls upon the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup to recognise the fact that emissions from this tower will affect two schools and four suburbs.”
- 5 “Any other business in order brought forward by the Electors present at the Electors meeting.”

The meeting was advertised in The Joondalup Community News on Thursday 29 January 2004, Thursday 5 February 2004 and Thursday 19 February 2004.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME/MOTIONS

The following question was submitted by Ms Glynis Porter, Member of Hillarys Action Group:

Q1 Hutchison Telecommunication have proposed to erect low impact antennae on Hillarys Shopping Centre. Some residential buildings are within 16 metres of this proposal. If moved to another site on roof will still be within a 30 metre radius to residential buildings.

Petitions were submitted to the suspended councillors.

Does Council intend approving this application?

A1 Council does not have the responsibility for making a determination on the proposed Low Impact facility on the Hillarys Shopping Centre. However, at its meeting held on 11 November 2003, Council reiterated to Hutchison Telecoms its strong objection to the facility.

Ms Rhonda Bowman, Kallaroo:

Ms Bowman stated that the last application was formally refused on 7 May 2003, due to proximity to a residential area and negative impact. In its first application, Hutchison indicated they would not appeal the decision. They have now submitted a new application and apparently that was done at the invitation of the Council.

Response by Director, Planning and Community Development: The Director Planning and Community Development wished to make it very clear that at no stage did the City invite Hutchison to submit an application.

Ms Natasha Doyle, Kallaroo:

Ms Doyle advised she spoke to Leah Nicol on 11 February in an attempt to clarify who invited Hutchison to reodge its application, and was informed it was at the invitation of former Mayor Don Carlos. On three separate occasions during the conversation, Leah Nicol stated the former Mayor invited Hutchison.

Mr Don Carlos, Ocean Reef:

Mr Carlos stated that after being elected as the Mayor of the City of Joondalup, along with the Director Planning and Community Development he attended a meeting regarding the phone tower at the Mullaloo Squash Courts. He advised as most residents of Mullaloo would be aware, there was a demonstration at the Squash Courts. Mr Carlos pointed out he was against the tower on the Surf Club and that the Council had no authority to remove it. Mr Carlos advised he located two sites on the coast away from residences and schools that he felt could have satisfied the residents of both Mullaloo and Kallaroo. Mr Carlos indicated that he had visited these sites along the Director Planning and Community Development and representatives from Hutchison Telecommunications. Hutchison then drove to the Kallaroo Park site.

Mr Carlos stated he did not believe he gave Hutchison the opportunity to put in an application for the Kallaroo Park site. He was of the opinion his reference was to the two sites on the coast. Hutchison indicated they would survey these, as it was Mr Carlos's view the two sites in question would have been acceptable to both the residents of Mullaloo and Kallaroo in view of the fact they were not in close proximity to any schools. A site was located near the Whitford Sea Rescue. Mr Carlos pointed out that at no time did he think Hutchison would put in an application and get approval for the site without reference to the ratepayers.

Mr Kim Young, Mullaloo:

Mr Young made reference to that part of the submission that made reference to satisfying the aspirations of the Mullaloo residents and how this had caused some angst within the community. Mr Young commented the statement "that the residents of the Mullaloo Community Action Group support the proposal to put a telecommunication tower in Kallaroo" was not true.

Mr Young believed there was a statement circulating to the effect that the Mullaloo and Kallaroo residents were divided on this issue. He stated nothing could be further from the truth. The people from Mullaloo and Kallaroo were firmly united in their opposition to the installation of any towers, be they low impact or high impact that put them and especially their children at risk.

Mr Young acknowledged the representatives from Hutchison Telecommunications in attendance at this evening's meeting, and requested those representatives to make it known to the Management of Hutchison that its divisive tactics had failed once again.

MOVED Heather King, 16 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo SECONDED Bernadette Brierley, 34 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo that the City of Joondalup Commissioners REAFFIRM Council's previous decision to reject the proposal from Hutchison Telecommunications totally and outright.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Oliver Lambert, 13 Awhina Place, Kallaroo SECONDED Janette Why, 32 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo that this Meeting of Electors calls upon the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup to treat all ratepayers with the same consideration, and not see Kallaroo Park as a site of lesser importance or less sensitivity in the locating of phone towers to the local community.

Discussion ensued on the motion as follows:

Mr Oliver Lambert, Kallaroo:

Mr Lambert raised the following concerns:

- one of the main reasons for the application by Hutchison was to facilitate the aspirations of the community surrounding the existing low impact facility located at the Mullaloo Squash Centre. Inquiries should have been made in relation to this statement;
- Further inquiries from Hutchison gave an indication as to the strength of the Mullaloo Action Group's campaign;
- Meetings were held on three different occasions in July 2002 and 28 November 2002. A further meeting held on 13 December 2002, chaired by the then Mayor, John Bombak. Also in attendance at that meeting held on 13 December were:

- two senior Council officers;
- four people from Hutchison;
- a representative from Mel Washer's office;
- two Councillors;
- a member for Carine.

- Residents of Mullaloo and Kallaroo were unaware these meetings had been held.
- Council under former Mayor John Bombak had a duty of care to alert residents of the fact there was going to be a tower placed in the park. That duty of care revolved around a tower which emitted a great deal of radiation which would affect the health of residents, perhaps decrease property values and generally minimise the visual amenity in our park.

Mr Lambert reiterated his concerns regarding this particular application and the fact Hutchison implied it was made at the invitation of former Mayor Don Carlos. He stated the community wanted advice from Council of any proposed installations of towers within their area and believed that all communities in this Council should be given the same information.

Ms Glynis Porter, Hillarys Action Group/resident of Hillarys:

Ms Porter made reference to the use of words “site of less sensitivity” in Motion 2, and stated the group supported objections to the tower being placed in Kallaroo, in addition to objecting to sites at Mullaloo Squash Court and the Hillarys Shopping Centre where it is understood low impact antennas are to be installed.

Ms Porter stated it was imperative that community sensitive locations must be looked at and referred to the Australian Communications Industry Forum, the Industrial Code – 5.5 Section 5.5.6.

She gave examples of sensitive areas which included residential areas, childcare centres, schools, aged care and hospitals.

Mr M Sideris, Mullaloo:

Mr Sideris spoke in support of a number of the comments that had been made during the evening. He wished to bring to the attention of Commissioners issues he had raised on 2 July 2002, followed up on 17 November 2002 relating to the City of Joondalup being pro-active in taking the initiative, working in full consultation with the City of Joondalup’s ratepayers and residents as well as the telecommunication providers, in developing a City-wide map of safer sites. Mr Sideris felt that by such information being provided, the residents of the City of Joondalup would have some level of assurance about their particular property, be it property values or the potential impact from radiation, with that same level of reassurance being given to the various telecommunication providers.

Mr Sideris was of the opinion that ratepayers should make their views clearly known to the various telecommunication providers that under no circumstances did they want a telecommunication tower placed in Mullaloo or Kallaroo.

He stated he strongly supported the resolution.

Commissioner Michael Anderson:

Mr Anderson stated he had previously requested that all Commissioners be provided with a map indicating the current location of all towers within the City of Joondalup. He made reference to the map and advised he was happy to provide it after this evening’s meeting for public viewing.

Mr M Sideris:

Mr Sideris referred to an inability to get information on or access to plans from any communication provider with particular reference to sites within the City of Joondalup.

Response by Chairman of Commissioners: Cmr Paterson stated this was an emotive issue and reinforced his respect for the staff of the City of Joondalup.

Response by Director Planning and Community Development: Mr Higham advised there had been attempts made by the staff to speak with the various carriers. The difficulty in providing designated sites was that every carrier had a different frequency, and not all carriers could co-locate on the one location. Whilst a site could be nominated in the middle of a park this would not solve this issue. It needed to be recognised the issue goes well beyond a very idealistic approach of providing designated sites.

**The Motion as Moved by Oliver Lambert, Seconded by Jannette Why was Put and
CARRIED**

MOVED Natasha Doyle, 40 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo SECONDED Edmond Ishak, 9 Bearing Parade, Mullaloo that the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup RECOGNISE that Kallaroo Park is established in a residential area with young families.

Ms Natasha Doyle, Kallaroo:

Ms Doyle made reference to information from the ABS Census in 2001 which indicated that Kallaroo had nearly twice as many young people aged 0-19 years than Mullaloo. There are 4,341 living in Kallaroo aged 0-19 and 2,206 living in Mullaloo aged 0-19 years. Furthermore, the two primary schools affected by the proposed tower in Kallaroo comprised approximately 950 students in total.

Ms Doyle stated she had seven children and that Rhonda, Janine and Renae all had two children. Her property would be directly in front of the proposed site. She advised at least 30 children lived directly beside this tower, so the statement made by Hutchison in their proposal to the effect that the area is totally isolated with no young families was incorrect.

**The Motion was Put and
CARRIED**

MOVED Janine Konigsberg, 20 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo SECONDED Natasha Doyle 40 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo that the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup RECOGNISE the fact that emissions from this tower will affect two schools and four suburbs.

Ms Janine Konigsberg, Kallaroo:

Ms Konigsberg made the following comments in support of the motion:

- The Radhaz (Radhaz Consulting Pty Ltd) report clearly stated radiation stretched over three suburbs. This was based on Hutchison's stand alone antenna.
- Hutchison had stated in its submission that other carriers would be permitted to "piggy-back" on to them.

- Radiation readings inaccurate, as these had been taken from one tower only, no consideration given to the fact that radiation may emit from two, three or four towers.
- Current calculation in report stated the tower will be approximately 22.5 metres. No allowance made for differences in levels of land. If in fact radiation levels are correctly stated, explanation from Hutchison is sought.
- Report assumed no other radiation exists. It is unknown how many other towers might exist in the area which are also emitting radiation.
- How can the Council be sure it is not approving another installation which may exceed the total recommended Standard, if there is a recommended Standard.

Discussion on the motion as follows:

Mr Phil Knippe, Total Access Solutions:

Response to comments raised by Mrs Konigsberg:

Mr Knippe referred to the first point mentioned in relation to the actual height between the park and street and understood there was approximately a 5 metre difference in height between the gradient park and the street. He stated he was unaware what the actual height levels were; and without knowing these, was not able to comment. In relation to the levels in the calculations, if it is a distance of two or three metres or even 5 metres in height difference between where the actual base station is located or proposed to be located and the actual street, the variance in the actual levels were actually quite low. The reason being is that over that distance that height change would not make a big difference to the levels. The levels that are calculated are based on a standard protocol, as in 1.5 metres above ground level from where the base station is located. It is very easy to calculate what the levels would be at any height level and in the report that was actually undertaken. Hutchison requested a calculation of what the levels would be if you were directly at the same height as the antenna to give a worse case scenario.

Mrs J Konigsberg:

Question in relation to response by Mr Knippe

Mrs Konigsberg queried whether Hutchison had asked that the calculation be made as though we were on the same level.

Mr Phil Knippe:

Response to question raised by Mrs Konigsberg

Mr Knippe stated that the prediction protocol that is set by PANSAs (the Commonwealth Regulatory Authority) in this area sets a standard protocol of 1.5 metres above ground level as where the base station is located. Calculations can be made for other levels depending on whether they are above the ground level at where the base station is located or below the base station in regard to its location. To try and attempt that for every variance across say an area of 500 metres is quite difficult in the fact that you would be calculating for three days. So a standard protocol is set with an understanding that if people want a specific location calculated, that can be undertaken as well. The residents could specify various locations, but to actually counteract or at least cover that problem, Hutchison Telecommunications have also asked for the levels to be calculated at direct line of sight.

Mrs J Konigsberg:*Question to Mr Knippe*

Mrs Konigsberg asked whether Mr Knippe could confirm or state otherwise what Hutchison have asked him to calculate, because they clearly state in the application should the facility go ahead they will allow other carriers to “piggy-back” on to it. Also, can he tell us what the radiation level would be if there was more than one Hutchison tower, in particular an additional two, three or four towers?

Mr Phil Knippe:*Response to Question raised by Mrs Konigsberg*

Mr Knippe advised there would be an increase in the levels. Mr Knippe stated if he was required to calculate a value, it would be necessary to know what equipment would be installed, what type of transmitters and bearings were used and what height the equipment would be installed at. Without this information it was not possible to calculate the levels. As far as Hutchison allowing other carriers to co-locate on to the tower, Hutchison was unaware at this stage if and when other carriers would locate until their capacity is required by the various carriers.

Ms J Konigsberg:

Mrs Konigsberg stated while she had some sympathy that radiation levels were not able to be calculated, it was not good enough that the community were expected to accept this.

Mr O Lambert, Kallaroo:

Mr Lambert raised the following comments in relation to radiation levels.

- Radiation is measured in microwatts per square centimetre. Microwatt is one millionth of a watt and we all know what a square centimetre is.
- The density of radiation of this tower bears no resemblance whatsoever to the density of radiation that can be expected when four carriers are mounted on this tower that is being leased by Hutchison for their own profit. This point is crucial in the radiation debate because we see a situation where the Council would be seeking rental from the erection of a tower by Hutchison and then Hutchison would be turning around seeking rental from the four “piggy-backers” which, of course, is all very good for Hutchison and the piggy-backers, but it is no good for the residents because of the radiation density increasing.

Mr Lambert stated he had a background with Telstra in mobile communications, that is VHF (very high frequency). He indicated he was aware that height was very important with this type of communication and in particular was referring to line of sight communication. The range of a signal going out from a low impact installation is far less than that from a high impact installation and the reason for that is height.

In support of his comments, Mr Lambert gave examples of maritime communications.

Mr Lambert stated the crucial point revolved around the fact that the height of the tower in Kallaroo Park would mean that the span of radiation and the range of radiation would be increased.

Mr Phil Knippe:

Mr Knippe referred to the first part of the question which talked about power densities and stated there were tight regulatory controls over what the maximum power density could be from any installation in Australia and that was heavily policed by the ACA under the Radio Telecommunications Act. Neither Hutchison Telecommunications nor any other carriers as a combined output could exceed a specified limit that is set under legislation. These numbers are based on both national and international standards which are set by the (WHO) World Health Organisation and ICNIRP (International Commission of Non-Ionising Radiation Protection). Mr Knippe advised in regards to the second component of the question relating to VHF, VHF transmitted better over a long distance than mobile phone transmissions. Mr Knippe made reference to the example given by Mr Lambert and stated the VHF propagation properties are different than they are when dealing with mobile phones and this is the reason they need to be in close proximity to the areas.

Mr O Lambert, Kallaroo:

Response to comments raised by Mr Knippe

Mr Lambert advised he had checked his information with the (ACA) Australian Communications Authority prior to attending the meeting to ensure it was correct. Mr Lambert stated he stood by his comments to the effect that both the density of radiation and range of signal would increase due to the height of the tower.

Mr C Stone, Mullaloo:

Questions to Mr Phil Knippe: Mr Stone sought clarification of comments made earlier by Mrs Konigsberg to the effect that currently the height is listed in the document at 21.5 metres, whereas in all probability it may be 16.5 metres and the impact to the people in the area from the power density would be higher. Mr Stone queried radiation exposure limits.

Response by Mr Phil Knippe: Mr Knippe stated it would depend at what distance a person was standing. To stand flush against the antenna, a person would exceed the limit. Based on an approximation of these antennas, if a person stood 10 metres away, they would be under the standard limit.

Mr Stone believed it is approximately five metres. Mr Stone stated he felt the calculations should be redone in view of the differences in the contour and levels of the park and height levels.

Response by Mr Phil Knippe: Mr Knippe stated that recalculations can be done.

Mr Stone referred to the fact that the ACA polices limits and there is a set limit that is accumulative between members of all the AM and FM frequencies.

Response by Mr Phil Knippe: Mr Knippe stated that the maximum power densities in any area cannot exceed a certain level.

Mr Stone stated whilst measurements for power densities from Hutchison's proposed mobile facility had been provided, no consideration had been given to other AM/FM CB radios that would increase the readings. Mr Stone acknowledged this was following a template, but felt for Council to have a true environmental statement of the impact of this and its accumulative effect, the readings should be on top of what has already been done.

Response by Mr Phil Knippe: Mr Knippe advised the measurements Mr Stone was referring to could be undertaken. He stated it was fairly unusual because the overall increase in the environmental level from any mobile base station represents probably 5% of the total background at the most of what is already there, giving an approximate increase of anywhere between 2 –5% of the overall background emissions from RF that are already being received. Mr Knippe stated this was the main reason why physical measurements were not done.

Mrs J Konigsberg, Kallaroo:

Q1 Is Hutchison prepared to indemnify the community for any potential health risk that might result out of this tower being put in either Mullaloo or Kallaroo?

A1 Response by Mr Laurie Green: Like every other carrier, Hutchison guarantees that its network and antennas always operate within the levels that are required by the regulated authority, that is what we are licensed for. We are the same as every other carrier, we do not determine what is safe. Like any other regulatory industry, it is our obligation to adhere to the safety standards established by the independent public health authorities.

Mrs Konigsberg referred to research that had been carried out by the group and stated the group was well aware that some of Hutchison's antennas were leaking radiation and that some had been withdrawn because of that fact.

Mr Steve Gibson, Iluka:

Mr Gibson advised he was currently Principal at one of the schools mentioned in this proposal, being Whitford Catholic Primary School, which is located some 500 metres from the proposed sight. The issue for the school was certainly not localised to the Kallaroo Park area, as the student population came from some 25 suburbs. Mr Gibson stated his comments related to the potential implications that this proposal had for the school community.

Mr Gibson referred to a number of reports he had read in relation to this issue and felt there seemed to be disagreement amongst the interpretation of the findings in every report. However, he felt there appeared to be agreement on one point that there is insufficient long-term data to make valid predictions and assurances regarding the future health of people living close to these towers. He urged Commissioners to be safe today, and not sorry tomorrow!

Mr Gibson stated children at Whitford Catholic Primary School would spend something like 11,000 hours during their education at the school. He requested that recognition be given to the fact that there is a degree of conflict that exists within the scientific information about child health and transmitter towers. He believed at the very least it was reasonable not to locate this type of tower or technology close to schools until authorities looked closely at initiating far-reaching research into this particular matter.

The Motion as Moved Jillian Konigsberg, SECONDED Natasha Doyle was Put and CARRIED

Ms Heather King, Kallaroo:

Ms King thanked members of Hutchison Telecommunications for attending this evening's meeting.

Q1 Would any of your representatives accept a 22.5 metre monstrosity directly opposite your home?

A1 Response by Leah Nicol: Yes I would, and I do have one located approximately 100 metres or so from my residence in Duncraig.

Annabelle (young school child):

Annabelle said she attended Whitford Catholic Primary School, which had priests living alongside. She said the children value their priests, and did not want the tower to be erected.

Mr K Young, Mullaloo:

Mr Young stated the installation of mobile phone towers had been a contentious issue for many years within the City of Joondalup, with opposition coming from the residents of both Mullaloo and Ocean Reef to an Optus proposal, subsequently opposition to various Hutchison proposals from the residents of Beldon, Mullaloo, Duncraig, Kallaroo and now Hillarys where a low impact tower is to be installed 16 metres from a child's bedroom.

MOVED Kim Young, 170 Mullaloo Drive, Mullaloo SECONDED Glynis Porter, 29 Halliday Grove, Hillarys that:

- 1 this Special Meeting of Electors calls on the City of Joondalup to REPLACE an immediate moratorium on the construction and commissioning of all mobile phone towers within the City boundaries until such time as the City develops a comprehensive policy regarding their installation and future use;**
- 2 the basis of any such policy would be that no mobile phone towers either high or low impact should be placed within a given distance from housing, schools and parks within residential areas. Due to the perceived health risk to our children, this matter should be afforded the upmost priority.**

Stjephan Maticovic, Hillarys:

Mr Maticovic advised he had received information from Hutchison regarding a small area, approximately 100m x 50m in size at the corner of Flinders Avenue and Waterford Drive, Hillarys consisting of a residential and shopping area where it was proposed to install a mobile phone base station. The proposal dealt with the suggestion that Hutchison should erect a low impact antenna system in the vicinity. Also in the report Hutchison provided radiation levels at distances of five, 50, 100, 200, 300 and 500 metres. He stated that looking at these figures, it can be seen that the radiation levels actually increased. The majority of housing in the area are double storey residences and many people have their bedrooms on the first floor, so people are directly in line of the electronic beams and being exposed constantly while they sleep. Mr Maticovic's concerns are in relation to this type of structure being erected in a residential area, where the majority of the housing is double storey and the radiation likely to be emitted from such a structure. For these reasons, he supported the motion put forward and encouraged people to vote for it.

The Motion MOVED Kim Young, SECONDED Glynis Porter was Put and CARRIED

Mr O Lambert, Kallaroo:

Mr Lambert reiterated points he had made earlier in the meeting and stated he wished to impress upon the Council that he perceived the continued applications from Hutchison as harassment. In an effort to support continued objection to the tower, a petition was presented to Council containing approximately 3,000 signatures. He stated his group was prepared to join forces with the Mullaloo Action Group and Council to discuss ways to force the Federal Government to amend the Telecommunications Act 1997.

MOVED Oliver Lambert, 13 Awhina Place, Kallaroo SECONDED Janine Konigsberg, 20 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo that the Council TAKE steps to protect its ratepayers from the continued pressure from Hutchison Telecommunications, which the ratepayers perceive as being harassment.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mrs J Konigsberg, Kallaroo:

Mrs Konigsberg reiterated comments made by Mr Lambert and referred to the Australian Community Industry Forum Telecommunication Act where it stated under the State and Territory Law the State Government had started to introduce Codes of Practice and statutory controls dealing with new telecommunication facilities under their jurisdiction. This facilitated the State to set guidelines and other control mechanisms to assist the Council to assess development applications.

Mr M Caiacob, Mullaloo:

Mr Caiacob referred to the development application submitted by Hutchison Telecommunications for Kallaroo Park and believed the information provided was false, misleading and factually incorrect in places. He raised the following points:

- 1 the application states that the facility is to be located in Gradient Park. I believe this is incorrect and the application should be for Kallaroo Park as indicated by the officers in the Council's report title;

- 2 the application states that the site selected is one of the most isolated locations from residential development, residential dwellings are located to the north. This is misleading Mr Chairman as there is no mention of the residential dwellings located within 200 metres of the proposed facility to the south in Kallaroo, west in Mullaloo and within 500 metres of Beldon to the east. Residential dwellings on all sides of this facility will be detrimentally affected with regards to health issues, property devaluation and visual pollution;
- 3 the application states that the facility is to be located amongst light poles. This is incorrect Mr Chairman as there are no light poles nor power poles in the Kallaroo Park and visual amenity will be adversely impacted.
- 4 the application states that it is made with the respect of proper and orderly planning principles as there is no residential properties adjacent. This is incorrect and misleading as there are residential properties and schools situated around this facility and within the emission boundaries of this facility.
- 5 the application states that the 22 metre tower is situated without compromising the character or amenity of the area and approval is requested given the positive contribution on the amenity of the area. This is false and misleading Mr Chairman as the development of a 22 metre tower is uncharacteristic for the area, as there is none. The amenity of the area will be adversely affected due to the over-bearing size and bulk of this tower within a residential area as per the Height and Scale Policy 3.1.9 and by the emissions and future carriers to be located on this facility, as well as the decrease in property values attributed directly to this development.
- 6 the application states that the site is selected to provide coverage for the Mullaloo area. This is false and misleading as this site is on my understanding for the continuance of the Hutchison network, with the co-habitation of other carriers. On the basis of being for the coverage of the Mullaloo area, the application should be rejected as the residents of Mullaloo here this evening and known to be objectors do not wish this facility to be imposed the residents of Kallaroo and Mullaloo alike.
- 7 The application states that the development would be for other carriers, yet we only have one company providing an application. I am aware that these carriers aren't lined up as yet, but who are the other carriers and what emissions will the public be subjected to in the long term. Applications are to be based on their merit and the merits of these future carriers has not been indicated in this application.
- 8 The application states that the proposal is presented at the invitation of the Council elected members and senior officers. This is blatantly incorrect and misleading towards the elected members and the staff of the City of Joondalup. I would draw to the attention of the Commissioners Notice of Motion C14-02/03 from the 18 February 2003 meeting. This motion called for Council assistance to help Hutchison relocate their low impact facility from the Mullaloo Squash Court site to another site which is to be acceptable to both the Mullaloo community and Hutchison. Mr Chairman and Commissioners make no mistake here, the Mullaloo community does not and will not accept the relocation of this facility to Kallaroo Park, Gradient Park or any other location within the locality that is in close proximity to schools, medical facilities, residential dwellings and at the same time supports the action group from Hillarys.

MOVED Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo SECONDED Natasha Doyle, 40 Kallaroo Place, Kallaroo that the Joint Commissioners REFUSE the application submitted by Hutchison Telecommunications for a telecommunication facility located in Gradient Park for the following reasons:

- 1 the development application is false, misleading and incorrect in statement and fact and therefore cannot be determined by the Commissioners;**
- 2 the location of the proposed facility is not acceptable to the Mullaloo community as required by Notice of Motion C14-02/03 of the 18 February 2003 and therefore cannot be determined by the City.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

CLOSE OF BUSINESS

There being no further business, the Chairman of Commissioners declared the meeting closed at 2010 hrs.