

MINUTES

AGM of Electors City of Joondalup

MINUTES OF
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
OF THE CITY OF JOONDALUP
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE,
BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP

MEETING DATE



ON MONDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2006



City of
Joondalup

www.joondalup.wa.gov.au

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON MONDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2006

OPEN AND WELCOME

The Mayor declared the meeting open at 1902 hrs and introduced the Deputy Mayor and Councillors

ATTENDANCES

Mayor:

TROY PICKARD

Councillors:

Cr KERRY HOLLYWOOD	North Ward	
Cr TOM McLEAN	North Ward	
Cr STEVE MAGYAR	North-Central Ward	
Cr GEOFF AMPHLETT	Central Ward	
Cr MICHELE JOHN	South-West Ward	
Cr SUE HART	South-East Ward	
Cr RUSSEL FISHWICK	South Ward	<i>To 2104 hrs</i>
Cr RICHARD CURRIE	South Ward	<i>Absent from 2050 hrs to 2052 hrs</i>

Officers:

MR GARRY HUNT	Chief Executive Officer
MR MIKE TIDY	Director, Corporate Services
MR CLAYTON HIGHAM	Director, Planning and Community Development
MR DAVID DJULBIC	Director, Infrastructure Services
MR IAN COWIE	Director, Governance & Strategy
MR MIKE SMITH	Manager, Marketing Communications & Council Support
MR CHRIS TERELINCK	Manager, Approvals Planning & Environmental Services
MR SAID HAFEZ	Manager Financial Services
MR LAURIE BRENNAN	Media Advisor
MS JANET HARRISON	Administrative Services Co-ordinator
MS GILLIAN KELLY	Administrative Secretary

In attendance

MS HAYLEY DUNN	Deloitte
MR ROSS JERRARD	Deloitte

APOLOGIES

Cr MARIE EVANS
MR STEPHEN KOBELKE
MS WENDY HERBERT

Leave of Absence previously approved

Cr B Corr	13 November 2006 – 20 November 2006 inclusive
Cr A Jacob	19 November 2006 – 24 November 2006 inclusive
Cr J Park	2 November 2006 - 27 November 2006 inclusive

There were 22 members of the Public in attendance, 21 of whom signed the register to record their attendance.

Appendix 1 - Attendance Register, click here:

[AGM Register.pdf](#)

There was 1 member of the Press in attendance.

ADDRESS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor advised that this meeting is held in accordance with Section 5.27 of the Local Government Act 1995.

The meeting was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 11 November 2006 and the Joondalup Times on 2, 9 and 16 November 2006. It was also placed on the City's website on 1 November 2006.

Video Presentation

At this point a video presentation was given outlining the events, activities and achievements of the City of Joondalup for the 2005/06 financial year.

Procedures at Electors' meetings:

The Mayor outlined the requirements for voting and speaking at an Electors Meeting and the definition of an Elector.

The Local Government (Administration) Regulations state that the procedures to be followed at electors' meetings are to be determined by the presiding person.

The Mayor advised that the purpose of tonight's meeting is not to adopt the Annual Report but to discuss its contents and raise any general business that Electors may have. The Local Government Act 1995 require Council to adopt the Annual Report which was adopted at its meeting on 31 October 2006.

CONTENTS OF THE 2005/2006 ANNUAL REPORT**Mr R de Gruchy, 57 Ashmore Way, Sorrento**

Q1 *In the Financial Report, I noticed that there was an excess of \$13.8M. Is that a true surplus or is there a reason for the figure being so high?*

A1 This does not mean it is cash at the bank, it is an accounting surplus. The adopted budget shows a surplus of \$8M, bearing in mind this is an operating statement and therefore the surpluses on operating are used to fund the Council's capital programme. Although the \$13.8M is high, it is actually \$5.8M in excess of budget. The reasons for that surplus are varied on both revenue and expense sides.

Q2 *I realise it is only \$5M above the budgeted figure, but I still can't grasp if it's a true surplus. The City budgeted for \$8M and ended up with \$13.8M, so there is \$5M more than was budgeted for, but it is still \$13.8M above expenses, is that right?*

A2 That is correct, and you would expect in normal cases that there would be an operating surplus because organisations need to generate an operating surplus to fund their capital expenditure. That is why the budget reflected that there would be an \$8M surplus. However, there are a variety of reasons why there is an additional \$5M that has affected both revenue and expenses, for example Council received significantly more interest income. There were a number of unplanned issues that altered the expenditure and revenue pattern. Council received some additional compensation from Landcorp due to part of the normalisation project which related to Council's original intention to purchase land for a depot which Council did not proceed with. These are unexpected and unplanned matters, but can have a significant impact on the surplus.

Q3 *When you say it is an operating surplus, it is not cash at the bank?*

A3 No.

Q4 *I see that there is a reserve of \$24.28M. Is that actual cash or is that just an accounting figure?*

A4 In the case of the City's Reserves, that is cash.

Mr M Sideris, 12 Page Drive, Mullaloo

Q1 *If the \$5M is not cash at the bank, what is it?*

A1 It is not all cash, there are non cash items included, for example the City brings to account, developer contributions when they hand over assets as part of subdivisional developments that includes parks and roads, infrastructure etc. It is always hard to predict what the non-cash items will be; the City does budget for it each year but it can vary quite markedly and the City did get additional developer contributions this year. On the expenditure side, part of the variance can be attributed to depreciation. Depreciation is a non-cash item. Cash is a major component of the surplus, but it is not all cash.

- Q2 *Of the \$13.8M surplus, what is the break up of cash assets and non-cash assets?*
- A2 There is approximately \$5M in non-cash assets, however the City did budget for some of those.
- Q3 *If there is approximately \$8M cash, why do we have to go to the bank for the City's money?*
- A3 This is an operating surplus, what is not reflected in this Operating Statement is the City's Capital Expenditure. A large part of the budgeted surplus of \$8M was to fund the City's Capital Expenditure so although there is an \$8M surplus it does not mean that the cash is in the bank. In the meantime Council has carried out road construction, parks, works operation services, delivery of a capital nature etc.
- Q4 *Last year the City budgeted for \$8M, you obtained \$13M and that is surplus. Out of the \$13M, approximately \$8M was cash and yet the City does not have cash?*
- A4 Of the \$13M that the City received as a surplus the City budgeted to finish with a surplus of \$8M, but the City did not budget to have \$8M in the bank, that operating surplus was used to fund the City's Capital Programme. As the operating surplus is higher than what the budget was, Council did finish up with additional funds, but the City still went ahead with a large capital programme, so it is not all cash in the bank.

Mr N Gannon, Clontarf Street, Sorrento.

- Q1 *An Elector is defined in the Local Government Act 1995 as a person who is eligible to vote in an Election at the City of Joondalup. Can we please be referred to as Electors?*
- A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard:* Certainly.

Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

- Q1 *It stated in the video that \$90,000 a year would be saved on heating the pool at Craigie Leisure Centre. As \$900,000 to \$1M was required to get the bore completed, that will take ten years to recoup, and that is not including the interest. How can this be a saving?*
- A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard:* This question will be taken on notice.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Dr M Apthorpe, 69 Bacchante Circle, Ocean Reef

I want to raise two items concerning the natural bush areas of the City of Joondalup. As we all know the natural and coastal bush areas are important to the City of Joondalup residents. The paths are used by thousands of people for walking and cycling, yet the budget for maintaining the 90 bush areas in this City is extremely small. I have heard various figures but one of them was less than \$350,000 per annum and according to the Natural Areas Bushcare Officer, this budget has been slashed by a further \$50,000 after the 2006/2007 budget was approved and passed by this Council. The Officer claimed that as of 18 September 2006 no money from the 2006/07 budget had actually been made available to the natural areas account to pay weeding contractors.

This period in September/October is when weed growth and seed formation in the bush areas are at their peak and that is the period when weeds need to be attacked in bush reserves and when more contractor labour needs to be employed. Making money available in summer and autumn is completely pointless, because the weeds have already dropped their seed loads which is one reason why the weed problem is increasing in our bush areas.

The City's insistence on spreading the budget expenditure evenly throughout the year and then not making more of the money available early in the financial year when it is needed is completely contrary to the City's claim to be managing our natural resources to ensure environmental sustainability.

MOVED Mrs M Apthorpe, 69 Bacchante Circle, Ocean Reef, SECONDED Mrs M Macdonald, 5 Mair Place, Mullaloo that the Natural Areas budget approved by Council be made available to the Bushcare Officer in toto for expenditure from 1 July of each financial year, so that appropriate allocation of expenditure can be made during the spring weed season, when most work is required in natural areas.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Bushcare Friends Groups put an enormous amount of their own unpaid labour in rehabilitating degraded areas of bush, for example in the case of 2 hectares from the Foreshore Reserves at Iluka, the community contribution is worth \$9,800 in the last 18 months in terms of community hours worked. In a budget that is less than \$350,000 for 90 reserves it is a good percentage for two hectares.

Over the ten years that community revegetation worked at Sorrento and Mullaloo, the community contribution would be in the order of hundreds of thousands of dollars of community labour. Friends Groups also apply for and receive matching government grants to be spent on revegetation. We are required to document all such work in high detail, according to the Friends Group Manual of the City of Joondalup, but we have no idea what the City of Joondalup's teams or contractors are doing or plan to do in the areas that we are working on.

Inevitably, some duplication of effort has occurred which wastes scarce funding. There is continued frustration amongst Friends Groups about the lack of information from the City in regard to its on-ground work plans. In interests of the community developing a supportive and trusting relationship with our community, I therefore wish to put a motion to the meeting.

MOVED Mrs M Apthorpe, 69 Bacchante Circle, Ocean Reef, SECONDED Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the City set up a quarterly forum between bushcare community representatives (i.e. Friends Groups and other interested people) and the City's Natural Areas staff, to exchange detailed information on work programs to be carried out in bush areas, and details of the City's budget in those areas, how much and what has been, and is to be spent on bush areas and when and exactly where.

Mrs M Zakrevsky spoke to the Motion.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

Q1 *Tonight's meeting is an Electors Meeting, this is not a Council Chamber it is a hall. This is not a Council Meeting. Nothing takes precedence over the Local Government Act and the flexibility and purpose of the Annual General Meeting is that grievances and motions be received in full.*

A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard:* As Presiding Member I am conducting this meeting and I will be using the Standing Orders as a guide in determining meeting procedure, but will not be adhering to them as strictly as I would for a Council meeting.

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

Q1 *I am frustrated that Mayor Pickard can make unilateral decisions, is there no flexibility?*

A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard:* The Local Government Regulations is a legally binding document which states that the procedures to be followed at Electors' Meeting are to be determined by the Presiding Person. As Mayor of the City of Joondalup I am the Presiding Member and I will be using the Standing Orders Local Law 2005 as a guide to conduct the meeting. Saying that, that is the foundation, I will not be conducting this meeting with the strict manner I conduct a Council meeting because it is not a Council meeting.

We have a platform in which the meeting is conducted, it is called the Standing Orders. There is no limit for how long anyone can speak tonight.

Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo

MOVED Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Ms M Moon, 6 Carew Place, Mullaloo that Council include in the 2007/08 budget adequate funds for the removal of asbestos roofs in public toilet blocks and the replacement of these roofs with an alternative safe material.

Mr Caiacob spoke to the Motion

Ms Moon spoke to the Motion

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mr Caiacob advised the City that the sprinklers on the median strip on the corner of Craigie Drive and Ocean Reef Road have numerous broken heads and water is being sprayed continually onto the pavements.

MOVED Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo, that Council:

- 1 provides a better standard of minutes, indicating a brief outline of each individual Councillor's debate, and**
- 2 includes in the 2007/08 budget funds for electronic video and audio streaming of the Council meetings for the benefit of the community.**

Mr Caiacob spoke to the Motion

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mr M Sideris, 12 Page Drive, Mullaloo

In the past months, questions have been asked to this Council relating to the parking bays located over the road from the new Mullaloo Tavern. I refer to some of the recently published answers that are in the Agenda for 21 November 2006, i.e. that "In 1980 or thereabouts", this Council which refuses to properly check the dates of these Wanneroo Inc. claims, continues to assert that approval was granted to a tavern for 34 parking bays subject to the tavern owners providing cash-in-lieu for parking, when it is a matter of public record that this planning approval was granted to a separately operated business, a restaurant, located in a different block of land.

This Council also asserts contrary to the public record and also refuses to check that the City built these car bays in about 1981 on Crown land on the opposite side of Oceanside Promenade, when in fact the public record clearly shows that these parking bays were built long before 1970, another fact that this Council refuses to acknowledge. This Council also continues to assert that contrary to the public record, which it also refuses to check, that the then restaurant owner at some point of time provided commercial consideration requirement i.e., the required amount related to the financial value of the bays in the form of a transfer of Land Title in Wangara, even though he did not own the surrendered land at that time and that the land in fact was repossessed by the then Council from others for breach of its purchase arrangements.

It is now clear to me from these still published fictions and many other stories that have preceded them, that none of the lessons of Wanneroo Inc have been learnt by this Council or its Administration. The Royal Commission noted explicitly that there were major problems with the City of Wanneroo's record keeping, its minutes and the factual basis of the reports of the officers presented to Council, the same problems which continue to this day under this Council. As a consequence of the Royal Commission findings, any isolated reports, notes and records extracted from this totally discredited Council have no legal credibility or validity whatsoever and could not be used in the way that this Council has used them in this Chamber or at the SAT earlier this year and it still continues today to knowingly use discredited Wanneroo Inc extracts in a deliberate misleading way in order to cover up the effective theft of millions of dollars of Council open space by senior Planning officers.

These photos that I have now presented to the meeting are of Mullaloo Beach – Tom Simpson Park and are dated 1975 and 1979 and there is the car park over the road which according to this Council was far smaller than it is now, when in fact it was bigger. It is clear from the State Records of 1980 that the owner of the restaurant on Lot 9 was granted development approval subject to a number of conditions being satisfied. None of these conditions included any granting of access to car parking bays over the road in perpetuity or make any formal written legal agreement to the effective ownership of the car bays which could have been sold on to other businesses when the restaurant was first sold in the early 1990s.

I ask Elected Members to look at these two aerial photos from State Records, I specifically ask which of these 34 restaurant car bays did Council provide over the road after 1981 despite what is just written in the Agenda for 21 November 2006 and judging by the photos, the salient fact is clearly, none. Another fact that the State Records clearly show is that the alleged land at Lot 225 Wangara was not even owned by the restaurant owner, Mr Bellombra at the time of its repossession and it could not have been used to fund the restaurant parking in the way claimed by this and previous Councils. The records show that this Lot was repossessed by the Shire of Wanneroo for a breach of its purchase agreements because the sale was never completed. Indeed, after reviewing the State Records, the City of Wanneroo in the late 1980s constructed limestone car bays north of Korella Street, Mullaloo, funded according to the already discredited Council minutes, allegedly by the same cash-in-lieu proceeds of this very same land repossessed from someone else not Mr Bellombra. This is where the salient public records show that this alleged cash-in-lieu parking money was spent on land north of Korella Street and that is not where this Council stated that this money was spent either in tomorrow night's agenda or earlier in the year at the State Administrative Tribunal.

It is also a matter of record that the money used to fund those parking works was transferred internally from another Wanneroo account and not from the proceeds of any land sale at all, because the land was repossessed and the only monies paid out was in fact by Wanneroo Council, a refund to the original deposit used as a down payment.

Appendix 2 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here:

[Mullaloo Car Parking 1975.pdf](#)

MOVED Mr M Sideris, 12 Page Drive, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that this Council places before itself and each Elected Member:

- 1 copies of all the following very salient State Records in respect of the statements made by the City of Joondalup to the Supreme Court, the State Administrative Tribunal and to ratepayers including the written quote “further 34 bays paid and constructed by the Tavern have been previously provided on the opposite side of the road” and “these car bays were funded by the owner of the tavern site”;**
- 2 the land title deeds of Lot 225 which clearly show that Mr Bellombra did not own the land at the time of its repossession;**
- 3 the two pictures of the Mullaloo Beach car parking pre 1981;**

- 4 Council resolution showing conditional approval to a restaurant on Lot 9;
- 5 Council's Minutes directing cash-in-lieu monies never received to be spent north of Korella Street.

Mr Sideris spoke to the Motion

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo

MOVED Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mrs M Macdonald, 5 Mair Place, Mullaloo that Council advise:

- 1 why the parking issues and safety concerns outlined in the correspondence from the City dated 30 October 2006 were not presented to State Administrative Tribunal (SAT);
- 2 why Council approval based on conditional landscaping requirements which affects parking provisions were not presented to the SAT;
- 3 why ongoing unauthorised commercial delivery issues were not presented to the SAT;
- 4 why the independent parking report referred to in the correspondence of 31 October 2006 was not present to the SAT;
- 5 if all required disabled bays are supplied including one bay minimum to the units level and what is the final number of disabled bays and their locations;
- 6 if Australian Standard 2890 Part 1 & 2 is complied with in total, including visual sight lines for commercial vehicles exiting the development and minimum head heights required for commercial vehicles entering the development.

Mr Caiacob spoke to the Motion

Mrs Macdonald spoke to the Motion

Ms M Moon spoke to the Motion

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Dr M Apthorpe, 69 Bacchante Circle, Ocean Reef

It has been brought to my attention, that despite the City's focus on caring for the environment which is prominently placed on Page 6 of the Annual Report under the City's Strategic Plan 2003-2008, that this document which goes into considerable detail on the activities of the City of Joondalup makes absolutely no mention whatever of the Conservation Advisory Committee, its existence, its monthly meetings or the enormous amount of work that it does on behalf of conservation in the City of Joondalup. As a member of that Committee I can only express my profound disgust that it is counted of so little importance by the staff who wrote this

document that it does not even rate a mention and I think that it is disgraceful and I would urge the Electors of the City to express their anger and frustration along with me, that we are angered and frustrated at the complete lack of mention of this important Community Advisory Committee to the City of Joondalup.

Response by Mayor Pickard: May I state on behalf of Council and Administration that indeed we are extremely grateful for the contribution that many members of our community make, not only on the Conservation Advisory Committee but the Sustainability Advisory Committee, also the Seniors Interests Advisory Committee and the numerous other voluntary roles our community play. Let me assure you that the contribution and the calibre that the City receives through its community representation on those advisory committees is, has been and will always be, greatly appreciated.

It is an oversight and I apologise on behalf of the City for that oversight and to the members of the Conservation Advisory Committee who are here in attendance.

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

I too, am appalled that the work done by so many Friends Groups does not get mentioned.

Response by Mayor Pickard: Once again, may I apologise, clearly it has been an oversight and all of the Friends Groups are greatly appreciated and I think that is demonstrated by the amount of recognition that I afford those environmental groups, their members and the administration of those groups in the public forum as I have done on numerous occasions.

Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

MOVED Mr K Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the Chris O'Neill Report be made available to the public immediately, and copies be provided to the Mullaloo residents who contributed to it, because it has no bearing on legal matters as it has been seen by Rennet Pty Ltd's lawyers, for the following reasons:

- **The Chris O'Neill investigation was instigated to assess the problems associated with Lot 100 Oceanside Promenade Mixed Use Development, that were and still are of serious concern to ratepayers.**
- **What facts are in it that it cannot be released to the public? What synopsis of the O'Neill Report have the Councillors been told or given as a statement? Who verbalised the Mullaloo Tavern (Lot 100 Oceanside Promenade) as "historic"? The matter is very much alive and not historic. It is still unfinished business and very current.**
- **Mr Chaney clearly stated at the SAT Directional Hearing that this matter has dragged on for so long because the plans were "Mottled and Confused". Mr Chaney at the hearing without any reference to or from the MPA or any ratepayer, was obviously not satisfied and perhaps, not surprisingly, becoming a little impatient with this matter before him. He has clearly advised both sides, solicitors for Rennet Pty Ltd and solicitors for the City of Joondalup to negotiate an agreement.**

- **What brief has been given to the Council's solicitors? If Councillors do not know what brief has been given to solicitors, then what brief are you, the Council, going to give the solicitors now because I understand that Rennet Pty Ltd have not submitted a new development application.**
- **City of Joondalup solicitors at the hearing said they will advise Council and that Council has at least two meetings to determine their position before 19 January 2007 SAT hearing.**
- **Council needs to urgently address this whole drawn out matter, which is very current and definitely not historic.**

Mr Zakrevsky spoke to the Motion and raised the following questions:

Q1 *What did the O'Neill Report cost?*

Q2 *What are the legal costs to date associated with the SAT hearings?*

A1-2 *Response by Mayor Pickard: These questions will be taken on notice.*

Ms Moon spoke to the Motion

Mr Caiacob spoke to the Motion

Cr Currie left the Chamber at 20.50 hrs and returned at 20.52 hrs

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

I am speaking on behalf of Mrs Wendy Herbert who says she was hoping to raise this motion in regard to health & safety from the increasing levels of dangerous bacteria from animal faeces in storm water run off onto the beaches.

The WA Health Department has recently begun to monitor and rate the safety of our beaches from life threatening animal faecal bacteria found in storm water run-offs on beaches. Recent advances in genetic finger-printing of the bacteria in individuals infected with lethal bacteria can locate the exact source and location of the infection.

One gram of dog faeces contains approximately 23 million bacteria and it takes only 10 to cause a life threatening infection.

MOVED Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo that Council investigate and implement world best practice to prevent the contamination of our beaches with life threatening animal faecal bacteria.

Mrs Zakrevsky spoke to the Motion

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo

Q1 *Is Mr Kevin Robinson presently a paid employee or under contract to the City of Joondalup and can you please advise what his current employment position is?*

A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard: Questions and motions cannot be accepted that relate to specific individual members.*

MOVED Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo, SECONDED Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo that the current corporate structure from executive to named middle manager level positions having a salary package of \$80,000 or more per annum be made public and available as an agenda report for the February 2007 Council Meeting.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT

Ms M Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood

Q1 *Is there a school closure occurring in Greenwood?*

A1 *Response by Mayor Pickard: Not to the City's knowledge, this is a question to be directed to the State Government.*

Re: Town Planning Scheme No. 6. It says in the Planning Scheme that the school site must be identified. In removing the Town Planning Scheme and that comment, it leaves it open for that school to be closed, so I am surprised that the City is not aware of this as it is in their area. I think this Town Planning Scheme should go out for public consultation, especially when it means children will be walking much further than the normal school catchment area to Allenswood Primary School.

Q2 *I contacted the Chief Executive Officer's office about comments made at the SAT on the Mullaloo issue, a Statutory Declaration made by the officers that they did not know which apartments were the short stay apartments. The Mullaloo Tavern had been through the Courts and it was clearly stated that the short stay apartments would be on the bottom level, they would not be referred to as multiple dwellings. I asked what configuration now allows these apartments to be. The Courts stated they were not to be multiple dwellings, they were never to be mentioned as multiple dwellings again, yet no development application was put in place by the City. Now if these have been configured into multiple dwellings they are now against the SAT decision on Sorrento which clearly stated that multiple dwellings cannot occur in R20. Is the configuration of the units as now approved under SAT given multiple dwellings*

A2 This question will be taken on notice.

Mr M Sideris, 12 Page Drive, Mullaloo

The screen in this Council Chamber is unreadable and unsatisfactory to a number of residents. If it is intended to relay information to members of the gallery, it is unacceptable as far as being accessible to all members of the public.

The lighting facilities at the lectern need to be improved as well, so that electors with visual disabilities can read their questions or statements.

Response by Mayor Pickard: Thank you for your suggestions Mr Sideris.

Cr Fishwick left the Chamber at 21.04 hrs

Ms M Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood

In your amendment that is advertised at the moment, it states that there is no strategic matter. I think this is a bit misleading, by putting something into the aim of the Town Planning Scheme, makes it viable in SAT or any court. So by moving something from a zone into aim, you are taking away a planning argument. To move a train station and density into an aim is strategic and I think it needs a little more consultation with people into the community.

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the Meeting closed at 2105 hrs; the following Elected Members being present at that time:

MAYOR TROY PICKARD
Cr KERRY HOLLYWOOD
Cr TOM McLEAN
Cr STEVE MAGYAR
Cr GEOFF AMPHLETT
Cr MICHELE JOHN
Cr SUE HART
Cr RICHARD CURRIE