

minutes

Special Meeting of Council

MEETING HELD ON **TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2013**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM NO	TITLE	WARD	PAGE NO
	DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS		1
	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME		2
	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME		2
	APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE		2
	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST		2
	IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY SIT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS		2
	ITEMS OF BUSINESS		3
JSC01-04/13	METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW FINAL REPORT – CITY OF JOONDALUP SUBMISSION – [101870]	All	3
	CLOSURE		17

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP, ON TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2013.

DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Mayor declared the meeting open at 6.46pm.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

ATTENDANCES

Mayor:

TROY PICKARD

Councillors:

Cr TOM McLEAN, JP	North Ward
Cr KERRY HOLLYWOOD	North Ward
Cr SAM THOMAS	North-Central Ward
Cr PHILIPPA TAYLOR	North-Central Ward
Cr GEOFF AMPHLETT, JP	Central Ward
Cr LIAM GOBBERT	Central Ward
Cr MIKE NORMAN	South-West Ward – <i>Deputy Mayor</i>
Cr CHRISTINE HAMILTON-PRIME	South-West Ward
Cr BRIAN CORR	South-East Ward
Cr JOHN CHESTER	South-East Ward
Cr TERESA RITCHIE	South Ward
Cr RUSS FISHWICK, JP	South Ward

Officers:

Mr GARRY HUNT	Chief Executive Officer
Mr JAMIE PARRY	Director Governance and Strategy
Mr MIKE TIDY	Director Corporate Services
Mr NICO CLAASSEN	Director Infrastructure Services
Mr BRAD SILLENCE	Manager Governance
Mr JOHN BYRNE	Governance Coordinator
Mrs LESLEY TAYLOR	Governance Officer

There were no members of the public and no members of the press in attendance.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil.

PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

Nil.

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**Leave of Absence previously approved**

Cr Brian Corr 4 April to 13 April 2013 inclusive.
Cr Kerry Hollywood 1 May to 26 May 2013 inclusive.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**Disclosures of Financial / Proximity Interest**

Nil.

Disclosure of interest affecting impartiality

Elected Members (in accordance with Regulation 11 of the *Local Government [Rules of Conduct] Regulations 2007*) and employees (in accordance with the Code of Conduct) are required to declare any interest that may affect their impartiality in considering a matter. This declaration does not restrict any right to participate in or be present during the decision-making process. The Elected Member/employee is also encouraged to disclose the nature of the interest.

Name/Position	Cr Sam Thomas.
Item No/Subject	JCS01-04/13 – Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report – City of Joondalup Submission.
Nature of interest	Interest that may affect impartiality.
Extent of Interest	Cr Thomas' son works at a local government.

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

Nil.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS**Disclosure of interest affecting impartiality**

Name/Position	Cr Sam Thomas.
Item No/Subject	JCS01-04/13 – Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report – City of Joondalup Submission.
Nature of interest	Interest that may affect impartiality.
Extent of Interest	Cr Thomas' son works at a local government.

JSC01-04/13 METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW FINAL REPORT – CITY OF JOONDALUP SUBMISSION

WARD	All
RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR	Mr Jamie Parry Governance and Strategy
FILE NUMBER	101870, 101515
ATTACHMENTS	<p>Attachment 1 Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report <i>(Please Note: This document is only available electronically)</i></p> <p>Attachment 2 Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report – Summary</p> <p>Attachment 3 City of Joondalup Submission to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report</p> <p>Attachment 4 WALGA Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Submission</p> <p>Attachment 5 Planning Context Report – Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations</p>
AUTHORITY / DISCRETION	Executive — The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council, such as adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.

PURPOSE

For Council to endorse the City's response to the *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's Final Report*.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel (the panel) released its final report in relation to the proposed reform of local government in the Perth Metropolitan Area, in October 2012 with submissions due on 5 April 2013.

The City's submission is based, where possible, on endorsed Council positions (previous reform reports CJ078-04/09, CJ248-12/11 and CJ083-05/12 refer), however, it is acknowledged that the Council has not yet adopted formal positions on a number of the recommendations. The City's response to the panel's final report aims to be brief in its approach, focusing on a defined position in relation to each of the recommendations. As such, it is recommended that the City's response to the final report be read in conjunction with its previous submissions to the panel for further explanatory remarks.

BACKGROUND

On 24 June 2011 the then Minister for Local Government, Hon John Castrilli MLA, announced an independent review of Perth metropolitan local government and broader governance structures.

The then Minister appointed an independent panel, the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel, to examine the social, economic and environmental challenges facing metropolitan Perth.

The panel was chaired by Professor Alan Robson, Vice Chancellor of The University of Western Australia. Other members were Dr Peter Tannock, former Vice Chancellor of the University of Notre Dame Australia and Dr Sue van Leeuwen, Chief Executive Officer of Leadership WA.

The Terms of Reference of the independent Metropolitan Governance Review Panel were to:

- *Identify current and anticipated specific regional, social, environmental and economic issues affecting, or likely to affect, the growth of metropolitan Perth in the next 50 years.*
- *Identify current and anticipated national and international factors likely to impact in the next 50 years.*
- *Research improved local government structures, and governance models and structures for the Perth metropolitan area, drawing on national and international experience and examining key issues relating to community representation, engagement, accountability and State imperatives among other things the Panel may identify during the course of the review.*
- *Identify new local government boundaries and a resultant reduction in the overall number of local governments to better meet the needs of the community.*
- *Prepare options to establish the most effective local government structures and governance models that take into account matters identified through the review including, but not limited to, community engagement, patterns of demographic change, regional and State growth and international factors which are likely to impact.*
- *Present a limited list of achievable options together with a recommendation on the preferred option.*

The panel was asked by the then Minister for Local Government to report on the above by June 2012.

The panel released an *Issues Paper* in October 2011 and the City completed a review of the *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel Issues Paper* and developed a submission which was presented to Council at its meeting held on 13 December 2011 (CJ248-12/11 refers).

The panel subsequently released its *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel Draft Findings* for comment, with submissions due by 25 May 2012.

The panel released the draft findings after considering the submissions received from a diverse range of community members and stakeholders, the discussions it had with representatives of local governments and other organisations, and the background and research material provided to it during the period of the review.

The panel's draft findings outlined the panel's preliminary thoughts on possible options to improve Perth's local government arrangements, and were structured around three main themes:

- Reforming relationships, roles and functions.
- An ideal structure of local government in metropolitan Perth.
- Improving governance.

The City prepared a response to each of the key findings posed in the draft findings which were, in the main, based on the City's submission to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel in December 2011 and previously endorsed positions. At its meeting held on 15 May 2012 (CJ083-05/12 refers) Council endorsed a submission in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's request for comment on its *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel Draft Findings Paper (April 2012)*.

Further to the drafting of a response to each of the key findings, the City participated in a study undertaken by Planning Context, commissioned by the City of Armadale, acting on behalf of a group of 20 metropolitan local governments ('G20'), to assist in the preparation of potential submissions for individual local governments on the Metropolitan Local Government Reform process.

The purpose of the brief was to develop and present alternative models for a possible future local government structure for the Perth metropolitan region and that one model was to be selected by the G20 as being preferred. While it is important to note that the G20 local governments strongly support a process of voluntary amalgamations, they believe, however, that if the State Government pursues a process of compulsory amalgamations they wish to propose a preferred map.

Following a process of consultation with individual local governments, six options for local government amalgamation were developed, together with six variations to boundaries within those options. The report titled *Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations* is provided as Attachment 5.

DETAILS

Issues and options considered

The *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's Final Report* was released in October 2012.

The panel has unanimously made 30 recommendations, in accordance with its Terms of Reference, which it considers will build the strength, capacity, effectiveness and authority of local government.

Comments are invited on the panel's report until 5 April 2013.

The City of Joondalup has developed its response based on previous Council positions, established policy positions, and an information session conducted with Elected Members on 5 February 2013 to discuss the panel's recommendations. The WA Local Government Association (WALGA) paper developed to assist local governments in their deliberations and the outcome of the Interested Metropolitan Mayors and Presidents study undertaken by Planning Context was also used to inform discussion.

The WALGA State Council endorsed its position at the March 2013 State Council meeting. The submission is based on WALGA's two previous submissions to the Metropolitan Local Government Review, established policy positions and feedback received from the local government sector. The City of Joondalup participated in development of this position through provision of its draft positions and the WALGA North Zone meetings.

A group of Interested Metropolitan Mayors and Presidents was established following the adoption of the WALGA proposal to draft a governance model based on 15 to 20 local governments (or to develop a governance model without a specified number of new local governments). The group considered that there is an alternative option that many local governments will endorse, and as such employed Planning Context to draft a map showing alternative revised local government boundaries, including some financial modelling to provide a more robust recommendation to the State Government. The City of Joondalup agreed to participate in the spirit of cooperation and willingness to explore local government determining its own future.

A copy of the Planning Context report titled *Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations* is provided as Attachment 5.

Following a process of consultation with individual local governments, six options for local government amalgamation were developed, together with six variations to boundaries within those options as follows:

- Option A - 22 local governments (Two suggested boundary adjustments).
- Option B - 20 local governments (One suggested boundary adjustment).
- Option C - 18 local governments (Two suggested boundary adjustments).
- Option D - 16 local governments (Two suggested boundary adjustments).
- Option E - 15 local governments (One suggested boundary adjustment).
- Option F - 9 local governments (Could include the Panel's 12 local governments option).

These options and variations were presented to a workshop attended by the Mayors and Chief Executive Officers of the G20 at the City of Stirling on 11 March 2013 and a vote was held to select a preferred option.

The voting process resulted in Option D (16 local governments) being selected as the most preferred option for amalgamation. The second preferred option was 18 local governments and the third was 15 local governments.

Option D involves the amalgamation of 14 local governments with the following being directly affected:

- Armadale and Serpentine-Jarrahdale.
- Fremantle and East Fremantle.
- Bayswater and Bassendean.
- Vincent and Perth.
- South Perth and Victoria Park.
- Cambridge, Subiaco, Nedlands, Claremont, Cottesloe, Peppermint Grove and Mosman Park.
- Cockburn and Kwinana.
- Swan and Mundaring.
- Belmont and Kalamunda.

Option D for 16 local governments sees the local governments of Wanneroo, Joondalup, Stirling, Melville, Canning, Gosnells and Rockingham unaffected. It results in all local governments having a population of about 100,000 or more by 2026, with the exception of the amalgamated local governments of Fremantle and East Fremantle, and Perth and Vincent.

The Planning Context report stresses that there needs to be acknowledgement there is no perfect solution or 'magic number' to amalgamations. Each option has its advantages and disadvantages. Planning Context, in preparing the range of options for amalgamation used the following principles:

- Joining up the smaller local governments to increase scale.
- Consideration of the local government's ability to look after regional assets.
- Improved employment self-sufficiency.
- Regional planning objectives supporting development of Centres, Corridors and Gateways.
- Share of a community of interest.
- Logical physical or road/rail boundaries.

The report provides a range of data related to the options and financial capacity and ability to meet the above principles. The City of Joondalup fares well and no boundary amendments are proposed.

In relation to the City of Joondalup's submission to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report there are two options for the Council's consideration:

Option 1

The Council may adopt the positions as presented in the City of Joondalup submission to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report, with no change.

Option 2

The Council may adopt the positions as presented in the City of Joondalup submission to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Final Report, with amendment.

Of particular interest is recommendation 15 which relates to the number of local governments proposed under any reform model, specifically that a new structure of local government in metropolitan Perth be created through specific legislation which reduces the number of local governments in metropolitan Perth to 12, with boundaries as detailed in Section 5 of the panel's report.

The City of Joondalup, in relation to recommendation 15, currently supports reducing the number of local governments in metropolitan Perth to between 10–12.

The WALGA preferred governance model is for metropolitan Perth to be governed by approximately 15-20 local governments.

Option D of the Planning Context Report proposes 16 local governments with the local governments of Wanneroo, Joondalup, Stirling, Melville, Canning, Gosnells and Rockingham remaining unaffected.

The Council may wish to consider revising its position given the positions of the WALGA and the G20.

Option 1 is the preferred option given that the City of Joondalup is proposed to remain unchanged under the panel's recommended model. This may alter should Council determine that another preferred number of local governments be examined, the implications of which have not been assessed by the City.

Legislation / Strategic Community Plan / policy implications

Legislation Not applicable.

Strategic Community Plan

Key theme Governance and Leadership.

Objective Strong leadership.

Strategic initiative Participate in State and Federal policy development processes affecting local government.

Policy Not applicable.

Risk management considerations

Providing a response to the *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's Final Report* provides the City with an opportunity to comment on the proposed governance models and boundaries for local governments in the Perth metropolitan area and, therefore, the future purpose and role of local government.

Financial/budget implications

Not applicable.

Regional significance

The City is a leading local government within the metropolitan area and a significant partner for the north-west metropolitan region and it is therefore important to respond to the *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's Final Report*.

One of the recurring themes highlighted in the City's submissions is the need for improved local government arrangements through better intergovernmental relations and regional approaches.

Sustainability implications

Local governments have a key role to play in ensuring the sustainability of their communities and the City's submission includes a number of references to the City's long term sustainability and improved outcomes for the community.

Consultation

The previous Minister for Local Government has released the report for extensive public comment with all comments due by 5 April 2013. Information on the report has been included on the City's web site encouraging the community to provide comments.

COMMENT

It is considered that the *Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's Final Report* provides an opportunity for the City of Joondalup, and local government in general, to comment on issues that are fundamental to the reform of local government in the metropolitan area.

The City of Joondalup is of the view that improvements can be made to local government arrangements in the Perth metropolitan area however improvements need to take a broader view than the adequacy of the current state of local government and take a more holistic view, examining the intergovernmental relations between Federal, State and local government, and the respective roles and responsibilities between the three spheres of government.

Within the context of the panel's research, the City believes it is uniquely positioned to demonstrate how a major reform process can result in the creation of a progressive and sustainable local government with appropriate capacity and size to deliver high quality services to its electors.

It is proposed that the Council endorse the City's submission (as shown in Attachment 3) in relation to the panel's recommendations. The City's submission should be read in conjunction with its previous submissions in relation to the Metropolitan Local Government Review.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

MOVED Cr Amphlett, SECONDED Cr McLean that Council:

- 1 ENDORSES the City of Joondalup submission, provided as Attachment 3 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012);**
- 2 NOTES that the City of Joondalup Submission referred to in Part 1 above will be forwarded to the WA Local Government Association;**
- 3 NOTES the WA Local Government Association’s Submission, provided as Attachment 4 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012);**
- 4 NOTES the Planning Context report Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations, provided as Attachment 5 to Report JSC01-04/13.**

AMENDMENT MOVED Cr Fishwick, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Part 1 of the Motion be amended to read:

“1 ENDORSES the City of Joondalup submission, provided as Attachment 3 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012) subject to:

1.1 Recommendation 8 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup OPPOSES the proposed Forum of Mayors as WALGA’s ‘Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum’ is a more appropriate governance structure.”;

1.2 The third paragraph on page 13 of the submission (stamped page 29 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“Acknowledging the existing advocacy role of the WA Local Government Association in relation to the Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum, more information on the proposed Forum of Mayors should have been provided in order to understand the implications of the proposal and to also avoid possible duplication.”;

1.3 The first paragraph on page 14 of the submission (stamped page 30 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“As the Lord Mayor of the City of Perth would not be seen as representing the whole of the metropolitan local government, the City considers that if the Forum of Mayors is established it should not be chaired by the Lord Mayor of Perth and that like any democratic process, the Forum of Mayors elect its own Chairperson, rather than the position being pre-determined.”;

1.4 Recommendation 6 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup, in relation to Recommendation 6:

- ***BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to adequately and equitably funding future Municipal Solid Waste management being delivered in a partnership between the State Government and Local Government with responsibilities being undertaken as follows:***

	AGENCY	RESPONSIBILITY
1	State Government and Local Government	Funding
2	State Government and Waste Authority	Strategic Management
3	Regional and Local Government	Infrastructure Planning Management Operations Management
4	Department Environmental Regulation	Regulation Management

- ***SUPPORTS the State Government establishing a Cabinet portfolio for waste, given its environmental significance.”;***

1.5 Recommendation 11 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup in relation to Recommendation 11:

- ***BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to consolidating Metropolitan Regional Local Governments to manage Municipal Solid Waste. This would provide a measure of resilience and achieve economies of scale for treatment and disposal without compromising the already high service provided by local government.***

For example three expanded Metropolitan Regional Councils based on adequate population and:

- Shared objectives and binding commitments with compulsory membership for the purposes of Municipal Solid Waste management treatment and disposal;***
 - Logical local government groupings for each Regional Local Government reflecting a consolidation to three Regional Local Governments;***
 - Employing more effective governance models such as Regional Subsidiaries or Council Controlled Organisation Models.***
- ***NOT SUPPORT, at this time, the provision of the Local Government Act 1995 relating to the ability of local governments to establish Regional Councils, being repealed;***
 - ***SUPPORT Tamala Park Regional Council land development activities being excluded from any proposed dissolution.”.***

It was requested that Part 1.1 of the Amendment be voted upon separately.

AMENDMENT MOVED Cr Fishwick, **SECONDED** Cr Hamilton-Prime that Part 1 of the Motion be amended to read:

“1 **ENDORSES** the City of Joondalup submission, provided as Attachment 3 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012) subject to:

1.2 The third paragraph on page 13 of the submission (stamped page 29 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“Acknowledging the existing advocacy role of the WA Local Government Association in relation to the Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum, more information on the proposed Forum of Mayors should have been provided in order to understand the implications of the proposal and to also avoid possible duplication.”;

1.3 The first paragraph on page 14 of the submission (stamped page 30 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“As the Lord Mayor of the City of Perth would not be seen as representing the whole of the metropolitan local government, the City considers that if the Forum of Mayors is established it should not be chaired by the Lord Mayor of Perth and that like any democratic process, the Forum of Mayors elect its own Chairperson, rather than the position being pre-determined.”;

1.4 Recommendation 6 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup, in relation to Recommendation 6:

- *BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to adequately and equitably funding future Municipal Solid Waste management being delivered in a partnership between the State Government and Local Government with responsibilities being undertaken as follows:*

AGENCY	RESPONSIBILITY
1 State Government and Local Government	Funding
2 State Government and Waste Authority	Strategic Management
3 Regional and Local Government	Infrastructure Planning Management Operations
4 Department Environmental Regulation	Regulation Management

- *SUPPORTS the State Government establishing a Cabinet portfolio for waste, given its environmental significance.”;*

1.5 Recommendation 11 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup in relation to Recommendation 11:

- ***BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to consolidating Metropolitan Regional Local Governments to manage Municipal Solid Waste. This would provide a measure of resilience and achieve economies of scale for treatment and disposal without compromising the already high service provided by local government.***

For example three expanded Metropolitan Regional Councils based on adequate population and:

- (a) ***Shared objectives and binding commitments with compulsory membership for the purposes of Municipal Solid Waste management treatment and disposal;***
- (b) ***Logical local government groupings for each Regional Local Government reflecting a consolidation to three Regional Local Governments;***
- (c) ***Employing more effective governance models such as Regional Subsidiaries or Council Controlled Organisation Models.***
- ***NOT SUPPORT, at this time, the provision of the Local Government Act 1995 relating to the ability of local governments to establish Regional Councils, being repealed;***
- ***SUPPORT Tamala Park Regional Council land development activities being excluded from any proposed dissolution.”.***

The Amendment was Put and

CARRIED (13/0)

In favour of the Amendment: Mayor Pickard, Crs Amphlett, Chester, Corr, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood, McLean, Norman, Ritchie, Taylor and Thomas.

AMENDMENT MOVED Cr Fishwick, SECONDED Cr Hamilton-Prime that Part 1 of the Motion be amended to read:

- 1 ENDORSES the City of Joondalup submission, provided as Attachment 3 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012) subject to:**

1.1 Recommendation 8 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup OPPOSES the proposed Forum of Mayors as WALGA’s ‘Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum’ is a more appropriate governance structure.”;

The Amendment was Put and

CARRIED (12/1)

In favour of the Amendment: Mayor Pickard, Crs Amphlett, Chester, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood, McLean, Norman, Ritchie, Taylor and Thomas.

Against the Amendment: Cr Corr.

AMENDMENT MOVED Mayor Pickard, **SECONDED** Cr Norman that an additional Part 1.6 be added to Part 1 of the Motion as follows:

“1.6 Recommendation 15 being amended to read as follows:

“The City of Joondalup, in relation to Recommendation 15, related to a proposed new structure of local government in metropolitan Perth being created through specific legislation, provides the following:

- *NOTES the proposal to incorporate all of the Swan and Canning Rivers within applicable local government areas;*
- *NOTES the proposal to transfer Rottnest Island to the proposed local government centred around the City of Fremantle;*
- *SUPPORTS reducing the number of local governments in metropolitan Perth to 16, aligned to Option D of the Planning Context report Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations, noting that this Option does not affect the City of Joondalup boundaries.”*

The Amendment was Put and

CARRIED (12/1)

In favour of the Amendment: Mayor Pickard, Crs Amphlett, Chester, Corr, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hamilton-Prime, McLean, Norman, Ritchie, Taylor and Thomas.

Against the Amendment: Cr Hollywood.

The original Motion as amended:

That Council:

1 ENDORSES the City of Joondalup submission, provided as Attachment 3 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012) subject to:

1.1 Recommendation 8 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup OPPOSES the proposed Forum of Mayors as WALGA’s ‘Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum’ is a more appropriate governance structure.”;

1.2 The third paragraph on page 13 of the submission (stamped page 29 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“Acknowledging the existing advocacy role of the WA Local Government Association in relation to the Metropolitan Mayors Policy Forum, more information on the proposed Forum of Mayors should have been provided in order to understand the implications of the proposal and to also avoid possible duplication.”;

- 1.3 The first paragraph on page 14 of the submission (stamped page 30 of the Attachment) being deleted and replaced with the following paragraph:

“As the Lord Mayor of the City of Perth would not be seen as representing the whole of the metropolitan local government, the City considers that if the Forum of Mayors is established it should not be chaired by the Lord Mayor of Perth and that like any democratic process, the Forum of Mayors elect its own Chairperson, rather than the position being pre-determined.”;

- 1.4 Recommendation 6 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup, in relation to Recommendation 6:

- *BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to adequately and equitably funding future Municipal Solid Waste management being delivered in a partnership between the State Government and Local Government with responsibilities being undertaken as follows:*

	AGENCY	RESPONSIBILITY
1	<i>State Government and Local Government</i>	<i>Funding</i>
2	<i>State Government and Waste Authority</i>	<i>Strategic Management</i>
3	<i>Regional and Local Government</i>	<i>Infrastructure Planning Management Operations Management</i>
4	<i>Department Environmental Regulation</i>	<i>Regulation Management</i>

- *SUPPORTS the State Government establishing a Cabinet portfolio for waste, given its environmental significance.”;*

- 1.5 Recommendation 11 being reworded to read:

“The City of Joondalup in relation to Recommendation 11:

- *BELIEVES that the State Government should give consideration to consolidating Metropolitan Regional Local Governments to manage Municipal Solid Waste. This would provide a measure of resilience and achieve economies of scale for treatment and disposal without compromising the already high service provided by local government.*

For example three expanded Metropolitan Regional Councils based on adequate population and:

- (a) Shared objectives and binding commitments with compulsory membership for the purposes of Municipal Solid Waste management treatment and disposal;*
- (b) Logical local government groupings for each Regional Local Government reflecting a consolidation to three Regional Local Governments;*

(c) Employing more effective governance models such as Regional Subsidiaries or Council Controlled Organisation Models.

- **NOT SUPPORT, at this time, the provision of the Local Government Act 1995 relating to the ability of local governments to establish Regional Councils, being repealed;**
- **SUPPORT Tamala Park Regional Council land development activities being excluded from any proposed dissolution.”;**

1.6 Recommendation 15 being amended to read as follows:

“The City of Joondalup, in relation to Recommendation 15, related to a proposed new structure of local government in metropolitan Perth being created through specific legislation, provides the following:

- **NOTES the proposal to incorporate all of the Swan and Canning Rivers within applicable local government areas;**
- **NOTES the proposal to transfer Rottnest Island to the proposed local government centred around the City of Fremantle;**
- **SUPPORTS reducing the number of local governments in metropolitan Perth to 16, aligned to Option D of the Planning Context report Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations, noting that this Option does not affect the City of Joondalup boundaries;”;**

- 2 NOTES that the City of Joondalup Submission referred to in Part 1 above will be forwarded to the WA Local Government Association;**
- 3 NOTES the WA Local Government Association’s Submission, provided as Attachment 4 to Report JSC01-04/13, in response to the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s request for comment on its Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel’s Final Report (July 2012);**
- 4 NOTES the Planning Context report Exploring Potential Metropolitan Local Government Amalgamations, provided as Attachment 5 to Report JSC01-04/13.**

Was Put and

CARRIED (13/0)

In favour of the Motion: Mayor Pickard, Crs Amphlett, Chester, Corr, Fishwick, Gobbert, Hamilton-Prime, Hollywood, McLean, Norman, Ritchie, Taylor and Thomas.

Appendix 1 refers

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1agn020413.pdf](#)

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the Meeting closed at 7.20pm; the following Elected Members being present at that time:

MAYOR TROY PICKARD
CR KERRY HOLLYWOOD
CR TOM McLEAN, JP
CR PHILIPPA TAYLOR
CR SAM THOMAS
CR LIAM GOBBERT
CR GEOFF AMPHLETT, JP
CR MIKE NORMAN
CR CHRISTINE HAMILTON-PRIME
CR JOHN CHESTER
CR BRIAN CORR
CR RUSS FISHWICK, JP
CR TERESA RITCHIE