



TOWN OF CLAREMONT

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

TUESDAY 15 NOVEMBER, 2016

Stephen Goode

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Date:

DISCLAIMER

Would all members of the public please note that they are cautioned against taking any action as a result of a Council decision tonight until such time as they have seen a copy of the Minutes or have been advised, in writing, by the Council's Administration with regard to any particular decision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	1
2	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1
3	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS	1
4	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .	1
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	2
6	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME	2
7	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	2
8	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS.....	2
9	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.....	2
10	ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC	2
11	BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	2
12	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....	2
13	REPORTS OF THE CEO.....	3
13.1	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	3
	13.1.1 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE.....	3
13.2	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	6
	13.2.1 PROPOSED SCHEME AMENDMENT NO. 134 – REZONING AND RESERVING OF LAND IN THE VICINITY OF LAKE CLAREMONT.....	6
13.3	CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE.....	12
	13.3.1 LIST OF PAYMENTS 1-31 OCTOBER 2016	12
	13.3.2 MONTHLY STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2016.....	14

- 13.3.3 INTRODUCTION OF TEMPORARY FOOD VENDOR LICENCE FEES FOR THE ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY (RAS)..... 17
- 13.4 INFRASTRUCTURE 20**
 - 13.4.1 FRESHWATER BAY PRIMARY SCHOOL – TWO CHILDREN’S CROSSINGS 20
 - 13.4.2 LEVELS OF SERVICE IN PARKS AND RESERVES 24
 - 13.4.3 TOWN WIDE WEED MANAGEMENT UPDATE 31
- 14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON..... 37**
- 15 ELECTED MEMBERS’ MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN..... 38**
 - 15.1.1 REVOCATION OF RESOLUTION 174/16 – CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL - APPROVAL OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPORT PLAN..... 38
 - 15.1.2 CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPORT PLAN..... 39
 - 15.1.3 PROPOSAL TO SEEK LEGAL ADVICE ON PROSECUTING CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL FOR BREACH OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION CONDITIONS 40
- 16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING 42**
- 17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC 43**
 - 17.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER 44**
 - 17.1.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT 44
 - 17.2 INFRASTRUCTURE 45**
 - 17.2.2 STANDARD PAYMENT RATES FOR GROUND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS 45
- 18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL 46**
- 19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING 46**

TOWN OF CLAREMONT
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
15 NOVEMBER, 2016
MINUTES

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

His Worship the Mayor, Mr Jock Barker, welcomed members of the public, staff and Councillors and declared the meeting open at 7:00 PM.

2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

ATTENDANCE

Mayor Barker

Cr Peter Browne

West Ward

Cr Peter Edwards

West Ward

Cr Chris Mews

South Ward

Cr Jill Goetze

South Ward

Cr Bruce Haynes

East Ward

Cr Kate Main

East Ward

Cr Alastair Tulloch

East Ward

Mr Stephen Goode (Chief Executive Officer)

Mr Les Crichton (Executive Manager Corporate and Governance)

Mr David Vinicombe (Executive Manager Planning and Development)

Mr Saba Kirupananthar (Executive Manager Infrastructure)

Ms Liz Ledger (Executive Manager People and Places)

Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)

Twenty five members of the public

Two members of the press

APOLOGIES

Cr Karen Wood (Leave of Absence)

Cr Paul Kelly (Apology)

3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

NIL

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

NIL

5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

NIL

6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

**Mr Simon Reid, Principal, Freshwater Bay Primary School.
Re: Item 13.4.1, Freshwater Bay Primary School – Two Children’s
Crossings.**

Mr Reid spoke against the officer recommendation and requested Council approved the two school crossings.

**Mr Con Zempilas, School Board Chair, Freshwater Bay Primary School.
Re: Item 13.4.1, Freshwater Bay Primary School – Two Children’s
Crossings.**

Mr Zempilas spoke against the officer recommendation and requested Council approved the two school crossings.

7 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

NIL

8 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

NIL

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Browne

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 1 November 2016 be confirmed.

**CARRIED(179/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

10 ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

17.1.1 Chief Executive Officer Contract of Employment.

17.2.1 Standard Payment Rates for Ground Maintenance Agreements.

11 BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

NIL

12 REPORTS OF COMMITTEESNIL

13 REPORTS OF THE CEO

13.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

13.1.1 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE

File Ref: INT/00090 EOM
Responsible Officer: Stephen Goode
Chief Executive Officer
Author: Cathy Bohdan
Manager Business Improvement
Proposed Meeting Date: 15 November 2016

Purpose

For Council to consider a request for funding of \$92,000 prior to mid year budget review for an upgrade to the Town's Information Technology (IT) infrastructure.

Background

IT infrastructure is a collection of physical or virtual resources that supports an overall IT environment including:

- Servers – is the central component that provides functionality for programs and devices (ie printers) on the network;
- Storage – collection of disks that house our data and information, and
- Network components – directs information on where it needs to go.

Infrastructure must provide a suitable platform for all the necessary IT applications and functions for the Town.

We are currently running on an aged IT infrastructure which is no longer fit for purpose and is poorly configured. The infrastructure being aged, means that it is no longer supported and out of warranty. Therefore, replacement parts are either difficult to obtain or costly to replace. There is also a high, indirect cost of managing the infrastructure as it is administratively taxing.

Implementing the new IT infrastructure, would mean that the infrastructure proposed is set to last the Town for a 5-year lifecycle until 2022, so just under \$20,000 per year investment.

While we will need to engage a contractor for the more technical components, we do intend to utilise internal resources to perform a component of project works, both to reduce costs and ensure internal IT staff are engaged and aware of requirements.

The current IT budget of \$470,199 comprises of operating budget of \$390,199 which is allocated to day to day running, printers, software, licences and some maintenance costs. The capital budget of \$80,000 is allocated to improvement of our ERP (Council First) and computer (desktop) replacement.

Review of other IT functions are also being undertaken and the Town will have savings for the 2017-18 financial year. So far identified financial benefits include:

- \$25,000 on our data links and internet costs
- \$10,000 on printers
- \$6,000 on our back up systems.

Discussion

A detailed review of the Town's IT infrastructure was completed and identified that it is in a critical state. This is primarily due to a "set and forget" set up on the infrastructure, with a lack of process around the management and maintenance of the infrastructure. IT infrastructure spending has tended to be adhoc and reactive, without proper planning and targeting.

The upgrade is required to protect the integrity of confidential data on the Town's network, as well as to stabilise the infrastructure.

The IT Infrastructure is critical to the Town as it runs the day to day operations of all directorates across the business. Without IT, the Town cannot operate to its current capacity servicing the community.

There are a number of components to the upgrade and part of this would include commencing a more robust Disaster Recovery Plan. Currently we have one aged and outdated server located at Claremont Quarter. If this server was to fail the Town would experience down time, meaning there would be limited or no capacity to service the community. At an estimate this down time could be a number of weeks. The intent is to replace this with two servers. One located at No 1 Claremont (main server) and the other at CCH (recovery server) this would then ensure a downtime of only several hours.

Along with the upgrade it gives us the opportunity to create a roadmap for the regular maintenance and management of the Town's IT platform, as well as better budgeting information for the future.

Past Resolutions

N/A

Financial and Staff Implications

EXPENDITURE	
Infrastructure (server, SQL servers, storage)	\$52,000
Consultant (set up, configuration)	\$40,000
TOTAL	\$92,000

Savings would include only small financial benefits, being the cessation of the lease with Claremont Quarter (\$12,000). Most of the savings will deliver non financial benefits, including better disaster recovery, less administration and reduction of risk.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Policy LG506 – Expenditure variations – Operating Budget
Local Government Act 1995 – s.6.8

Strategic Community Plan

Governance and Leadership

We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.

- Provide and maintain a high standard of governance, accountability, management and strategic planning

Urgency

There is some urgency with this item due to the risks, already mentioned, that it places the Town under.

Voting Requirements

Absolute majority decision of the Council required.

Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Haynes

That Council allow for the provision of \$92,000 prior to mid year budget review to complete the IT infrastructure upgrade by 31 January 2017.

**CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY(180/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

13.2 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

13.2.1 PROPOSED SCHEME AMENDMENT NO. 134 – REZONING AND RESERVING OF LAND IN THE VICINITY OF LAKE CLAREMONT

Files Reference:	LND/114
Attachments:	Location Plans
Responsible Officer:	David Vinicombe Executive Manager Planning and Development
Author:	Josh Wilson Urban Planner
Proposed Meeting Date:	15 November 2016
Date Prepared:	7 November 2016
Financial Implications:	Advertising costs
Enabling Legislation:	<i>Planning and Development Act 2005 (PDA)</i> <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (LPS Regs)</i> Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS3)

Summary

- Scheme Amendment 134 proposes minor changes to the scheme maps to zone land surrounding Lake Claremont.
- The amendment is in response to the recently approved Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment No. 1275/57 which altered the MRS Parks and Recreation Reserve and in part applied an Urban MRS zone over land in locality, which now requires a zone to be applied under TPS3.
- Council supported the MRS amendment at its meeting on 18 March 2014 and made a commitment to review several related zoning issues once the MRS amendment was finalised.
- The MRS Amendment was gazetted on 8 July 2016 and TPS3 now requires modifications.
- Recommend Council resolve to prepare an amendment to TPS3 and proceed to advertising.

Purpose

To seek Council's approval to prepare an amendment to TPS3 to zone land in the vicinity of Lake Claremont.

Background

The following table outlines key dates regarding this proposal:

Date	Item/Outcome
18 March 2014	Council resolved to support MRS Amendment No. 1275/57 and commits to reviewing zoning once it is gazetted
8 July 2016	MRS amendment gazetted
7 November 2016	Amendment Report prepared for Council

Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 18 March 2014, Resolution No. 33/14:

In addition to supporting MRS Amendment No. 1275/57 Council determined the following:

3. *Upon finalisation of the Metropolitan Region Scheme Central Districts Omnibus Amendment No. 4, Council is to consider an amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to include the following:*
 - a) *Rezoning the Reserve for Recreation contained on Lot 11098 on Plan 16084 directly north of The Cedus as Local Reserves – Recreation.*
 - b) *Define the road reserve in the vicinity of the junction of Mitford Street, Fern Street and Devon Road and add and remove associated remnant land developed as public open space surrounding the junction of these roads.*
 - c) *The removal of Lot 90 (39) Fern Street from the residential zone and add the lot to Local Reserves for Recreation to preserve the natural bushland and amenity of the property as an adjunct to the Lake Claremont parklands for the future benefit and enjoyment of the local community.*

Statutory Considerations

The MRS amendment has been approved and gazetted on 8 July 2016. Council is required to initiate action to amend TPS3 to reflect the changes contained in the MRS amendment in accordance with section 124 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* (PDA). Section 126(1) of the PDA automatically gives effect to inclusion of the new reservations in TPS3. Where the MRS amendment zones land 'Urban', a new zone or local reserve is required to be applied to TPS3 over the 'Urban' MRS zones.

Amendments are required to be undertaken in accordance with Part 5 of the new *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (LPS Regs).

Amendments must now be classed as basic, standard or complex and justification for this must be stated in Council's resolution. The proposed amendment is classed as 'standard' based on the following criteria as set out in the LPS Regs:

- a) the amendment will make the scheme consistent with a region planning scheme, and is not a basic amendment
- b) the amendment would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not the subject of the amendment

- c) the amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area.

If Council resolves to prepare the amendment it will be referred to the relevant statutory authorities and advertised to the general public for a period of 42 days. Any submissions will be addressed in a second report to Council where Council will determine whether to support the amendment (with or without modification) or not. If the amendment is supported, the Minister for Planning determines whether or not the amendment is approved and gazetted.

Consultation

Consultation is required to be undertaken in accordance with the LPS Regs and will be carried out once Council resolves to prepare the amendment.

Discussion

The proposed changes to the TPS3 maps include:

1. Zone parts of the Scotch College playing fields from 'unzoned' to 'Educational'.
2. Rezone the 'Educational' zoned playing fields to the north of The Cedus to 'Local Reserves - Recreation'.
3. Remove the zone and reserve portions over the road reserve at the intersection of Devon Road, Mitford Street and Fern Street to reflect its use as a local road.
4. Rezone the bushland to the north of the Lakeway Estate from 'Residential R20' to 'Local Reserves - Recreation'.
5. Remove the Residential zone over the road reserves within the Lakeway Estate.
6. Zone the unzoned portion of 88 Davies Road 'Residential' and apply a density code of 'R30' to match the remainder of the site.

A location map identifying the proposed changes is attached to this report inclusive of the following:

1 - Scotch Playing fields

The MRS 'Parks and Recreation' reserve boundary for the Scotch College playing fields has been realigned to match the lot boundaries. This is simply a tidying of boundaries and is not intended to have any effect on the use or development of the land. The resultant unzoned land is proposed to be zoned 'Educational' to match the remainder of the affected lots. The land is owned by Scotch College.

2 – The Cedus

Land to the north of the Cedus was originally zoned 'Educational' as part of the development of that estate. The intent was to retain part of the old oval as a school playing field and to ensure the land was retained as open space. The land is owned by the Town and while school sports may be played on the land there are no restrictions on its use by the public and therefore it is more appropriate to reserve the land as 'Local Reserves - Recreation' under TPS3.

3 – Devon Road Mitford Street and Fern Road Intersection

The as-constructed intersection of Devon Road, Mitford Street and Fern Street is not reflected in the zoning or cadastral boundaries of the land. The majority of the intersection is zoned under TPS3 as 'Local Reserves - Recreation'.

The MRS amendment extended the MRS boundary up to what should be the edge of the road reserve in this location. It is proposed to un-zone the land that the road is built on, leaving approximately 400m² of parkland to the south of the intersection.

It is intended to formally dedicate the land used as a road reserve at some point in the future. The proposed reserve boundaries reflect this future arrangement and will clarify the intended use of the land in the mean time. The boundaries of the reserve are based on drawings by the Town's Engineering Services and the Department of Lands.

4 – Lakeway Estate Bushland

The bushland to the north of the Lakeway Estate is currently zoned 'Residential'. It contains high quality native vegetation and serves a drainage function for the area. The existing 'Residential' zoning of this land resulted from the change of use from the old drive-in-theatre that used to occupy the site. When the land was redeveloped by the Council the whole site was zoned 'Residential' with a 'R20' coding, so as not to constrain the final design. Now that the development of the estate is complete, reserving this land as 'Local Reserves - Recreation' under TPS3 is recommended to reflect its environmental qualities.

5 – Lakeway Estate Roads

Similar to point 5 above, the roads within the Lakeway Estate should be unzoned now that the development of the estate is complete.

6 – Lot 66 (88) Davies Road

An anomaly exists in that the majority of this property is currently unzoned under TPS3. The lot is 3586m² in area and approximately 2150m² of this is unzoned with the remainder being 'Residential' with an 'R30' coding. The property has been developed with 10 grouped dwellings, despite this anomaly. It is proposed to zone the unzoned portion of this lot 'Residential' with a density code of 'R30' to match the remainder of the lot. This density code is comparable to the existing density of the development.

It is noted that several streets were removed from MRS reserves by the MRS Amendment No. 1275/57. As road reserves are generally unzoned under local planning schemes, it is proposed to leave the affected parts of the following streets unzoned and not apply a zoning to TPS3 as part of this amendment:

- Shenton Place
- Davies Road
- Lapsley Road
- Elliot Road
- (all formerly 'Parks and Recreation' Reserve); and
- Gugerri Street (formerly 'Railways' Reserve)

Rezoning of Lot 90 (39) Fern Street from 'Residential R20' to 'Local Reserves - Recreation' may also be considered by Council in accordance with Council's resolution 33/14 dated Meeting 18 March 2014 to preserve the natural bushland and amenity of the property as an adjunct to the Lake Claremont parklands for the future benefit and enjoyment of the local community.

Lot 90 Fern Street is owned by the Town in freehold. It appears that the land was acquired for the purpose of allowing a road connection through to Mitford Street however was ultimately not required for this, and the road was constructed under its present alignment to the immediate west. The land has been treated as public open space by local residents and contains a number of mature trees. The site is valued by members of the local community, many of whom have successfully sought to retain the site as vacant land when Council previously considered its sale.

The lot is 685m² in area and has a likely value of in the order of \$1m if sold on the open market (a formal valuation has not been sought).

Reserving this lot as 'Local Reserves - Recreation' would mean the lot will remain as parkland in the future. In determining whether to include this lot into the amendment, Council should consider the relative benefits to the community of retaining the land as is or selling it and using the proceeds to improve other facilities in the Town. There may however be some potential for this land to be swapped with other State owned land. This would require detailed investigation and could be considered in the future should Council wish to pursue the application of a Local Open Space reservation on the land at another time.

Summary

Scheme Amendment No. 134 will resolve a number of zoning issues surrounding Lake Claremont. It is recommended Council resolve to prepare the amendment as per the officer's recommendation below and proceed with public consultation.

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Browne

THAT Council resolve the following:

1. **In accordance with Section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, amend Town Planning Scheme No. 3 as follows:**
 - a. **Zone the unzoned portions of the following lots to 'Educational':**
 - Lot 1 on D6269
 - Lot 400 on P33694
 - Lot 151 on D30924

All of which form part of the Scotch College campus at 31 Shenton Road, Swanbourne.
 - b. **Modify the portions of the following lots that are currently zoned 'Educational' to 'Local Reserves – Recreation':**
 - Lot 900 on P48900

- Lot 11098 on P016084 (R40523)
which are located immediately north of The Cedus, Swanbourne.
 - c. Remove the present “Local Reserves - Recreation’ from the portion of Lot 1063 on P222328 that is intended to be formalised as a road reserve and that forms the intersecting area of Devon Road, Mitford Street and Fern Street.
 - d. Modify the following lots from ‘Residential’ to ‘Local Reserves – Recreation’:
 - Lot 440 on P59604 (R49882)
 - Lot 441 on P59604 (R49882)Which are adjacent to Swanway Crescent, Swanbourne.
 - e. Remove the present ‘Residential’ zone from the following road reserves within the Lakeway Estate, Swanbourne:
 - Swanway Crescent
 - Glenway Crescent
 - Eastway Crescent
 - Aceway Lane
 - Melway Lane
 - f. Zone the unzoned portion of Lot 63 on PS002835 (88 Davies Road, Claremont) ‘Residential’ and apply a density code of ‘R30’.
2. That proposed Amendment No. 134 to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 be treated as a ‘standard amendment’ for the purposes of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, based on the following criteria:
- a. the amendment will make the scheme consistent with a region planning scheme, and is not a basic amendment
 - b. the amendment would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not the subject of the amendment
 - c. the amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area.

**CARRIED(181/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

13.3 CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE

Items 13.3.1 to 13.3.2 were carried en bloc.

13.3.1 LIST OF PAYMENTS 1-31 OCTOBER 2016

File Ref:	FIM/0062-02
Attachments:	List of Payments October 2016 NAB Purchase Card Statement – October 2016
Responsible Officer:	Les Crichton Executive Manager Corporate and Governance
Author:	Edwin Kwan Finance Officer
Proposed Meeting Date:	15 November 2016

Purpose

For Council to note the payments made in October 2016.

Background

Council has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the Municipal Fund or Trust Fund. The CEO is then required to prepare a list of accounts, for recording in the Minutes, detailing those payments made since the last list was presented.

Discussion

Attached is the list of all accounts paid totalling \$1,566,767.18 during the month of October 2016.

The attached schedule covers:

• Municipal Funds electronic funds transfers (EFT)	\$	1,045,226.20
• Municipal Fund vouchers (39493-39496)	\$	4,055.18
• Municipal Fund direct debits	\$	453,565.34
• Trust Fund electronic funds transfer (EFT)	\$	63,920.46
• Trust Fund vouchers	\$	0.00.

All invoices have been verified, and all payments have been duly authorised in accordance with Council's procedures.

Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 18 October 2016, Resolution 164/16:

That Council notes all payments made for September 2016 totalling \$2,651,989.61 comprising;

<i>Municipal Funds electronic funds transfers (EFT)</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>2,122,196.35</i>
<i>Municipal Fund vouchers (39484-39492)</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>23,882.04</i>
<i>Municipal Fund direct debits</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>452,070.94</i>
<i>Trust Fund electronic funds transfer (EFT)</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>53,840.28</i>

<i>Trust Fund vouchers</i>	\$	<i>0.00</i>
----------------------------	----	-------------

Financial and Staff Implication

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, Regulations 12- 13.
Town of Claremont Delegation Register – DA9 Payment of Accounts.

Communication / Consultation

N/A

Urgency

N/A

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards

THAT Council notes all payments made for October 2016 totalling \$1,566,767.18 comprising;

Municipal Funds electronic funds transfers (EFT)	\$	1,045,226.20
Municipal Fund vouchers (39493-39496)	\$	4,055.18
Municipal Fund direct debits	\$	453,565.34
Trust Fund electronic funds transfer (EFT)	\$	63,920.46
Trust Fund vouchers	\$	0.00

**CARRIED(182/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

**13.3.2 MONTHLY STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD
ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2016**

File Ref:	FIM/0062-02
Attachments:	Statement of Financial Activity for period ending 30 September 2016 Infrastructure Assets – 2016-17 Schedule of Works
Responsible Officer:	Les Crichton Executive Manager Corporate and Governance
Author:	Hitesh Hans Finance Manager
Proposed Meeting Date:	15 November 2016

Purpose

For Council to note the Statement of Financial Activity for the month ending 30 September 2016.

Background

The Monthly Financial Report is presented in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995* and *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Discussion

The Financial Statements to 30 September 2016 represent the first quarter of operation within the 2016-17 financial year and compares year-to-date expenditure and revenue against the corresponding budget. The budget figures incorporate all 2015-16 carry-forwards approved as part of the June 2016 end of year report.

The closing surplus of \$13,271,029 compares favourably against the budgeted surplus of \$12,652,356. Detailed below, the \$618,673 variance is comprised of operating revenue \$266,695 above budget and operating expenditure (excluding non cash items) \$218,303 under budget. In addition, capital revenue and capital expenditure are \$26,040 and \$159,716 respectively under budget. Of the overall variance, approximately \$61,000 is considered as permanent savings with the balance relating to timing.

Operating revenue - \$266,695 above budget,

- \$205,607 increase in fees and charges is mainly from refuse collection \$38K (more properties added before the rates were levied) and timing of income from development applications \$65K and parking services \$71K.
 - \$27,782 increases in grants received is mainly due to receipt of Lotterywest 'Get into Life' grant ahead of budget timing.
 - \$23,043 increase in interest income due to higher than estimated cash holdings.
-

Operating expenditure - \$206,608 under budget

- \$133,741 due to timing difference across materials and contracts services \$54K and office expenses \$71K.
- \$85,511 insurance is under the budget due to timing of premiums invoices.

Capital revenue – \$26,040 under budget

Capital revenue is under the budget due to timing of disposal and proceeds on sale of vehicle and asset opening balances (for 2016-17) to be finalised as part of 2015-16 audit process.

Capital expenditure – \$159,716 under budget

As detailed within the capital works schedules (note 10), the capital expenditure comprises;

- \$68,323 under budget in infrastructure works. Attachment 2 provides further detail on the projects and variance explanation.
- \$162,230 under budget in land and building is mainly due to timing of Aquatic Centre Upgrade.
- \$80,692 under budget on transfers to reserves due to timing of interest income on reserve investment.

Cash holdings

Current investment holdings are outside Council's Investment Policy LG511 with 57% investment with NAB due to significant interest income benefit. The policy limits funds with one institution at 45% however the risk of investments with NAB was considered low given it has an excellent credit rating.

Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 18 October 2016, Resolution 164/16:

That Council notes the Financial Statement of Activity for the period 1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016.

Financial and Staff Implications

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Local Government Act 1995.

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

Publicity

N/A

Strategic Community Plan**Governance and Leadership**

We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.

- Provide and maintain a high standard of governance, accountability, management and strategic planning.
- Maintain long term financial stability and growth.

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards

That Council notes the Financial Statement of Activity for the period 1 July 2015 to 30 September 2016.

**CARRIED(182/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

13.3.3 INTRODUCTION OF TEMPORARY FOOD VENDOR LICENCE FEES FOR THE ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY (RAS)

File Ref:	FIM/00075
Responsible Officer:	Les Crichton Executive Manager Corporate and Governance
Author:	Justin Strange Principal Environmental Health Officer
Proposed Meeting Date:	15 November 2016

Purpose

Report recommends Council adopt a schedule of fees for temporary food vendors operating at the Royal Agricultural Society (RAS) Showgrounds.

Background

The current fees for temporary food business registration and notification and surveillance inspections as required under the *Food Act 2008*, at times, are difficult to determine with the nature of vendors that operate out of the RAS grounds during events.

This can create confusion for vendors, increased processing time of applications for Council staff, and invoicing difficulties where vendors have left, or are from interstate.

The proposed schedule of fees seeks to simplify the process and introduce a single food business application fee for events operating within the RAS grounds.

Discussion

The fees to be considered cover the notification/registration of all food businesses operating, with the surveillance fee being set for varying lengths of events, these being –

- One day
- Two days
- Three days, and
- Four to eight days (for extended events such as the Caravan and Camping Show and the Perth Royal Show).

The proposal will allow RAS staff to confidently advise prospective vendors of all health fees, through the use of a co-branded application form and simplified fee structure.

Financial and Staff Implications

Following discussions with the RAS, under the proposed arrangement they will accept payment from vendors in regards to fees associated with notification/registration and surveillance attending events at the Showgrounds and will reimburse the Town within 14 days on receipt of an invoice. The proposed schedule would require a single invoice to be issued to the RAS. Furthermore the RAS staff shall co-ordinate all applications, ensuring that all aspects of the

applications are completed ensuring that all businesses are registered, therefore reducing administrative processing time and cost to the Town.

This is expected to reduce 'red tape' for all parties by removing additional layers of invoicing, and provide ease of processing payments requiring less officer time.

While the proposed fees will reduce the cost to a large percentage of vendors, it is recognised that a small percentage of vendors will have a small increase in fees. Table 1 illustrates the current fees.

Table 1: Current fee structure 2016-2017

Fee type	Current Fee
Registration	\$154.00
Notification	\$55.00
One day	\$35.00
Two days	\$70.00
Three days	\$105.00
Seven days	\$115.00
Eight days	\$150.00

The report recommends Council adopt a schedule of fees for temporary food vendors operating at the Royal Agricultural Society (RAS) Showground as outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Proposed fees table

New Schedule of Fees RAS temporary food vendor licences	Proposed Fee
Notification	\$55.00
One day	\$20.00
Two days	\$35.00
Three days	\$70.00
4-8 days capped	\$90.00

Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 21 June 2016, Resolution 96/16:

Part C – General Fees and Charges for 2016-17

Pursuant to section 6.16 of the Local Government Act 1995, the Fees and Charges detailed in the section titled 'Fees and Charges are adopted.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Food Act 2008.

Food Regulations 2009.

Town of Claremont Schedule of Fees and Charges 2016-2017.

Communication and Consultation

Nil.

Strategic Community Plan**Governance and Leadership**

We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.

- Focus on improved customer service, communication and consultation.
- Maintain long term financial stability and growth.

Urgency

There is a significant number of events that are to be held before the end of the Christmas/New Year festivities with a high number of temporary food vendors expected to attend. Applying the new fee schedule will allow for the RAS and the Town to be able to process applications expediently and provide a greater cohesive service, understanding of the fees required, and increase vendor confidence.

Voting Requirements

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF COUNCIL REQUIRED.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Tulloch

That Council adopt the schedule of fees for temporary food vendors operating at the Royal Agricultural Society Showgrounds as illustrated in Table 2 of the report.

**CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY(183/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

13.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

13.4.1 FRESHWATER BAY PRIMARY SCHOOL – TWO CHILDREN’S CROSSINGS

File Ref:	4682
Attachments:	Plan
Responsible Officer:	Saba Kirupanather Executive Manager Infrastructure
Author:	Nick King Manager Engineering Services
Proposed Meeting Date:	8 November 2016

Purpose

Report recommends Council not approve the two children’s crossings, requested by the Freshwater Bay Primary School.

Background

Freshwater Bay Primary School in March 2014 applied to the Children’s Crossing & Road Safety Committee (CC&RSC) to seek approval for two children’s crossings on Princess Road between Bay View Terrace and Chester Road, and Bay View Terrace between Park Lane and Princess Road.

Both of these approvals were conditionally endorsed by the Town of Claremont, noting that the Town could not commit any funds towards the design or construction of the children’s crossing if approved by the CC&RSC. This was due to the fact that the final approval would need to be given by Claremont Council.

No further action was taken once the final approval was given for both crossings, as Freshwater Bay Primary school changed Principal around this time.

The crossings were revisited in early 2016 when the administration was contacted by the School’s Principal at the time.

After discussions between the school and the Town’s officers, it was decided that due to the lapsed time since the approval, it was best to have another onsite meeting with the CC&RSC. The onsite meeting concluded that the school crossing on Princess Road was reaffirmed, and should be installed as soon as practicable once Council approval was given.

There was no further amendments to the proposed Bay View Terrace crossing, however it was confirmed that the original approval still stands. It is assumed the school is requesting a crossing at each location.

Discussion

Freshwater Bay Primary School in early 2014 applied for the two school crossings as it believed its students needed two safer crossing points to enter and exit school each day.

Both crossings were approved as Type A Children's crossings where for a primary school a minimum of 20 students and 200 vehicle movements occur within the hour immediately before and immediately after school.

Both of the proposed crossings are within school zones with a speed limit of 40km/hour during school times. The speed limit signs are now upgraded to electronic flashing speed zone signs.

The on road parking will be impacted near the crossing locations. The Town had concerns that loss of parking may have a significant negative effect on adjoining residents, business and school parent users.

The major impact for parking affects a shop on Princess Road, which is directly opposite the school crossing. With Main Roads WA approval, the Town is proposing to relax the parking restrictions outside of school times adjacent to the school crossing on Princess Road. This will mean that customers will still be able to park in front of the shop, outside the restricted school times of 7:30am-9:00am and 2:30pm-4:00pm.

The standard practice through all Children's Crossing installations around WA is that the local government approves the crossing locations in the road reserve approved by the CC&RSC and bears the whole cost of the design and installation, where Main Roads WA will maintain the infrastructure after installed, excluding the parking signage.

Council did not approve the children's crossing in Queenslea Drive outside Christ Church Grammar School although it was originally approved by the CC&RSC.

The 85th percentile speed in Princess Road (between Bay View Terrace and Chester Road) and in Bay View Terrace (between Princess Road and Park Lane) during school times are 43.9km/h and 47.8km/h respectively and in other times are 54.5km/h and 54.3km/h.

There are no reported accidents in the last five years in the above locations.

Primary school children should be accompanied by parents, especially when crossing the road. Parents and the school should educate and create more child awareness for road crossing.

Past Resolutions

Nil

Financial and Staff Implications

There is no budget provision for either proposed crossing. The school/ Education Department and/ or the P&C would have to pay for the design and construction unless the Council decides to allocate funds.

The preliminary cost estimate for both the crossings is \$50,000. The final cost estimate will only be known once the design is finalised.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Parking Local Law 2016, Main Roads WA standards,
A Parent's Guide to Kidsafe Roads 2011 edition - is a publication of the Child Accident Prevention Foundation of Australia (Kidsafe).

Communication / Consultation

Should Council approve the crossings and the method of funding resolved, notification will be undertaken with the affected residents and businesses.

Strategic Community Plan**Liveability**

Maintain and upgrade infrastructure for seamless day to day usage

Urgency

The school would like an early reply.

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Tulloch, seconded Cr Main**That Council**

- 1. Not approve the children's crossings in front of the Freshwater Bay Primary School in Princess Road (between Bay View Terrace and Chester Road) and in Bay View Terrace (between Princess Road and Park Lane) approved by the Children's Crossing & Road Safety Committee;**
- 2. Inform the Freshwater Bay Primary School and Children's Crossing & Road Safety Committee about the Council decision.**

**LOST
(ALL DISSENT)**

ALTERNATIVE MOTION**Moved Cr Goetze, seconded Cr Haynes****That Council**

- 1. Approve the children's crossing in front of the Freshwater Bay Primary School in Princess Rd (between Bay View Tce and Chester Rd) and in Bay View Tce (between Princess Rd and Park Lane) approved by the Children's Crossing & Road Safety Committee,**
- 2. Consider funding the crossing as part of the mid-year budget review;**
- 3. Inform the Freshwater Bay Primary School and Children's Crossing & Road Safety Committee about the Council decision.**
- 4. Request the school work with the Town to develop a Traffic Management Plan in time for the mid-year budget review.**

Reason: To provide crossings for primary school students to safely cross the roads to access the primary school.

**CARRIED(184/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

Items 13.4.2 to 13.4.3 were carried en bloc.

13.4.2 LEVELS OF SERVICE IN PARKS AND RESERVES

File Ref: PRK/00240
Attachments: [Town of Claremont current levels of service Parks](#)
Responsible Officer: Saba Kirupanather
Executive Manager Infrastructure
Author: Andrew Head
Manager Parks and Environment
Proposed Meeting Date: 15 November 2016

Purpose

For Council to receive a report on the current levels of service (LOS) in parks and reserves within the Town of Claremont.

Background

The Town has a number of well used parks and reserves. Budgets are allocated based on current levels of service at each location.

The Town has an annual maintenance program to schedule and monitor the works, undertake financial tracking of activities, and to extrapolate the financial impact of changes in the LOS should it be requested.

Discussion

Levels of service are determined by feedback received from the community during public consultation for various strategic documents such as the Claremont Ahead 2023. Where possible, efficiencies are reviewed and adjusted to ensure the cost of operations doesn't significantly impact budgets, and technologies are introduced to increase capacity and reduce cost. An example being the central controlled reticulation system found in many of the parks and reserves in the Town which reduces the demand during inspections and assists with finding faults.

LOS of tree, turf, and garden management have a direct correlation on expenditure. Presentation standards can be improved through greater expenditure however the level of service is determined by the patronage and type of reserve. The biggest contributor to cost on operating expenses is turf and water management.

Turf Watering

The volume and the quality of the water can improve turf quality. The cost to maintain can vary significantly depending on a number of factors. Some of the considerations include; limitations to water supply, mowing frequency, renovation regime and weed control program.

Under our groundwater license we are able to water three days a week, to a maximum of 750mm of irrigation over the area watered annually. This restricts the amount of water which can be applied during the forty weeks of approved irrigation

scheduling. There is very little surplus water to accommodate additional watering. Nutrient applications need to be increased to match the leaching triggered by additional watering.

The groundwater quality in some parks is quite poor due to saltwater intrusion. This is a limiting factor to turf performance, particularly in the Swanbourne locality. The only way to improve the quality in the short term would be to change water supply in those locations. This would require either very expensive water treatment plants and/or converting irrigation systems to scheme water. The cost for scheme water would be close to \$3 per kilolitre for supply, which equates to \$21,500 per hectare. Currently there is over 8.7ha of affected reserves which would result in annual costs for water increasing by \$187,000.

This does not include the replacement of irrigation systems which would require modification or replacement to match supply pressures. These costs would be approximately \$30,000 per hectare or \$261,000 over the affected sites.

Each year we undertake bore pressure and flow tests to determine performance and wear of the pump and bore. This helps extend the life of the bores and reduces the likelihood of unplanned failure. This activity costs the Town around \$10,000 each year.

Turf Fertilising

With every application of nutrient, the demand increases for water as does mowing frequency. As turf growth is forced the nutrient balance requires adjustment through trace element applications. To ensure the correct nutrients are being applied, testing should occur prior to the selection and application.

Many active sportsgrounds are fed on a two monthly basis to maximise growth rate of turf to aid recovery and dense grass cover. This increases demands for mowing, irrigation, renovation and weed control.

Currently the Town undertakes annual nutrient soil and tissue tests to determine the blend and application rates of an appropriate turf fertiliser. Fertiliser is applied in spring to maximise efficacy of the application. An additional application would increase cost annually by nearly \$20,000 and increase demand on water and mowing requirements and therefore increase those costs. So real increase in costs includes the fertilising cost, the additional water, additional mowing required to compliment the increased growth rates expected following an application of fertiliser and renovation to remove thatch build up as a result of forcing turf growth. These costs are shown elsewhere in the report.

Turf Mowing

Currently the Town mows all irrigated parks at a fortnightly interval. These are all passive parks and the active reserves are all leased to various clubs. We allow all clippings to fall back onto the ground to allow composting of the clippings which returns organic matter and nutrients to the surface soils; this in turn reduces the need for more frequent fertiliser applications.

Increasing mowing to weekly intervals would improve turf quality but would increase operating costs by approximately \$120,000 in mowing costs alone. Additionally we

would need to increase irrigation inspections to weekly to ensure all damaged sprinklers are replaced after each mowing service, which would increase the cost by around \$110,000 each year not including the cost of parts.

Changing the specification to include the removal of grass clippings from the site would reduce the number of weeds found in the turf but also increase the nutrient and water demands and thus impact costs in a number of areas.

Turf Renovation

Turf renovation involves a number of different techniques to de-compact and de-thatch the turf sward. Currently the Town does this only when there is an identified problem. This type of work has only been undertaken in a few selected locations including the Foreshore reserve and at Lake Claremont. This is in part due to cost, but mainly due to the low demand placed on our turf areas due to use and wear.

Scarifying is done to remove thatch, reduce sponginess, activate new turf growth, remove mature weeds. It is done prior to sanding and levelling uneven surfaces. Spiking or shattering the soil will improve water penetration but it will increase water demand.

Coring or drilling is done to remove thatch and mat layer. This is done on active sport turf to improve water penetration and de-compact the soil prior to sanding which in turn improves growth rates and longer term turf health.

Some considerations when undertaking renovation include; providing adequate supervision during operations to ensure park user safety, correct marking of ground services such as sprinklers and power cable locations, the additional water required during recovery of renovated areas and biggest cost which is the contractor hire which includes removal of waste material. Cost can vary between \$2,000 and \$8,000 per hectare (sanding brings up cost by \$6,000 a hectare). With over 33 hectares of suitable areas for renovation this annual cost would be as high as \$264,000.

Renovation removes plant/organic matter and this means that additional fertiliser must be applied to replace the removed or extracted potential nutrients. All renovation requires significant increase in irrigation application to aid recovery

Weed Control

Weeds are currently treated annually in spring with a selective weed killer to remove bindii, caltrop, clover, cape daisy and other broadleaf weeds which can create problems for park users. Treatment is applied in late September as many broadleaf weeds will germinate from early April and continue to germinate into October. By undertaking the single application in late September, the efficacy of the application is maximised without the need for multiple applications. This is only applied to areas near playgrounds and open grassed areas where children often walk barefoot.

Winter grass is not treated in Claremont as it only grows in areas where grass is shaded, poor performing and only occurs in cooler weather. By October the winter grass will die off in the heat and not be an issue again until May.

Summer and autumn doesn't produce the weed load seen during the winter and spring months so warm season treatments are not undertaken.

Park Tree Management

Tree management needs to be undertaken to address risk mitigation, tree health and access issues. Currently the Town undertakes annual large tree inspections and the works recommended in those reports. Other trees get work undertaken once deadwood becomes a diameter of concern (>50mm) or if foliage grows low and impacts irrigation and/or mowing operations. These works equate to \$74,000 per year. Mulching of collected branches from around the Town is undertaken at Lake Claremont. This material is used throughout the Town to reduce weed load and water loss in natural areas and public gardens, this activity saves large amounts on purchasing of mulches and disposal of green waste. This mulching costs the Town around \$22,000 a year and saves the Town over \$10,000 in tip fees and over \$20,000 in materials for mulching.

Garden Maintenance

Gardens are maintained a various frequencies depending on location and landscape type. Most parks are serviced on a monthly basis. This includes weed control, pruning, litter collection and path cleaning. To increase these garden services to fortnightly would cost around \$220,000. Each mulching service costs over \$58,000. To increase this service would not be possible without having to purchase the additional mulch which would add another \$20,000 in materials.

Conversely reducing the frequency to six or eight weekly would result in far lower presentation standards as many weeds would flower and set seed at those lower frequencies.

Furniture Maintenance

BBQ's are cleaned weekly using a chemical free hot water cleaning process. All hotplates are cleaned, units are wiped over and grease blocks replaced. More frequent cleaning is not required due to the low level of patronage. Current costs are around \$8,000 across town. Reducing the cleaning frequency of the BBQ's would result in similar costs as the clean required becomes more difficult.

Tables, chairs and benches are washed on a needs basis to remove dirt, food grime and bird droppings. Programmed cleaning is not necessary as often these are reasonably clean year round, many are placed outside of tree canopy lines to reduce bird droppings and sap staining and others are built with canopies to shelter the table surface.

Playground Maintenance

All playgrounds are checked by a suitably qualified playground inspector on a weekly basis to check for any faults or hazards. This service is high value for low cost to the Town. Very few faults are reported to the Town now that proactive checks are undertaken. This has also extended the life of the equipment by reducing wear and tear issues. This services annually costs the Town around \$25,000 to inspect all playgrounds in parks. Faulty items are replaced or repaired to minimise hazards identified by the community and ensure the equipment is back to good working order as soon as possible.

On an annual basis all playgrounds within the Town are audited for condition and compliance to standards. This report assists in prioritisation of replacement of each

piece of equipment. This costs the Town around \$3,000 a year to undertake this program.

All playgrounds have sand soft fall in them. This requires sieving to be undertaken quarterly (Each school holidays) to remove grass, leaves, twigs, glass or any other hazards. This redistributes the sand around the pit to correct levels to ensure child safety within the play area. This sand is also another play element in the pit which many children get hours of fun out of. This service costs over \$18,000 over the year.

To replace this sand with rubber soft fall has many factors which need to be considered. Rubber soft fall is very expensive to install with costs starting at \$150 per square metre. In sunny locations rubber has the ability to heat up to very hot temperatures which can burn young feet. Rubber becomes compacted when sand enters the rubber profile, with the only way to correct this is to replace the rubber. While rubber can improve accessibility of playgrounds for mobility challenged people, the use of rubber in playgrounds increases the chance of broken bones for young people as a result of a fall compared to soft sand. Clear separation between rubber and sand is required to extend the life of both products.

We have one playground with shade sails which costs around \$1500 a year to install and take down each season. We need to consider the replacement sails which need to be renewed every ten years for a cost of around \$3,000 a year or \$30,000 every ten years. Most other playgrounds within the Town are situated in natural shade for all or part of the day.

Bin collections and dog bags

All bins within parks are emptied from one to five times a week, depending on location. In locations of very high demand where daily emptying is required additional bins are installed. All park bins located near park entries have dog bag holders on them; these are topped up weekly to ensure park users have access to dog bags in every park.

Bins are cleaned out with phenols at the end of each winter to ensure the bins smell clean during the warmer weather. The enclosures are cleaned on a need basis and locks are serviced annually to make sure bins enclosures are secure.

Past Resolutions

Nil

Financial and Staff Implications

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Local Government Act 1995

Waterwise Council

Lake Claremont Management Plan 2010

Claremont Ahead 2023

Communication / Consultation

Nil

Strategic Community Plan

Liveability

We are an accessible community, with well maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.

- Clean, usable, attractive, accessible streetscapes and public open spaces.
- Develop the public realm as gathering spaces for participation and enjoyment.
- Maintain and upgrade infrastructure for seamless day to day usage.
- Provide a responsible and well managed urban environment, with sustainable development outcomes.

People

We live in an accessible and safe community that welcomes diversity, enjoys being active and has a strong sense of belonging.

- Maintain, effectively manage and enhance the Town's community facilities in response to a growing community.
- Create opportunities for and access to social participation and inclusion in support of community health and well being.
- Develop a strategy for services and facilities for an ageing population.
- Improve the capacity of local community groups.

Environment

We are a leader in responsibly managing the build and natural environment for the enjoyment of the community and continue to provide sustainable, leafy green parks, streets and outdoor spaces.

- Strive for innovative environmental design practices in new developments and redevelopments.
- Constantly seek and implement best options for waste management and water usage.
- Provide education and communication on leading practices to the community.
- Implement sound environmental practices as reflected in the WESROC Climate Change Risk Assessment Project.

Governance and Leadership

We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.

- Maintain long term financial stability and growth.
- Provide responsive and responsible leadership.

Urgency

Low

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards

That Council supports the current levels of service being provided in parks, reserves and open space within the Town.

**CARRIED(185/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

13.4.3 TOWN WIDE WEED MANAGEMENT UPDATE

File Ref:	ENV/00048
Responsible Officer:	Saba Kirupanather Executive Manager Infrastructure
Author:	Jackie Parker Supervisor Parks and Environment
Proposed Meeting Date:	01 November 2016

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to Council on the current weed control practices across the Town of Claremont.

Background

The management of weeds across the Town has operated in much the same way for many years. In more recent times, some improvements have been implemented to limit the use of chemical weed control, allowing the Town to move towards an integrated approach to weed management.

In May 2016, for the first time the Town advertised a tender for weed control (Town-wide). The contract was awarded under a single contractor arrangement. The contract comprises all major weed control applications including kerb lines, foot paths, laneways, verges, natural areas, sumps and median islands.

Within this tender, the Town invited alternative submissions to be made. This would have allowed for treatment methods other than chemical control. No alternative tender submissions were received, likely due to the high costs associated with alternative methods.

Additional weed control activities to those in the new contract are undertaken by the Town's mowing contractor and horticultural contractor within various parks and streetscapes. These activities comprise chemical control as well as hand weeding.

Discussion

Integrated weed management refers to an approach of utilising various methods in an attempt to successfully control weeds. A quality integrated weed management approach is considered to be industry best practice. How organisations/land managers choose to undertake quality integrated weed management differs widely.

Currently within the Town, kerb lines, footpaths, laneways, verges, natural areas, sumps and median islands receive regular chemical weed control. This is undertaken when weather conditions are suitable, this includes wind direction and speed, rainfall, temperature and time of day. The Town requires the contractors to follow the WA Health Guidelines for Application of Pesticides in Public Places. The Town's contract specification requires the following to ensure public safety;

- Place signage around site advising patrons of application
 - Signage must remain in place until such time as chemical has dried
 - Signage must show type of chemical applied
-

- A dye is used to indicate where the chemical has been applied
- Most appropriate chemical to be selected
- Times are selected to minimise exposure to any patron by prioritising areas of high traffic during early hours to avoid conflict
- Weather conditions are suitable
- Minimise application quantities through regular application at critical times

Within some natural areas (Lake Claremont, Mackenzie Bushland and the Foreshore) volunteer and paid hand weeding occurs. The Friends of Lake Claremont make a significant contribution in reducing chemical use at Lake Claremont through thousands of volunteer hours spent hand weeding each year. Periodically, the Town pays for hand weeding to occur along the foreshore to remove Kikuyu from the reeds.

The below table captures the Town's current weed control methods, suitable applications, advantages and disadvantages.

Method	Application	Advantages	Disadvantages
Regular Chemical Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerb lines • Footpaths • Laneways • Verges • Natural Areas • Sumps • Median Islands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost effective • Time efficient • Highly effective at controlling weeds • When spot sprayed there is limited chemical applied • Able to be applied in most weather conditions • Low impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health concerns • Potential longer term effects/residues
Hand Weeding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Areas • Verges • Median Islands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical free • Highly effective at controlling weeds • Hand weeding able to be undertaken in all weather conditions • Targeted control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time consuming • High financial cost • Large manual labour component • Involves removing weed bags from site and putting in landfill • Not all weeds can be effectively hand weeded (eg. Oxalis, couch) • Disturbs soil which activates weed germination and increases erosion risk
Landscaping by planting densely to smother weeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verges • Median Islands • Sumps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractive • Reduces large portion of weeds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires some weed management • Requires horticultural maintenance and management
Mulching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires some weed

open areas to smother weeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median Islands • Natural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces medium portion of weeds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires maintenance
Installing fences and paths to reduce soil disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less need for chemical use due to lower weed germination • Formal access reduces damage to surrounding areas from trampling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost for initial installation and ongoing maintenance • Impedes permeability in natural areas.

The below table identifies alternative weed control methods, suitable applications, advantages and disadvantages.

Method	Application	Advantages	Disadvantages
Steam weeding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerb lines • Footpaths • Laneways • Median Islands (unplanted) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical free 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kills beneficial soil bacteria, fungi and animals found in the surface soil/ mulch layer (therefore not suitable for natural areas and verges except when being initially treated prior to a revegetation project) • Adds moisture to the soil which can stimulate weed germination, particularly in paved areas which increases new germination • Emits diesel fumes from generator which are known to be carcinogenic • Can produce large steam clouds which can impact road safety/visibility • Hoses will damage other plants by being dragged over them so unsuitable in natural areas
Thermal weeding (burning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerb lines • Footpaths • Laneways • Median Islands (unplanted) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical free • Moderately time efficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to generate public concern • Unsuitable for most areas due to smoke and non selective • Unable to use as target control • Likely to leave burn marks

			on surfaces or damage infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of fire spread
Acid treatment (such as Pelargonic Acid)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerb lines • Footpaths • Laneways • Verges • Natural Areas • Sumps • Median Islands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time efficient • Cost effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little known about effectiveness • Many unapproved for use in public areas (not yet certified) • Unknown health impacts and environmental impacts • Questionable availability

Further information on the weed control methods listed in the tables above can be found in the City of Joondalup Draft Weed Management Plan 2016, available here: <http://www.joondalup.wa.gov.au/files/councilmeetings/2016/Attach5brf160913.pdf>

Limitations

When considering the information presented in the two tables above, many limitations exist when presenting specific information relevant to a broad context. These limitations are explained below and must be considered with the information within this report.

- Seasonal (and yearly) variation of weeds and growth patterns can vary largely, significantly impacting on the information provided within this report;
- Not all control methods listed above are effective in controlling all weed species across the Town;
- The weeds affecting the majority of infrastructure assets (eg: footpaths and kerb lines) cannot be effectively controlled by all methods (eg: hand weeding);
- Many of the alternative control methods outside of natural areas would require traffic management to ensure safety of personnel/public therefore adding an additional large cost;
- Many of the alternative control methods presented in this report are unapproved for use in public areas due to safety and unknown impacts (both environmental and health related);
- The Department of Health does not currently support the public use of acid treatment products; and
- Available research on steam weeding and thermal weeding is presented within farming or broad acre settings, rather than in urban environments. Limited local trials have been undertaken (including in Joondalup and Nedlands), during which it was noted that the steam control was inferior to chemical control, had limited effectiveness on woody weeds and grasses, was more costly and failed to provide any long term control.

Past Resolutions

There are no past resolutions relating to this report.

Financial and Staff Implications

A change in weed control methods would have significant financial and staff implications.

The following table was prepared in consultation with a weed control operator, shows estimated costs associated with the nominated weed control methods. While it is hard to estimate the likely cost of each treatment type across the Town's different applications, the below table is an estimation for each treatment type across 100m² assuming a contractor is already fully equipped and is being paid per treatment. The estimation is based on an average treatment undertaken as if on a monthly basis on a typical mulched verge.

Method	Cost (per 100m ²)	Estimated Annual Cost
Chemical control	\$10	\$150,000
Hand weeding	\$120	\$1,800,000
Landscaping (dense planting)	\$60	\$900,000
Mulching	\$60	\$900,000
Steam weeding	\$30	\$450,000
Thermal weeding	\$30	\$450,000
Acid treatment	\$15	\$225,000

Note: Assuming 150ha of weed control is undertaken in the Town. Weed control undertaken under the current tender by the Town comes to approximately \$150,000 per year.

Strategic Community Plan

Liveability

We are an accessible community, with well maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.

- Clean, usable, attractive, accessible streetscapes and public open spaces.
- Develop the public realm as gathering spaces for participation and enjoyment.
- Provide a responsible and well managed urban environment, with sustainable development outcomes.

Environment

We are a leader in responsibly managing the build and natural environment for the enjoyment of the community and continue to provide sustainable, leafy green parks, streets and outdoor spaces.

- Provide education and communication on leading practices to the community.

Urgency

N/A

Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards

That Council

- 1. Receives the information presented in this report outlining current weed control practices within the Town.**
- 2. Notes the Town's measured approach to Integrated Weed Management.**
- 3. Endorses continuation of the current weed control practices without change.**

**CARRIED(185/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON

Mayor Barker reported on his attendance at the Remembrance Day ceremony and Seniors Cruise event.

Cr Tulloch reported on the success of Bay View Terrace since the development upgrade.

Cr Goetze and Cr Main reported on their attendance at the International Cities Town Centres Conference in Tasmania.

Cr Browne reported on his attendance at the Remembrance Day ceremony, Seniors Cruise event, and a meeting he attended in company of Crs Tulloch and Goetze with Christ Church Grammar School representatives. The meeting was at the instigation of the school and there was no discussion about items on the Council agenda.

15 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**15.1.1 REVOCATION OF RESOLUTION 174/16 – CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL - APPROVAL OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPORT PLAN**

File Ref: GVN00057
Supporting Elected Members: Cr Haynes
Cr Paul Kelly
Cr Chris Mews
Cr Alastair Tulloch
Proposed Meeting Date 15 November 2016

Purpose

I hereby give notice of a motion to be considered at the ordinary council meeting of 15 November 2016 to revoke resolution 174/16 carried at Special Council Meeting of 25 October 2016:

REVOCATION OF MOTION

That Council revoke resolution 174/16 carried at Special Council Meeting of 25 October 2016:

Reason:

1. To enable Councillors absent from a Special Meeting to consider the matter if they wish to do so, and
2. To enable all Councillors to consider the matter in the light of the subsequent refusal to support the Development Application with which this matter was related.

CEO Comment

The Notice of Motion is supported by Cr Kelly, Cr Tulloch and Cr Mews. This meets the requirements of s.5.25 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, requiring support of four (1/3 of all offices) members.

The Notice was received on Monday 7 November 2016 which meets the seven clear days requirement to be considered at 15 November 2016 meeting.

The applicants have since requested a review of the determination with the State Administrative Tribunal. As a result, and in accordance with s.26 of the *State Administrative Act 2004*, Council is now unable to consider the Notice of Revocation Motion unless the applicant agrees, which has not been sought or expected to be given.

The motion lapsed for want of a mover due to the pending SAT review.

15.1.2 CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPORT PLAN

File Ref: A-2929
Moved: Cr Haynes
Proposed Meeting Date 15 November 2016

That

1. Council require Christ Church Grammar School (CCGS) to prepare a Traffic Management and Transport Plan that specifies
 - a) targets to be achieved
 - b) actions by CCGS to achieve those targets
 - c) actions by third parties
 - d) timeframes for actions
 - e) reporting process on actions and outcomes.
2. The Traffic Management and Transport Plan be presented to Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting 7 March 2017.

Reason: To ensure the school has a Traffic Management and Transport Plan as required by resolutions 81/12 and 22/14.

CEO Comment

This motion, proposed to replace resolution 174/16 which is subject of revocation motion at 15.1.1, cannot proceed as the revocation motion cannot proceed.

The motion lapsed for want of a mover due to the pending SAT review.

15.1.3 PROPOSAL TO SEEK LEGAL ADVICE ON PROSECUTING CHRIST CHURCH GRAMMAR SCHOOL FOR BREACH OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION CONDITIONS

File Ref: LEG/00112
Moved: Cr Mews
Proposed Meeting Date 15 November 2016

That Council direct the Chief Executive Officer to seek advice from McLeods regarding prosecution of Christ Church Grammar School for the breach of the Town's planning approval, granted by resolution 22/14 on 18 February 2014, by increasing the school's student numbers to greater than 1600 as approved.

Reasons:

1. Council approved the application for alterations to the chapel in good faith despite being concerned about the traffic and parking issues at the school.
2. The previous approval by the Council of the School's R Block development clearly restricted the student numbers to 1600 – until a traffic management and transport plan had been prepared by the school and to the satisfaction of the Town.
3. Christ Church Grammar School increased numbers to 1650 in clear contravention of the development condition because there is still no suitable plan.
4. The traffic management and transport plan prepared by the School is inadequate and unsuitable and neither addresses existing traffic issues nor provides real measures for future improvements.
5. A suitable traffic management and transport plan should include measurable and verifiable proposals to improve the existing traffic problems directly caused by the operation of the school before any additional problems are caused.

CEO comment

- 1 Council set an approval condition limiting the student numbers at 1600 when approving the alterations to the school chapel (Resolution 22/14 of OCM 18 February 2014).
 2. The Christ Church Grammar School (CCGS) acted on the development approval and has completed the development.
 3. Statements and submissions by CCGS state that current student numbers are 1650.
 4. On the face of it this indicates a breach of the planning conditions has occurred.
 5. The *Planning and Development Act 2005* provides at Section 218(c) that a person who
commences, continues or carries out any such development which is required to comply with a planning scheme otherwise than in accordance with any condition imposed under this Act or the scheme with respect to the development, or otherwise fails to comply with any such condition, commits an offence.
-

6. Section 223 provides, where an offence is committed under the Act, a general penalty of \$200,000 and for a continuing offence an additional daily penalty of \$25,000. It is atypical for the maximum penalty be awarded by the Court.
7. No legal advice has been obtained about the apparent offence at this time.
8. Notwithstanding attempts to negotiate a TMTP which would satisfy the 2014 planning condition CCGS or/and its consultants have not met the requirements of the planning approval and have increased student numbers.
9. The school also plans to add more students (to a total of 1800) with continuing dispute over the suitability of the submitted TMTP – and which the school has referred to SAT although it was quite unclear after listening to the school's consultants submissions to the JDAP on 8 November if that referral is about the 2014 application or the current application.

Item 15.1.3 was withdrawn by Cr Mews.

**16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON
PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING**

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Moved Cr Mews, seconded Mayor Barker

That Council give condolences to the family of Morris Fisher.

**CARRIED(186/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

MOTION TO CLOSE DOORS

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Main

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That in accordance with Section 5.23 (2) of the Local Government Act 1995 the meeting is closed to members of the public with the following aspects of the Act being applicable to these matterS:

- (a) A matter affecting an employee or employees.
- (c) A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

**CARRIED(187/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

Mayor Barker adjourned the meeting at 7:48PM.

Mayor Barker reconvened the meeting at 7:49PM.

Mayor Barker

Cr Peter Browne

West Ward

Cr Peter Edwards

West Ward

Cr Chris Mews

South Ward

Cr Jill Goetze

South Ward

Cr Bruce Haynes

East Ward

Cr Kate Main

East Ward

Cr Alastair Tulloch

East Ward

Mr Stephen Goode (Chief Executive Officer)

Mr Les Crichton (Executive Manager Corporate and Governance)

Mr David Vinicombe (Executive Manager Planning and Development)

Mr Saba Kirupanather (Executive Manager Infrastructure)

Ms Liz Ledger (Executive Manager People and Places)

Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)

17.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**17.1.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT**

File Ref: PER/00307
Responsible Officer: Stephen Goode
Chief Executive Officer
Author: Stephen Goode
Chief Executive Officer
Proposed Meeting Date: 15 November 2016

Purpose

The following item was considered in closed session.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That in accordance with Section 5.23 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* the meeting is closed to members of the public with the following aspect of the Act being applicable to this matter:

- (a) A matter affecting an employee or employees.
- (c) A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

17.2 INFRASTRUCTURE**17.2.2 STANDARD PAYMENT RATES FOR GROUND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS**

File Ref: CRD/00021
Responsible Officer: Saba Kirupanather
Executive Manager Infrastructure
Author: Andrew Head
Manager Parks and Environment
Proposed Meeting Date: 15 November 2016

Purpose

The following item was considered in closed session.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That in accordance with Section 5.23 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* the meeting is closed to members of the public with the following aspects of the Act being applicable to this matter:

(c) A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

PUBLIC RECOMMENDATION/COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Main

That the officer reports and motions passed behind closed doors remain confidential except as required to implement the Council decisions.

**CARRIED(192/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

MOTION TO OPEN DOORS

Moved Cr Edwards, seconded Cr Goetze

That the doors be opened.

**CARRIED(193/16)
(NO DISSENT)**

The doors opened at 8:33PM.

THE MAYOR READ ALOUD THE RESOLUTION MADE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS.

18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

Ordinary Council Meeting, 13 December 2016, at 7:00PM.

Annual General Meeting of Electors, 14 December 2016, at 6:00PM.

19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING

There being no further business, the presiding member declared the meeting closed at 8:35 pm.

Confirmed this day of 2016.

PRESIDING MEMBER