



City of Belmont
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

15 APRIL 2002

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	OFFICIAL OPENING.....	1
2.	APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1
2.1	APOLOGIES.....	1
2.2	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	1
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	2
4.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)	5
5.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	7
5.1	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING.....	7
5.1.1	Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	7
5.1.2	Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	9
5.1.3	Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	10
5.1.4	Ms Lorraine Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale	10
5.2	QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING	11
5.2.1	Mr Michael J Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	11
5.2.2	Mr Michael J Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	13
5.2.3	Mr P Hitt, Belmont Residents and Ratepayers Association (85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale)	13
5.2.4	Mr Jonathan Bass, 77 Keymer Street, Belmont.....	15

15 APRIL 2002

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
5.3	QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.....	16
5.3.1	Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone	16
5.3.2	Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone	16
5.3.3	Mr Mark Treadwell, 15 St. Kilda Road, Rivervale	17
5.3.4	Mr Norman Arber, 6 Spencer Court, Redcliffe	17
5.3.5	Mr Clive Coombs, 317 Wright Street, Cloverdale	17
5.3.6	Mr Quentin Bailey, 31 Keane Street, Kewdale	18
5.3.7	Mr Brad Wicks, 28 Peachey Avenue, Kewdale	18
5.3.8	Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone	18
6.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	19
6.1	ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 25 TH MARCH 2002	19
7.	QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)	19
8.	PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS	20
8.1	BELMONT CRICKET CLUB – ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AT PEET PARK	20
9.	BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	21
9.1.1	OCM 25 th March 2002 – Item 11.3.1 Withdrawn Item 8.1.1 (Policy Manual Review)	21
10.	CORRESPONDENCE	21
10.1	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	21
10.2	GENERAL.....	21
10.3	LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE.....	21
11.	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES	22
11.1	SPECIAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 26 MARCH 2002	22
11.2	WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 8 APRIL 2002	22
11.2.1	Withdrawn Item 8.2.1 – Crossover – 24 Reen Street, Kewdale	23
11.2.2	Withdrawn Item 8.2.5 – 2002/2003 Draft Footpath Construction Program	24
11.2.3	Withdrawn Item 8.3.1 – Tender 03/2002 – Goodwood Parade Boat Ramp	24
11.2.4	Withdrawn Item 8.4.3 – Traffic Movement in Belmont City Centre	25
11.2.5	Withdrawn Item 8.4.4 – Extension of Water Ski Area at Goodwood Parade	25

15 APRIL 2002

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
11.3	ADMINISTRATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 9 APRIL 2002	25
11.3.1	Withdrawn Item 8.1.3 – Centenary Park Reserve	26
11.3.2	Withdrawn Item 8.2.2 – Committee Meeting – Meals	27
11.3.3	Withdrawn Item 8.4.1- Local Law Review – Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law	27
11.3.4	Withdrawn Item 8.4.6 - Three (3) Dog Application – 47 Trink Street, Cloverdale – Ms C Tassone	28
11.3.5	– Withdrawn Item 8.5.2 – City of Belmont Code of Conduct	28
12.	REPORTS OF OFFICERS	29
12.1	INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS	29
12.1.1	Local Government News: Issue 12:02 – 22 March 2002	30
12.1.2	Local Government News: Issue 13:02 – 28 March 2002	30
12.1.3	Local Government News: Issue 14:02 – 05 April 2002	30
12.2	STATE SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA CONSULTATION PAPER**	31
13.	REPORTS OF DELEGATES	33
13.1	PIONEERS AFTERNOON TEA - 6 APRIL 2002	33
13.2	MAYOR’S REPORT - AUTUMN RIVER FESTIVAL GARVEY PARK 7 APRIL 2002	34
13.3	2002 SKATE EXTREME FEST SERIES – CR GODSELL	35
14.	URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION	36
15.	MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED	36
16.	CLOSURE	36

ATTACHMENTS:

****Attachments 1, 2 & 3 – Item 12.2 refers**

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE, 215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE, ON MONDAY, 15 APRIL 2002, COMMENCING AT 7.34PM

PRESENT

Cr P R Passeri, JP	West Ward
Cr M H Blair	Central Ward
Cr G Dornford	Central Ward
Cr M C Godsell	Central Ward
Cr G Doney	West Ward
Cr M M Bass	East Ward
Cr G J Godfrey	East Ward
Cr P Marks	East Ward
Cr A P Murfin, OAM, JP	South Ward
Cr E Teasdale	South Ward
Cr J Powell	South Ward

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr N Hartley	Acting Chief Executive Officer
Mr R Lutey	Director - Engineering
Mr S Cole	Director – Corporate Services
Mr R Garrett	Manager – Financial Services
Mr P Clarke	Acting Manager – Administrative Services

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were 36 members of the public and one member of the press (Southern Gazette) present.

1. OFFICIAL OPENING

The Mayor opened the meeting and welcomed those in attendance.

2. APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE

2.1 APOLOGIES

Nil

2.2 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Richardson

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Passeri declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Doney declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Powell declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Godfrey declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Murfin declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Marks declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Teasdale declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Godsell declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Councillor Richardson declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

Item 3 – Continued...

Councillor Blair declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she attends numerous committee meetings and stays for the meal. *

The Acting Chief Executive Officer declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he is required to attend numerous committee meetings and is expected to stay for the meal.

(* The Minister for Local Government has granted by way of a letter dated 5 April, an exemption to the above Councillors under Section 5.69 of the Local Government Act in order that they may participate in the debate and vote on this matter.)

The Acting Chief Executive Officer declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Marks declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Passeri declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Blair declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Doney declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Item 3 – Continued...

Cr Dornford declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Murfin declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Godfrey declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Councillor Dornford declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that it is a matter concerning meals.

Cr Bass declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that it could be read into this Code of Conduct that she, as a Councillor, may have a financial interest.

Cr Powell declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Godsell declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Teasdale declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he may be the recipient of a gift, reward or benefit.

Cr Bass declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.3 (Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that she has a financial interest in meals.

Councillor Dornford declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.2 (Item 8.4.3 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting minutes dated 8 April 2002). The nature of the interest being that he is the owner of property which is located close to the city centre.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Mayor advised that he was in receipt of correspondence from the Western Australian Local Government Association advising that Cr Glenys Godfrey had been appointed as a representative on the Western Australian Local Government Superannuation Board. The Mayor and Councillors expressed their congratulations in the appropriate manner.

The Mayor then made the following statement:

"I have been asked by several people as to the recently published proposal for a race track on airport land and what action the City is proposing, relative to this development. I would like to provide a response at this forum so that all Councillors are aware of the situation, if they should be asked a similar question from a member of the community.

1. In regard to the concept of the proposal, the idea is at this stage just that, a concept, and no formal application has been made to Westralia Airports Corporation. The only information available at this stage is the information the promoters have included in their website media statement (a copy of which has been forwarded to Councillors recently). The statement includes a plan that depicts a formula one race track complete with pit garages, corporate boxes, control tower and so forth. According to the developers, the overall construction of the circuit including grandstand will cost about \$30 million. I understand that they have indicated that they wish to schedule a race for February 2003, although in reality, this is not even remotely possible.

Westralia Airports have confirmed that no formal proposal has been received regarding the racetrack and should any proposal be received it would have to follow the development approval process and would require significant consultation with all stakeholders.

2. Whilst Westralia Airports Corporation have confirmed that there is no current formal proposal for a racetrack, should one be received it will be required to go through strenuous assessment procedures. If this project is pursued however, there is a real concern regarding the potential of such a proposal to impact on residents within Belmont and other near surrounding communities. Key impacts that may arise as the result of such a proposal relate to noise generated by racecars and the impacts of development on the environment generally. The City of Belmont has been working hard with a number of agencies to address noise impacts from the existing operations of the airport and would be looking very closely at issues of noise generation if a formal proposal is eventually lodged.

Item 4 – Continued...

3. If a formal development proposal is received by Westralia Airports Corporation, it will need to follow a formal environmental assessment procedure. Whilst there has been some talk in the media that the developers have claimed all approvals will be in place by June 2002, this is not possible given the length of time of the consultation process and the assessment that must then be carried out of the submissions lodged.

Westralia Airports have indicated that a report must be produced which includes financial, social and environmental impact studies. That then has to go out for public comment for three months, including assessment by Council's and State Government. After that it has to go to Canberra for final approval by the Federal Minister for Transport and Regional Services. It is estimated that that process will take a minimum of nine to twelve months.

4. Without a formal development proposal with all requisite information provided, it is premature to anticipate Council's likely response, however Council will be looking very closely at any potential adverse impacts on its residents and will be keeping any potentially affected parts of the community informed.

Further to the above information, the Mayor advised that he had attended a Group meeting of the Perth Airport Municipalities Group and the above matter was discussed with the Group recommending that a letter be forwarded to the proposed Developers advising that their web-site provides incorrect and misleading information and should be adjusted accordingly."

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

5.1 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING

5.1.1 Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

Mr Ryan asked the following question at the Council meeting held on 25th February 2002, which was taken on notice. Mr Ryan's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 8 March 2002, and the response was included as item 5.1.4 of the 11th March 2002 Council minutes (see details below).

Why does Council continue to accept and publish the nett return per square metre to landowners in Cell 3 of The Springs as \$328, when the nett return is only \$221M². A figure confirmed by Urban Focus to Council in a response to questions as put by a landowner in Cell 3.

For the record, \$328M² is calculated by dividing the nett area of Cell 3 (after roads and reserves are deducted) into the estimated nett surplus. This is simply incorrect and misleading. The correct way to calculate the nett return per M² is to divide the "Estimated Nett Return" by the gross area of the cell.

Thanks but no thanks, to the invitation to meet with the City's consultants.

We understand and accept Mr Ryan's suggestion that the calculation of net return per m² based on the gross area of the Cell could provide an indicative net return, but only if the valuations, on a m² basis, of all the properties within each cell were of a similar amount.

It is our Consultant's view, supported by substantial landowner contention that some properties within each cell, because of their position or outlook could attract a valuation of very significantly more than other properties within each cell. Therefore a calculation on an area basis could be quite misleading.

We reiterate that the actual calculation of net return to each landowner will be based on the determination of the "before value" of their landholding, which will be based on its pre-Scheme development unimproved value, taking into account factors such as the previous zoning, position and outlook of the land.

Because of the complexity of the operation of the Scheme it is suggested that further questions should be directed to Council's Planning Department and Consultants and we reiterate our offer to arrange a meeting with Mr Ryan to clarify any additional issues of concern.

Item 5.1.1 – Continued...

At item 5.3.5 of the 25th March Council meeting, Mr Ryan expressed his dissatisfaction with the adequacy of the above answer and the question was again taken on notice.

It is not clear how Mr Ryan has arrived at a figure of \$221m². Council maintains that the figure of \$328m² based on the nett area of Cell 3 is the most accurate estimate of returns, this is based on the reasoning outlined as follows:

- a. Cell 3 is comprised of 10 separate ownerships.*
- b. Each Participating Landowners interest in a Development Cell is governed by the ratio that the “Before Value” of each Participating Landowners Nett Area bears to the total of the “Before Values” of all the Nett Areas in the Development Cell.*
- c. The “Before Values” of each Participating Landowners Nett Area is to be determined by an appropriately experienced licensed valuer.*
- d. Undoubtedly properties within Cell 3 that have river/city views etc will achieve a higher m² valuer than those properties that have no external views etc. Hence it is anticipated that properties abutting the Graham Farmer Freeway and or that have river views from Riversdale Road, will attract a higher m² value than the internal properties with virtually no views.*
- e. For the reasons outlined in item (d) above, it would be misleading and incorrect to assign the same m² “Before Value” across all properties within Cell 3.*
- f. As Participating Landowners Interest in the Cell is determined by the assessed “Before Value” of their land, which will vary, so the proportion of the Nett Profits from the Cell are anticipated to vary on a m² basis between the Participating Landowners.*
- g. Further, it is noted that sale values have been increasing in the Belmont/Rivervale area over the past few years and particularly, since the opening of the Graham Farmer Freeway. We are confident this trend will continue resulting in higher values being achieved by the time Cell 3 is actually developed.*
- h. In addition, we expect to review the design layout for Cell 3 prior to obtaining DPI subdivisional approval with a view to reducing costs and achieving an improved financial outcome whilst retaining the planning/design integrity of the Cell.*

Item 5.1.1 – Continued...

- i. As the “Before Value” of the properties involved in the Cell will not be determined until after TPS No. 13 is gazetted, it is not possible at this point in time, to provide an accurate nett return value per m².*
- j. If however it could be accepted (and it cannot), that all “Before Values” were the same for each property within Cell 3, by dividing the projected nett return for the middle and upper scenarios contained in the advertised Static Analysis, the projected range per m² would vary from \$229m² to \$269m². This calculation is based on a total gross Cell Area of 2.5836 hectares (inclusive of Crown Land).*
- k. Prior to the development of Cell 3 and having regard to the review outlined in item (h) hereof coupled with increasing values referred in item (g), we confidently expect to achieve a higher return to that currently projected in the aforesaid Static Analysis.*
- l. It must also be noted and recognised, that with any form of subdivision and development of the Cell 3 area, land will be required for road access purposes.*

In discussing the methodology of likely returns, the Scheme Manager has expressed the view that the \$328M² calculation to be the most accurate, based on their previous development scheme. Council accepts that there are other methodologies available (including that promoted by Mr Ryan), but on this occasion, supports our consultant’s position.

5.1.2 Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

Mr Ryan asked the following questions at the Council meeting held on 25 March 2002, which were taken on notice. Mr Ryan’s questions were responded to in correspondence dated 12 April 2002.

1. Will Council please advise the indicative nett per square metre returns to landowners in Cell 3 based on the gross area of the landowners holdings and the nett returns for Cell 3 reported in the Static Analysis for The Springs redevelopment Town Planning Scheme No. 13.

The response is as per that for the previous question

2. Will Council’s planning staff please independently confirm any figures submitted by the Scheme Managers, Urban Focus.

No. Advice received independently of the Scheme Manager confirms the Scheme Manager’s advice that the Scheme was viable and reinforced confidence in the Manager’s proven track record in managing successful Schemes.

Item 5.1 – Continued...

5.1.3 Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

Mr Ryan asked the following question at the Council meeting held on 25 March 2002, which was taken on notice. Mr Ryan's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 11 April 2002.

Mr Ryan stated that the Director – Development referred to small quantity of fill – what is quantified as a “small quantity of fill?”

A "small quantity" of fill is clearly a relative term. As the originating question was however, in regard to Lot 712, Council can advise that in relation to the area of Lot 712 (and the fill already in position on Lot 600) the approximately 430m³ to be placed on Lot 712 for the purpose of planting landscaping to screen the adjoining development, is considered to be a "small quantity".

5.1.4 Ms Lorraine Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale

Ms Hitt asked the following question at the Council meeting held on 25 March 2002, and the Director – Development advised that he would provide further information at the Council meeting of 15 April 2002: This information was forwarded in a letter to Ms Hitt on 11 April 2002.

“Does the sales office for Lot 49 Ascot Cove meet disabled access requirements?”

The “sales office” referred to does not presently have compliant ramp access to the elevated floor level (for general public use).

The owners of the building have been notified in writing of their obligations to comply with the relevant legislation in this area, being the Disability Discrimination Act and the Building Code of Australia.

*****7.42pm For the benefit of the public present the Acting Chief Executive Officer stated the rules of Question Time.**

5.2 QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING

5.2.1 Mr Michael J Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

I refer to Item 5.1.2 of tonight's Ordinary Council meeting 15/04/02 being the answers to my question put at the Council meeting held on 25 March 2002 and respond as follows:

The answer to question 1 should simply be \$222m² and not the extraordinarily long and misleading one actually given at 5.1.1.

And at answer to question 2 ask:

1. Why Council refuses to have the planning staff independently verify the figures submitted by Scheme Managers, Urban Focus?

The answer to this question is adequately provided in the answer to question #2 of Item 5.1.2 of tonight's agenda.

2. Who supplied the independent advice confirming the Scheme Managers advice and which are the successful Schemes referred to?

Three consultants namely, Time Conti Sheffield, Satterley & Co, and Sullivans provided the projected likely returns. Engineering costings were estimated by Urban Focus and by Sinclair Knight Merz. The figures provided by those five were then used to compile the static analysis provided during the second advertising period of the Scheme and which demonstrated the viability of the Scheme. This served to confirm earlier advice from Urban Focus that the Scheme was indeed viable.

In regard to Urban Focus and their track record with successful schemes - Coburg Nominees P/L trading as Urban Focus commenced business on 1 June 1975, initially trading as Community Management Services then subsequently as CMS Urban Consultants and since June 1992 as Urban Focus.

The Company was primarily established to assist State and Local Government to free up and develop land for urban purposes that was held in small multiple ownerships. This occurred during a period when the State Government was experiencing an acute shortage of residential allotments that caused land values to escalate.

Item 5.2.1 – Continued...

Over the years since 1975 Urban Focus have either prepared and managed or managed in excess of 20 Statutory Development Schemes – both Resumptive and Guided. Many of those Schemes (both metropolitan and country) have now been satisfactorily concluded. Over the last 27 years Urban Focus has overseen the construction and management of in excess of 25,000 residential, industrial, special rural and commercial lots.

Although Urban Focus has undertaken a wide variety of projects, those most closely related to the Council's Springs project are summarised hereunder as follows –

- ◆ **Shire of Harvey/Dardanup**
Preparation of the East Australind/Eaton Guided Development Scheme that relates to a proposed new city area ultimately accommodating some 45,000 residents.
- ◆ **City of Albany**
A proposed new Guided Development Scheme to cater for the sharing of costs in relation to the Bayonet Head area that is planned to create some 3,000 residential allotments.
- ◆ **Shire of Capel**
The ongoing management of the Gelorup Guided Development Scheme that was gazetted in 1976.
- ◆ **City of Bunbury**
The establishment of the Glen Iris Special Development Precinct incorporating a statutory scheme mechanism incorporating provisions to identify and cater for the collection of the relevant shared costs.
- ◆ **Shire of Greenough**
The ongoing management of the Waggrakine Guided Development Scheme that was gazetted in 1978 catering for the creation of some 1,700 residential allotments.
- ◆ **City of Armadale**
Establishment of the Roleystone Hills Precinct and the statutory mechanism to identify and collect the applicable shared costs.
- ◆ **Private Land Pooling Arrangements**
 - Packham Development Area – 135 owners and 1,500 lots (City of Cockburn)
 - Beeliar Cells 9 and 10 – 45 owners and 1,200 lots (City of Cockburn)
 - Lake Coogee – 40 owners and 800 lots (City of Cockburn)
 - Anstey Park – 30 owners and 1,000 lots (City of Rockingham)
 - Lark Hill Equine Estate – 8 owners and 170 lots (Rockingham)
 - Mardella Estate – 9 owners and 190 lots (Shire of Serpentine/Jarrahdale)
 - Woodvale Estate – 10 owners and 220 lots (City of Wanneroo).

Item 5.2 – Continued...

5.2.2 Mr Michael J Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

To clear up the confusion as to how I arrive at the figure of \$221m², one only has to take the figures in part (J) of the answer on page 6 of tonight's agenda and factor in the lower return of \$168m² supplied by Satterley & Co in static analysis. Rather than use the selective middle and upper figure scenario of \$229m² and \$269m² as stated and average the three figures (actually \$222m²).

The details given at points (A) through (K) in the answer, whilst some may find them interesting, have no bearing on my question and in fact fly in the face of advice given to some landowners during the consultation period by Urban Focus. It should be noted and recognised at point (L) that the statement is only relevant if justifying the existing or similar plan for Cell 3.

And I would ask why does Council continue to support and accept as correct, \$328m² as an accurate return for Cell 3 when it cannot be properly demonstrated from the figures contained in the static analysis supplied to landowners in The Springs?

The answer to this question is adequately provided in the answer to Item 5.1.1 of tonight's agenda.

5.2.3 Mr P Hitt, Belmont Residents ~~and Ratepayers Association/Ratepayers~~ Action Group Refer OCM 29/04/02 Item 6.1 (85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale)

With reference to concern recorded in the Council Minutes 17/12/01 public question time reference 5.2.1. On the 15th March 2002 at approximately 3.30pm, a group of youths were observed brawling in the vicinity of the bus stop at the corner of Wright Street and the road leading to the Council building. It was also noted that a security guard attended the scene.

This specific area has been the scene of a number of ugly incidents and assaults in the past. An occurrence of youths fighting near the entrance to our Council building does not present a positive opening statement to local residents or visitors to our City. Our older residents may also feel threatened and be dissuaded from using their recreational facilities through fear of violence or being accosted.

1. Has the City of Belmont taken any action since this further incident was observed?

Yes, refer to information in (2) below.

Item 5.2.3 – Continued... Mr Paul Hitt

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, what action was taken?

On Friday, 15 March 2002 at 3.30pm, the Belmont Forum Security Guards requested the City of Belmont Community Security Watch Patrol to attend an incident that was occurring at the bus shelter near the Senior Citizens building in Wright Street.

The Community Watch Patrol Officer arrived at the above location at 3.35pm and the following information was contained in his "Incident Report" provided to Council the following day:-

"Report of a fight about to take place outside the bus shelter near Senior Citizens.

Patrol on site. Observed 2 teenagers in Belmont Senior High School uniforms fighting. Police advised. Fight broken up, however more youths got involved including a father of one of the teenagers. A chain weapon was produced from a vehicle, which was confiscated by Security. Father and offending teenagers left in the abovementioned vehicle prior to Police arrival".

The above reports were provided to the Belmont Police Station and the Police reported the incident to the Belmont College via the Police Youth Liaison Officers. The Police were also provided with the registration plate of the vehicle in question and they are undertaking their own investigations.

The City of Belmont Community Security Watch Patrol Officers have been instructed to make regular patrols to the bus shelters in Wright Street in the period immediately after school hours to deter any repeat of the above kinds of incidences.

As indicated on 17 December 2001 in relation to a question submitted by Mr Hitt on anti-social behaviour of this kind, the Patrol Officers and Council Rangers only have limited powers and therefore, the WA Police Service is the ultimate provider of law and order to the residents of the City.

Council will continue to instruct the Patrol Officers to regularly patrol this and other areas of the City in an effort to deter anti-social behaviour.

In addition to the above, Council has a very active Recreation Section and Youth Services Section, both of whom work co-operatively to encourage the youth of our district to participate in productive activities. It is hoped that the continuation of these programmes will minimise the potential for future anti-social behaviour.

Item 5.2.3 – Continued... Mr Paul Hitt

3. If the answer to question 1 is no, is Council going to implement any further action?

Refer to answer (2) above.

It has been brought to our attention that a large eucalyptus tree in the vicinity of the development of the Nulsen Haven precinct has been removed.

4. Does the Council have a tree register for trees of significant historical interest within the City of Belmont?

The Council does not currently have a tree register, however the City's Municipal Inventory includes places and trees of historical significance.

5. If the answer is no, will the Council establish a tree register?

Clause 10.13.4 of the City of Belmont District Planning Scheme No 14 provides Council with the power to keep and maintain a register of trees that do not have specific historical interest. Part 7 of the Scheme also provides for the preservation of trees that have heritage significance worthy of conservation.

A number of trees with significant historical interest have already been listed within the City of Belmont Municipal Inventory.

6. If a tree register is established will Council alter current bylaws or introduce new bylaws to allow Council to prosecute any person/s, organisations or developers who remove trees that are registered?

Under the City of Belmont District Planning Scheme No 14, no person served with a tree preservation order may remove, cut, break or otherwise damage any part of a tree affected by the order except with the prior approval in writing of the Council.

5.2.4 Mr Jonathan Bass, 77 Keymer Street, Belmont

Why did the Mayor not ask the two witnesses that observed the abuse directed at me in this chamber by Councillor Teasdale, before he made what should have been, an "informed decision" on this complaint?

The Mayor indicated that the answer provided by him at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 25 March 2002 (refer to item 5.2.8) adequately answers the question put by Mr Bass this evening.

Item 5.2.4 – Continued...

Is the Mayor going to act on the second part of my question of 25 March 2002, that “if this apology is not received that Council act upon Standing Orders 8.4, #2”.

The Mayor advised Mr Bass that the answer to this question is adequately provided in item 5.2.8 of the 25 March 2002 Council minutes, however that if Mr Bass wished to pursue this matter further, then he could consider taking the appropriate civil action through the Court system.

5.3 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

5.3.1 Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone

In reference to Item 5.1.3 of tonight’s Council Agenda, Mr Stewart asked, will Council amend item 8.6.4 of the 18th March 2002 Planning and Development Committee minutes.

The Mayor advised that he would take this question on notice.

5.3.2 Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone

In response to the above matter (vis. Item 5.3.1) Mr Stewart requested that he be granted permission to attend the **May April** 2002 Planning and Development Committee meeting to allow him to put to the Committee his position on Lot 712/600 and the Trust. **Refer OCM 29/04/02 Item 6.1**

The Mayor advised that there were opportunities available for parties directly affected by Council proposals to seek to attend Committee meetings to discuss issues and this can be achieved through an approach to the Chairman, in writing, seeking such attendance. Generally, these requests will be accommodated.

The Mayor advised Mr Stewart to place his request in writing so it could be addressed. Mr Stewart responded that he would do so.

Item 5.3 – Continued...

5.3.3 Mr Mark Treadwell, 15 St. Kilda Road, Rivervale

Requests that Council support the extension of the ski area as originally proposed and to consult with skiers, as they were unaware that Council would be rejecting the proposed extension.

The Mayor advised Mr Treadwell of the recommendation contained in the Works and Technical Services Committee Minutes that would be deliberated upon by Council at this meeting.

The Mayor further advised that a significant petition had been received from residents in close proximity to the Goodwood Parade ski area expressing their concerns to the proposed extension area.

5.3.4 Mr Norman Arber, 6 Spencer Court, Redcliffe

In the refurbishment of the court floors recently carried out on the Basketball and Netball Courts at the Belmont Oasis Leisure Centre, I question why the legs of the chairs in the Centre have not been repaired when they are damaging the new floor surface.

The Mayor referred this matter to Cr Teasdale as a Board Member of the Belmont Oasis Leisure Centre.

Cr Teasdale indicated that he was not aware of this matter but would immediately draw it to the attention of the Centre Management and raise the issue at the next Board meeting to address Mr Arber's concerns.

5.3.5 Mr Clive Coombs, 317 Wright Street, Cloverdale

Mr Coombs requested the Mayor to allow Cr Bass to ask the question that she sought in relation to the Goodwood Parade ski area.

The Mayor advised that Public Question Time was allocated to residents to raise issues with Council and receive an appropriate response. The Public Question Time period was not set aside for Councillors to raise questions or conduct debate.

Item 5.3 – Continued...

5.3.6 Mr Quentin Bailey, 31 Keane Street, Kewdale

I ask if anything more can be done in support of the Goodwood Parade ski area extension before Council makes a decision on the matter at tonight's meeting, in light of what is recommended in the Committee Minutes.

The Director – Engineering advised that an approach could be made to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Marine Safety Division, to consider an extension to the consultative process but he was unsure of what their actual processes consisted of.

The Mayor added that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure had referred the matter to Council for comment and Council was merely following the Department's processes.

5.3.7 Mr Brad Wicks, 28 Peachey Avenue, Kewdale

I seek further information regarding why an extension cannot be granted to the Goodwood Parade ski area. The problem is compounded when ski areas in the southern part of the State are drying up due to current weather conditions and skiers have only limited areas in which to partake in their sport.

If the residents had the right to prepare a submission objecting to the extension, then is it not possible for skiers to also present a submission to Council in support of the extension?

The Mayor reiterated the process that had taken place in respect to the recommendation proposed by the Works and Technical Services Committee however, should a Councillor wish to withdraw the item when considering the minutes, the possibility of a deferral, or otherwise, of this recommendation would be considered at that time. Council would be more than prepared to accept a petition from the skiing community putting their case.

5.3.8 Mr Peter Stewart, 317 Peet Road, Roleystone

In reference to Item 5.1.3 of tonight's agenda, how high will the landscaping sand fill be, on lot 712.

The Mayor advised that he would take this question on notice.

*****8.14pm The Mayor declared Public Question Time closed as the 30 minutes allowed for Public Question Time had elapsed.**

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**6.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD 25TH MARCH 2002**

GODSELL MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 25 March 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

**7. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN
(WITHOUT DISCUSSION)**

Nil

8. PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

8.1 BELMONT CRICKET CLUB – ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AT PEET PARK

Report by Acting Chief Executive Officer.

APPLICATION

To advise Council of a memorial received from Geoff and Stephanie Welch, 91A Sydenham Street, Rivervale.

IS THIS PROPOSAL CONSISTENT WITH COUNCIL'S OPERATIONAL PLAN?	N/A
--	-----

BACKGROUND

A memorial has been received from Mr G and Ms S Welch in relation to noisy and offensive behaviour by the Belmont Cricket Club at Peet Park Community Centre, and reads as follows:

"For the past four years we have been verbally complaining to your office about the nuisance created by the cricket players, by their noisy behaviour. You responded to my most recent complaint by advising me to put it in writing.

The offences occur mainly on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. The players stay until late at night, sometimes until 2:00am, they get noisier as the night progresses.

They empty bottles into bins with a great clatter. On Saturday 30th March this occurred at 1:30am. They shout to each other as they leave and stay talking outside the building (this is directly in front of our bedroom window).

Some of them change their clothes outside the building and occasionally have been seen urinating outside the building. This is not necessary as they have new change rooms and the toilets are only a few metres away.

They honk their horns and screech their tyres as they drive away.

My neighbours are as fed up with this as we are and have appended their signatures below."

COMMENT

The complaint was verified by other residents of Sydenham Street.

BLAIR MOVED, DONEY SECONDED, that the memorial from G and S Welch regarding anti social behaviour at Peet Park be received and referred to the next meeting of the Administration and Community Services Committee for its consideration.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

9. BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

9.1.1 OCM 25th March 2002 – Item 11.3.1 Withdrawn Item 8.1.1 (Policy Manual Review)

At the 25th March Council meeting, the abovementioned item was adjourned (in accordance with clause 6.2 of the City of Belmont Standing Orders) in order to seek from the Minister for Local Government, an exemption from the financial interest provisions of the Local Government Act. An application has been forwarded to the Minister, unfortunately he has been unable to consider our request in time for the Council to deliberate on the matter at this meeting.

The matter will be rescheduled for the 29th April 2002 Ordinary Council meeting.

10. CORRESPONDENCE

10.1 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

10.2 GENERAL

Nil

10.3 LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil

11. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

11.1 SPECIAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 26 MARCH 2002

Receipt of Minutes

MARKS MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that the minutes of the Special Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 26 March 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

POWELL MOVED, BLAIR SECONDED, that recommendation 6.1 of the Special Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 26 March 2002, be adopted.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

11.2 WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 8 APRIL 2002

Receipt of Minutes

GODSELL MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that the minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 8 April 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Items 8.2.1 and 8.3.1 were withdrawn at the request of Cr Bass
Items 8.2.5 and 8.4.3 were withdrawn at the request of Cr Teasdale
Item 8.4.4 was withdrawn at the request of Cr Godsell

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

GODSELL MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.2.4, 8.2.6, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.5, 8.4.6, 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 8 April 2002, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of items 8.2.1, 8.2.5, 8.3.1, 8.4.3 and 8.4.4).

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

Item 11.2 – Continued...

11.2.1 Withdrawn Item 8.2.1 – Crossover – 24 Reen Street, Kewdale

BASS MOVED, DORNFORD SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation not be adopted and as there has been ongoing problems with the owners' driveway since the reseal of Reen Street was undertaken, Council renew the driveway of 24 Reen Street, Kewdale, to the satisfaction of the owners.

LOST 2 VOTES TO 9

For: Bass, Dornford

**Against: Passeri, Blair, Doney,
Godsell, Teasdale, Godfrey,
Marks, Murfin, Powell**

The Mayor advised for Councillor information, that there had appeared to be some confusion in the attendance of the owners of 24 Reen Street to the Works and Technical Services Committee on 8 April 2002, and they had actually turned up on the night of the Administration and Community Services (ACS) Committee meeting on 9 April 2002.

The ACS Committee Chairman kindly allowed his meeting to adjourn to allow those Councillors and staff in attendance the opportunity to meet with the owners of 24 Reen Street to discuss their issues of concern. From the discussions that took place, the Mayor forwarded a letter to the owners advising that Council would provide a 10 year structural guarantee on the driveway to alleviate their concerns.

BASS MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that Item 8.2.1 be referred back to the next meeting of the Works and Technical Services Committee at which time Council should be in receipt of a response from the owners of 24 Reen Street, Kewdale relating to the offer put forward by the Mayor on behalf of Council in respect to their driveway.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

During the above discussions and voting on the matter in question, Mr Peter Stewart continually interjected causing the Mayor to request Order in the Chamber and in particular, stress to Mr Stewart to comply with meeting protocol and the Mayor's directions, as Chairman of the meeting or otherwise risk being removed from the Chamber.

Mr Stewart then stood and remarked that the Mayor was a "boofhead and a bully".

Cr Godsell requested that the above remark be recorded in the Minutes.

Item 11.2 – Continued...

11.2.2 Withdrawn Item 8.2.5 – 2002/2003 Draft Footpath Construction Program

TEASDALE MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation in its current form not be adopted and that to ensure that Tomato Lake retains its status as a prime passive reserve for the residents of the City, Council

1. **Receives the draft 2002/2003 Footpath Program and Councillors be requested to discuss any footpath project concerns with the Director – Engineering.**
2. **That consideration be given to upgrading the Tomato Lake pathway to:-**
 - a) **concrete kerbed brown asphalt, or**
 - b) **brown asphalt, or**
 - c) **brown concrete.**

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

11.2.3 Withdrawn Item 8.3.1 – Tender 03/2002 – Goodwood Parade Boat Ramp

BASS MOVED, DORNFORD SECONDED, that the committee recommendation not be adopted and that it be referred back to the next meeting of the Works and Technical Services Committee for further consideration.

LOST 1 VOTES TO 10

For: Bass

**Against: Passeri, Blair, Doney,
Dornford, Godsell, Godfrey,
Marks, Murfin, Teasdale, Powell**

MURFIN MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

*****8.41pm** Having earlier declared an interest in the following Item, Cr Dornford departed from the Chamber.

Item 11.2 – Continued...

11.2.4 Withdrawn Item 8.4.3 – Traffic Movement in Belmont City Centre

TEASDALE MOVED, BLAIR SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 10 VOTES TO 0

*****8.42pm Cr Dornford returned to the Chamber.**

11.2.5 Withdrawn Item 8.4.4 – Extension of Water Ski Area at Goodwood Parade

GODSELL MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation in its current form not be adopted and that in view of the concerns expressed by the skiing fraternity, this matter be referred back to the next meeting of the Works and Technical Services Committee to allow a delegation of skiers to attend the meeting to support their reasons for the extension of the ski area.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

**11.3 ADMINISTRATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 APRIL 2002**

Receipt of Minutes

DONEY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the minutes of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

Item 11.3 – Continued...

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Items 8.2.2, 8.5.2 and 8.4.1 were withdrawn at the request of Cr Doney
 Item 8.1.3 was withdrawn at the request of Cr Bass
 Item 8.4.6 was withdrawn at the request of Cr Powell

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

Doney MOVED, Blair SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.2.1, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.4.2, 8.4.3, 8.4.4, 8.4.5, 8.5.1 and 8.5.3 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of items 8.1.3, 8.2.2, 8.4.1, 8.4.6 and 8.5.2).

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

Cr Doney, as Chairman of the Committee, informed Councillors of the criteria associated with the grant funding received from the Ministry for Sport and Recreation under the Community and Sporting Recreational Facilities Funds for Garvey Park, Lighting and Surface upgrade at Belmont Tennis Club and Lighting at Redcliffe Park as indicated in Item 8.1.1 of the Committee Minutes.

11.3.1 Withdrawn Item 8.1.3 – Centenary Park Reserve

BASS MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED that the Committee recommendation in its current form not be adopted and that Council staff investigate costs and viability of lighting for Middleton Park. The outcome of the report to be referred to the Works and Technical Services Committee for its deliberation.

That Council advise the Western Australian Rugby League Club of the above consideration, but at this time Council cannot support their application to utilise Centenary Park Reserve on Wednesday evenings.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

*****8.52pm** **Having earlier declared an interest in the following item, Crs Bass and Dornford departed the Chamber.**

Item 11.3 – Continued...

11.3.2 Withdrawn Item 8.2.2 – Committee Meeting – Meals

Note: *The Minister for Local Government has granted by way of a letter dated 5 April, an exemption for Councillors Passeri, Blair, Doney, Powell, Godfrey, Murfin, Marks, Teasdale, Godsell and Richardson, under Section 5.69 of the Local Government Act in order that they may participate in the debate and vote on the matter.*

DONEY MOVED, BLAIR SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 9 VOTES TO 0

Cr Godfrey, on behalf of Cr Bass, advised that Cr Bass had indicated that in the event of the above motion being defeated, she wished to foreshadow the following motion:

“That Item 8.2.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002, be deferred to the next Council meeting for both Cr Bass and Cr Dornford to request that the Minister grant exemption, so that they can debate the motion –

“That full catered meals and alcoholic beverages for Councillors and officers after committee meetings, be replaced by sandwiches and fruit, if the committee meetings that start at 5.30pm conclude before 8.00pm”.

As the substantive motion was carried, the foreshadowed motion lapsed.

*****9.01pm** Crs Bass and Dornford returned to the Chamber.

11.3.3 Withdrawn Item 8.4.1- Local Law Review – Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law

The Mayor advised that it was a statutory requirement that the Purpose and Effect of a proposed Local Law be read aloud at a Council Meeting and requested the Acting Chief Executive Officer to read the Purpose and Effect as printed in the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting minutes at Item 8.4.1.

The Acting Chief Executive read aloud, the Purpose and Effect of the proposed Local Law.

DONEY MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0 (Special Majority)

Item 11.3 – Continued...

11.3.4 Withdrawn Item 8.4.6 - Three (3) Dog Application – 47 Trink Street, Cloverdale – Ms C Tassone

POWELL MOVED, DORNFORD SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation in its current form not be adopted and that Council delay legal proceedings for a period of two to three months to allow Ms Tassone to relocate from her current residence.

LOST 3 VOTES TO 8

For: Powell, Bass, Dornford

Against: Passeri, Blair, Doney, Godsell, Godfrey, Marks, Murfin, Teasdale

DONEY MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 8 VOTES TO 3

For: Passeri, Blair, Doney, Godsell, Godfrey, Marks, Murfin, Teasdale

Against: Powell, Bass, Dornford

*****9.17pm** Having earlier declared an interest in the following item, Crs Passeri, Blair, Doney, Godsell, Bass, Godfrey, Marks, Murfin, Teasdale, Powell and Dornford departed the Chamber.

11.3.5 – Withdrawn Item 8.5.2 – City of Belmont Code of Conduct

The Acting Chief Executive Officer advised those present of Standing Orders clause 6.2, which outlines the procedure when a meeting quorum is not present (vis. if at any time during the course of a meeting of the Council or Committee a quorum is not present because of a member or members leaving the meeting after disclosing a financial interest, the matter is adjourned until the Minister for Local Government allows a disclosing member or members to preside at the meeting or to participate in discussions or the decision making procedures relating to the matter under section 5.69 of the Local Government Act 1995).

*****9.19pm** Crs Passeri, Blair, Doney, Godsell, Bass, Godfrey, Marks, Murfin, Teasdale, Powell and Dornford returned to the Chamber.

12. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

12.1 INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

Report by Acting Chief Executive Officer

APPLICATION

Council's acknowledgment of receipt of information of general interest.

IS THIS PROPOSAL CONSISTENT WITH COUNCIL'S CORPORATE PLAN?	YES
--	-----

<i>"Operational Plan O1/1(c) - To keep Councillors informed of relevant industry and officer activities, regular update reports be presented to the respective committees".</i>

BACKGROUND

This item relates to information circulated by the Chief Executive Officer which may be of general interest to Councillors.

COMMENT

General information and memorandums:

DATED	SUBJECT
22 March 2002	Lot 49 (154) Great Eastern Highway – Temporary Sales Office
22 March 2002	Proposed Amendment No. 20 to Town Planning Scheme No. 14 – Realignment of Tanunda Way, Rivervale
28 March 2002	Perth International Airport – International Motorsport Complex
28 March 2002	Questions dated 21 March 2002 regarding Lot 600 and Lot 49 Great Eastern Highway
28 March 2002	Financial Interest – Policy Manual Review
28 March 2002	WALGA Infopage – Privacy Laws for the Private Sector
28 March 2002	WALGA Infopage – Summary of a meeting with the Minister for Health, Hon. Bob Kucera
28 March 2002	Autumn River Festival – Sunday 7 April 2002
05 April 2002	2002 Year of the Outback
05 April 2002	Questions regarding Payment of Accounts and EMRC
05 April 2002	This Week at ALGA
05 April 2002	Lot 49 Great Eastern Highway – Temporary Sales Office
05 April 2002	Belmont Community Watch Monthly Report to 31/3/02
05 April 2002	Financial Interest Exemption: 8.2.2 ACS 9/4/02 – Committee Meals – Copy of Minister's Letter

Item 12.1 – Continued....

DATED	SUBJECT
05 April 2002	Draft Notes from Special Planning and Development Committee Meeting held 26 March 2002
12 April 2002	This Week at ALGA – Friday 5 April 2002
12 April 2002	Belmont City College Newsletter
12 April 2002	Presentation – The Role of Regional and Local Governments in Sustainability
12 April 2002	Letter and Plan to Residents: Oats Street Upgrading – Kambalda Way to Wheatley Street
12 April 2002	Formula One Racing Circuit at Perth International Airport
12 April 2002	2002 Autumn River Festival
12 April 2002	Letter to Mr and Mrs Wright, 24 Reen Street

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 28 March 2002:

12.1.1 Local Government News: Issue 12:02 – 22 March 2002.

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 5 April 2002:

12.1.2 Local Government News: Issue 13:02 – 28 March 2002.

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 12 April 2002:

12.1.3 Local Government News: Issue 14:02 – 05 April 2002.

BLAIR MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that the information provided to all Councillors and listed in this “Information Only Items” report be noted and received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

12.2 STATE SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA CONSULTATION PAPER**

****Attachments 1, 2 & 3 – Item 12.2 refers**

Report by Acting Chief Executive Officer

APPLICATION

To advise Council of the State Sustainability Strategy for Western Australia consultation paper recently released by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and seek Council support for the submission prepared for Council on the consultation paper.

IS THIS PROPOSAL CONSISTENT WITH COUNCIL'S OPERATIONAL PLAN? YES
Community Objective # C6 : "To be environmentally conscientious".

BACKGROUND

EMRC's Environmental Services has prepared a submission on the State Sustainability Strategy for Western Australia consultation paper. The submission was adopted at its meeting held on 28 February 2002 (Item 14.22) and it was agreed that:

"That the EMRC submission be referred to member Councils to assist in the preparation of member Council submissions, if required".

The City of Belmont received a letter dated 14 March 2002 (Ref: 71002:58:SE441) from the EMRC, encouraging Council to prepare a submission on the consultation paper and extending assistance in preparing the submission on behalf of the City of Belmont.

This matter is referred to full Council because there is insufficient time to refer the item to the Planning and Development Committee and meet the deadline for the lodgement of the submission.

COMMENT

The Department of Premier and Cabinet recently released a consultation paper for the State Sustainability Strategy for Western Australia entitled *Focus on the Future: Opportunities for Sustainability in Western Australia* (refer Attachment 1).

Item 12.2 – Continued....

The consultation paper outlines:

- The Western Australian Government's position on sustainability including the definition and principles that will inform the State Sustainability Strategy;
- Some of the key concepts of sustainability;
- Examples of the issues that could be addressed in the State Sustainability Strategy;
- The process that will be used to develop the Strategy; and
- Guidance on preparing written submissions.

The Sustainability Policy Unit has been established within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to develop the State Sustainability Strategy and implement the Government's other commitments to sustainability.

The consultation paper was released in November 2001, inviting written submissions until the end of March 2002. The consultation period has now been extended until the end of April 2002. The Sustainability Policy Unit will work with key stakeholders to seek input into the strategy development process.

The EMRC's Environmental Services has prepared a submission on the consultation paper (refer Attachment 2). The submission highlights sustainability issues for Local Government namely; partnerships with State Government, policy structures, funding and resources and strategic long term planning.

The submission prepared for the City of Belmont (refer Attachment 3), seeks to highlight concerns related to the provision of adequate resources for Local Government operations that are beyond core business.

From the written submissions, an options paper will be prepared by the Sustainability Unit reflecting the outcomes of the consultation process. A draft strategy will be released for further comment in mid 2002. The strategy will then be released in October 2002.

GODFREY MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED –

- 1. That Council supports the attached submission prepared by the EMRC on the State Sustainability Strategy Consultation Paper as provided in Attachment 2.***
- 2. That Council supports the submission prepared for the City of Belmont as provided in Attachment 3.***

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

13. REPORTS OF DELEGATES

13.1 PIONEERS AFTERNOON TEA - 6 APRIL 2002

Saturday, 6th April, 2002, marked the 26th occasion on which a celebration was held for those registered as Pioneers of Belmont.

Although the number of Pioneers who attended was low, those who did attend were very supportive of Council holding this function each year, and thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity of meeting up with old friends.

My thanks to Councillors Glyn Doney, Glenys Godfrey, Phil Marks and Ted Teasdale, accompanied by Jan, for their support and also Mrs Peg Parkin, Freeman of the City for making their time available to attend and to mingle with our guests. Apologies were received from Councillors Blair, Richardson and Godsell.

Special thanks to Maureen Leo for organising this event and to Ruth Cook and Judy Pavia (Ascot Adult Day Centre), Louisa Perroni (Home Care Services) and also Maureen who attended the afternoon tea and mingled with guests. Thanks also to Christel for preparing afternoon tea and Trixie who assisted her.

One of the topics again brought to our notice, especially with the smaller attendance, was whether we should be changing the year (1926) for Pioneer status. My suggestion is that 1926 remain as the Pioneer registration year, but that any person who has lived in Belmont continuously for 50 years or more, be invited to register as a resident and be invited to attend.

Prior to conclusion of the afternoon Mr Norman Bell took the opportunity to thank the City for the enjoyable day and extended his support to the City during this difficult time.

DONEY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the report of Cr Passeri be received. Also the Community and Executive Services Committee be requested to give consideration of changing the criteria for "Pioneer Status" in the City, and consequently the attendance criteria of the annual Pioneers celebration event.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

13.2 MAYOR'S REPORT - AUTUMN RIVER FESTIVAL GARVEY PARK 7 APRIL 2002

The programme for the day got under way at 9.00 a.m. with the 'Walk for a Wish' - participation being by a gold coin donation. The walk was conducted over 7 km, covered in times of one hour to one and a half hours. Unfortunately, the cloudburst prior to the commencement, left many (including myself) soaked to the skin.

The Festival was a huge success and even though the black clouds stayed overhead for most of the day, the atmosphere was terrific, in fact, I believe more people came out because it was overcast and not so hot.

I wish to thank Councillors Blair, Doney, Godfrey, Marks, Murfin and Teasdale, together with ex Councillor Coops and Bob Blair for their help in serving the public at the Fish and Chips and Drink stalls between 11.00a.m and 4.00p.m. Well done.

Congratulations Stuart, Lorraine and Amy for the organisation of the Festival and for their help on the day. To all the staff who assisted - thank you: Maurice - for his marathon stint at cooking together with Geoff: To Dave, Tom and Nina at the hole-in-one competition: Nick and Joseph who did a magic job with the parking: Peter and Robin on the wine tent and to Andrew, Jodi, Melissa, Debbie, Chris, Natalie, Sam, Jodie, Denise, Natasha, Maria, Bradley and Leanne for your help on the day - whether it was organising, story telling, serving wine or fish and chips!! If I've missed anybody, I apologise.

Thanks must also go to Kailis Brothers, Taylor Wine, International Sporting and Cultural Exchange, The Face Painting Place, Aero Bungy, Show West, the Kalamunda Camel Farm, Richard and his staff from CMS Events, The Belmont Forum and the Oasis Leisure Centre.

The entertainment during the day was top class and enjoyed by all - especially the fish cooking and singing, and the African Music Congress.

Over 1400 fillets of fish were cooked and many bottles of wine tasted.

All in all, a wonderful day and once again congratulations to all involved.

BLAIR MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the report of Cr Passeri be received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

13.3 2002 SKATE EXTREME FEST SERIES – CR GODSELL

On Friday 12 April 2002 I called into the Belmont Skate Park to watch first hand one of our “Extreme Fest” nights.

There was plenty of noise, action and music and young people doing what young people do – enjoy themselves.

I met up with our Recreation Services Co-ordinator, Andrew Ward, who told me a little of what was happening.

- The Extreme Fest is a series of five extreme events aimed at young people and families, co-ordinated by the City’s Recreation Services. The events consist of skateboard, bike, in-line and scooter riders participating in a non-structured and informal format at the Belmont Skate Park on Friday evenings from 6pm ‘till late.
- The series began on March 8th 2002, with the last event scheduled for May 3rd.
- Participation in the events and attendance by families and friends has been nothing short of fantastic. Last Friday’s event was attended by over 300 young people and was tied into national youth week with lots of entertainment being added to the regular event format.
- The concept of the events appears to be well accepted by the young people, organisers and sponsors and I anticipate that the Recreation Services Section will be seeking to extend the series next financial year, possibly to be operated over a six month period.
- Youth Services, schools and the City has received very positive feedback on the Extreme Fest events from young people and parents alike.
- The next Extreme Fest is scheduled for Friday 19th April 2002 and everyone is welcome to come along and join in.

BLAIR MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that the report of Cr Godsell be received.

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0

14. URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION

Nil

15. MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil

16. CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9.27pm.