



City of Belmont
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

17 DECEMBER 2001

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
NOTICE OF MEETING		
1	OFFICIAL OPENING	1
2	APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1
2.1	APOLOGIES	1
2.2	LEAVE OF ABSENCE	2
3	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	2
4	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)	2
4.1	BELMONT CITY COLLEGE – CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION	2
4.2	CITIES FOR CLIMATE PROTECTION	2
4.3	COUNCIL LIKE “SECRET SOCIETY”	3
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	6
5.1	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING	6
5.1.1	Mr Paul Hitt – 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale	6
5.1.2	Pat Morgan – Lot 133 Malvern Road	8
5.1.3	Graham Hayes – Lot 4 (57) Riversdale Road	9
5.1.4	Mr W Foy – 14 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale	11
5.1.5	Mr Peter Stewart – 3 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale (in Springs)	12
5.1.6	Mr Ross O’Neil – 12 Rowe Avenue, Rivervale	13
5.1.7	KH & PD Morgan	14
5.1.8	Timothy Turner – 63 Riversdale Road	15
5.2	QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING	15
5.2.1	Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale – Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc. 15	
5.2.2	Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale – Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc. 17	
5.2.3	Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale - Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc.	18
5.2.4	Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale	19
5.2.5	Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	20

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
5.3	QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR	21
5.3.1	Mr Steven Carlsson, 32 Menzies Street, Rivervale	21
5.3.2	Mrs Barbara Bartlett, 7 Patterson Road, Kewdale.....	21
5.3.3	Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale	21
5.3.4	Mr Peter Stewart, 3 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale	22
6	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	23
6.1	ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 19 NOVEMBER 2001	23
6.2	ANNUAL ELECTORS MEETING HELD 29 NOVEMBER 2001	23
7	QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)	24
8	PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS	24
8.1	MEMORIAL – WICCA PARK – MR R J PEACH	24
9	BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	25
10	CORRESPONDENCE	25
10.1	LEAVE OF ABSENCE	25
10.2	GENERAL	25
10.3	LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE	25
11	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES	26
11.1	WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 3 DECEMBER 2001	26
11.1.1	Withdrawn Item 8.1.1 – Removal of Trees, 1 Valentine Road, Kewdale	26
11.2	ADMINISTRATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 4 DECEMBER 2001	27
11.3	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 10 DECEMBER 2001	27
11.3.1	Withdrawn Item 8.2.2 – Progress Report – Cities for Climate Protection.....	28
11.3.2	Withdrawn Item 8.6.2 – Lot 800 (34) Menzies Street, Rivervale – Proposed Single Storey New Residence with Parapet Walls	29
11.4	RESOURCES AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 11 DECEMBER 2001	29
11.4.1	Withdrawn Item 8.8.3 – Analysis of Investments as at 30 November 2001	30
12	REPORTS OF OFFICERS	31
12.1	INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS	31
13	REPORTS OF DELEGATES	33
13.1	REPORT ON NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT 2001 – COUNCILLOR PETER PASSERI AND COUNCILLOR MARION BLAIR	33
13.2	BELMONT CITY FAIR 2001 – CHAIRMAN’S REPORT, CR MIKE GODSELL	36
13.3	CLOVERDALE AND KEWDALE STREET AUDIT – 4 DECEMBER 2001	38
13.4	GEAC MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY	39
13.5	TWILIGHT SYMPHONY CONCERT – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY	39
13.6	RSL BELMONT – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY	40
13.7	LAUNCH OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR	40

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
14	URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION	41
15	MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS	41
16	CLOSURE.....	41

ATTACHMENTS INDEX

****Attachment 1 – Item 8.1.1 refers**

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE, 215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE, ON MONDAY 17 DECEMBER 2001, COMMENCING AT 7.30PM

PRESENT

Cr P R Passeri, JP, Mayor	West Ward
Cr M H Blair	Central Ward
Cr M C Godsell	Central Ward
Cr G Dornford	Central Ward
Cr G Doney	West Ward
Cr A T Richardson, JP	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 B Genoni	Chief Executive Officer
Mr P Varris	Acting Director – Administration and Community Services
Mr N Deague	Director – Development
Mr S Cole	Director – Corporate Services
Mr R Lutey	Director - Engineering
Mr M Ferialdi	Manager – Health Services

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were 22 members of the public and 1 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

Nil.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Passeri declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 8.8.3 of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting minutes dated 11 December 2001. The nature of the interest being that he is a holder of AMP Shares.

Councillor Dornford declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 8.8.3 of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting minutes dated 11 December 2001. The nature of the interest being that he is a holder of AMP Shares.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

4.1 Belmont City College – Certificate of Appreciation

The Mayor advised that he had received a letter from the Belmont City College enclosing a Certificate of Appreciation to the Belmont City Council “for their generous support of the Belmont City College School - Industry Link Programme”.

4.2 Cities for Climate Protection

The Mayor noted that the City has received two Certificates from the Cities for Climate Protection recognising that the City of Belmont has successfully achieved a Corporate Goal as part of Milestone 2; and achieved a Corporate Local Action Plan as part of Milestone 3.

These certificates recognise that the City of Belmont has made a formal commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the municipality.

4.3 Council Like “Secret Society”

Further to an article titled “*Belmont Council like secret society: Lawyer*” in the 4th December edition of the *Southern Gazette*, the Mayor made the following statement on behalf of the City of Belmont –

“Upon reading the article I was extremely upset that some of our residents may have concluded from reading this story, that their City is managed in a less than professional manner. I wish to make it clear that nothing could be further from the truth.

On the presumption that the names of the Councillors in the article are correct, that is Councillors Bass and Dornford, I am very disappointed that these two members of this Council have seen fit to pursue the matter in the way that they have. They have every right of course to seek their own legal advice if they believe it is appropriate, however I would have hoped that they had taken the trouble to read and understand the provisions of the Local Government Act and the Local Laws and Policies developed by Council, all of which control the operations of our City and which we fully comply with. As a result of the two Councillors’ lack of understanding of Belmont’s legislative and operational procedures, it is apparent that they have not correctly informed Mr Hammond.

Other than the choice of headline, which could have alternatively read -“*Residents assured of Belmont City’s accountability*” or “*Lawyers concerns appear to have no legal substance*”, I have no issue with the *Southern Gazette* as they are only printing the information that is provided to them. I would however, appreciate it if they could follow the matter up with some comments from the Department of Local Government to confirm that the City of Belmont is operating within the legal interpretation of the Local Government Act 1995.

I would like to now specifically refer to the statements made in the article –

1. Mr Hammond allegedly made the statement on behalf of his clients, Councillors Dornford and Bass, that the City “was not providing good government for Belmont residents and ratepayers”. I would challenge Mr Hammond to provide relevant and sustainable information as to how his clients have reached this conclusion.
2. Mr Hammond has allegedly said that in accordance with the Local Government Act, meetings of local governments must be open to the public unless there is good reason to close them. Mr Hammond is correct to the extent that this is the case for full Council meetings and the City of Belmont willingly complies with this legislative requirement. It is quite incorrect however, to imply that these legislative requirements apply to all meetings of this state’s local governments. The City of Belmont’s Committee system operates completely within the parameters of the Local Government Act’s legislative requirements.

Item 4.3 – Continued ...

In regard to the City of Belmont's Committee system, a recent response to Council by the Department of Local Government included the following points:

...It is well established that Councils and their Committees have a right to determine their own procedures subject to the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 and any other written law. This includes the right to decide who can be present at a meeting. Under the Act, local governments are entitled to decide whether Committees without delegated powers should be open or closed to the public. The Department believes that there are circumstances where it is appropriate for such meetings to be closed.

With regard to open or closed Committee meetings, each local government needs to decide on how best to manage their executive functions and this Council has deliberated on this subject on several occasions. Our present position is that the currently existing committee meeting procedure provides for the most beneficial form of governance for the majority of our community. I don't think that anyone could say that the decisions ultimately made at our council meetings, are anything other than in the best interests of the wider Belmont community and I feel that our Committee/Council system is still the best system for our City.

3. In regard to the community not having an opportunity to ask questions at Committee meetings, it must be remembered that the Local Government Act specifies that if a Council Committee has delegated authority, IT MUST publish its agenda and provide a public question time. The City of Belmont's standing committees have no power to make decisions on behalf of the City or the community and the Local Government Act specifically outlines that there is therefore no requirement for public question time, or for the agenda to be published prior to the meeting. Having said this, whilst the meetings are not open to the general public, Council's committees often allow delegations of relevant affected people to their meetings to put alternative positions for the Committee's consideration. As part of the Council agenda, the minutes of these Committee meetings are however, made available to the public on Council's web page and at the Ruth Faulkner Library. Following perusal of the committee minutes and the Council agenda, the general public is then in a position and most welcome to contact Councillors or officers to seek clarification, ask questions or put alternative options. It is at the Council meeting of course, where the Committee recommendations are considered and decided upon. The general public can, during the Council meeting's public question time, formally ask questions of Council prior to the Committee recommendations being considered by Councillors.

Item 4.3 – Continued ...

4. I dispute in the strongest possible way, the assertion that this City is operating “in a manner akin to a secret society”. To me it is unbelievable that anyone could conclude that a government body operating in accordance with the meeting procedures outlined by a democratically elected state government, could in any way conclude it be operating like a secret society. The City provides open Council meetings, open public meetings, public forums, and an annual electors meeting. Also, its Councillors are widely available to the general public, as are the officers of the organization. A great deal of public consultation occurs and I am very disappointed that such an assertion has been made by a person of such prominence. I would challenge Mr Hammond to provide proof as to how he rationally concluded that the City of Belmont meeting procedure was akin to a secret society (whatever one of those actually is) and then defend that against the Local Government Act 1995.
5. Mr Hammond twice highlights in regard to closed Committee meetings, the various pressures that can be brought to bear on Councillors, when they make their decision... Let me make it quite clear that the Standing Committees of this City DO NOT MAKE DECISIONS, they can only make recommendations to Council – FOR ITS DECISION. It is deceptive to say or imply otherwise.
6. In regard to Councillors’ correspondence, Council’s established records management procedures outline that ALL mail entering our office is opened and if applicable, recorded and registered, including Councillors’ mail. In accordance with the General Disposal Authority for Local Government Records (required since 1999 by the State Records Office of WA) “*records created or received in a course of the Mayor or a Councillors’ local government duties are public records and as such are subject to the same legislative requirements as any other public record*”. In fact, I understand that in the not too distant future, the State Records Act will require all Councillors to maintain any mail they receive that relates to their activities as a Councillor, to the same standards as the City’s records management system – irrespective of how it is delivered to them. The procedure for Councillors’ mail delivered to the City is outlined in the Management Policy & Procedures document at M1.6.10, a copy of which has previously been provided to all Councillors.
7. On the last issue, that of the computer software contract, this matter was handled very efficiently by the staff with the legislative tender obligations being met by the Western Australian Local Government Association. As was explained to Councillors at the Resources and Policy meeting, if there had been more time to involve Councillors in the decision making process, this would have been desirable, but it was not an option available to us on this occasion. There was however, nothing illegal or improper about the manner in which the decision on this computer software upgrade process was conducted – and it was the right decision in any event. I am aware that the Western Australian Local Government Association is very pleased with the value of the contract they negotiated on Local Governments’ behalf.

Item 4.3 – Continued ...

I appreciate that I have taken several minutes of your time to explain my and Council's position on the matter. I hope that this detail will assist us all to better understand how the City of Belmont is in fact, providing good government to the people of our district. The unprecedented progress and service improvement within our City, together with the regular commendations received by the City are further testament to this."

*****7.42pm**

For the benefit of the public present the Chief Executive Officer stated the rules of Question Time.

5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

5.1 Responses To Questions Taken on Notice At Previous Meeting

5.1.1 Mr Paul Hitt – 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale

Mr Hitt asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr Hitt's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

1. As the former Bowling Club site (152 Great Eastern Highway) is now being developed could the Council please advise :-
 - (a) The total price received for the site?
 - (b) When the sale was settled?
- 1(a) *The majority of the land occupied by the former bowling club site not yet been sold because of the constraints imposed by the charitable trust in place over that area. The land that is presently being developed includes a small portion of the old bowling club site and was sold for a total of \$1,530,914*
- 1(b) *October 2000.*
2. Regarding the same site, did Council provide any cash services or other contributions to the rehabilitation of this site during the contract period?

No.

Item 5.1.1 – Continued ...

3. Was the Bowling Club site ever formally valued and if so:

- (a) By whom?
- (b) When?
- (c) Valuation figure?

The value of all the land in the Ascot Waters Project was determined by Public Tender in accordance with the then in place Local Government Act 1961. No separate formal valuation of the bowling club site was undertaken.

4(a) Has the Council entered into any agreement to sell the land encompassing the former Parry Field (and being part of Lot 5 and Lot 49) subject to the lifting of the Deed of Trust protecting this property. If so:

- (a) To whom?
- (b) Sale price on each lot?
- (c) when was the contract formalised?
- (d) Will any part of this land be retained for Public Open Space?
- (e) If so, what is the land area proposed to be retained and where is it located?

4(a) The Council has not entered into any agreement to sell the former Parry Fields baseball stadium site, however Ascot Fields Nominees Pty Ltd have a first right of refusal in respect of approximately 1 hectare of the former baseball stadium land.

4(b) As just explained, all that exists is a first right of refusal. No price has been established however any sale price is required to be at full market value at time of sale.

4(c) No Contract of Sale has been formalised.

4(d) Of the total approximate 15.8 hectares of Lot 5 and Lot 49, some two thirds (10 hectares) are proposed to remain as public open space. This will complement the large areas of additional adjacent public open space created with the Ascot Waters project. These areas include Ascot Island, the Marina and its open space areas, the foreshore, and linear and other park areas within the residential estate.

4(e) The only area of Lot 5 and Lot 49 not proposed to remain as public open space is the area generally bounded by Great Eastern Highway, Stoneham Street, the Central Belmont Main Drain reserve, and the former Lot 247 (the land on which development you referred to in question one is presently occurring).

5.1.2 Pat Morgan – Lot 133 Malvern Road

Mrs Morgan asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mrs Morgan's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development, I ask:

- 1 Why does the report, under "Viability" continue to misrepresent "nett returns" to landowners on a dollar per square metre, when landowners are given no direct indication of what reduced area their land holding will represent under the scheme?

The assertion that the "nett return" figures are misrepresented is refuted. It is apparent that the confusion in this question has arisen by the reluctance to liaise directly with Council's Scheme Managers. Nett returns are based on the market value of the proposed lots less the development costs. The area is not a factor.

- 2 Why have all the Headworks cost allocations changed since the close of readvertising?

The developable area of Cells 5 and 6 have increased.

- 3 Why does the new Headworks costing favour Cell 3. Cell 3 contains some 31% of road frontage yet now contributes only 13% for these Scheme costs?

The Scheme Text provides for the Headworks to be apportioned on a "value basis". As Council will not be undertaking valuations until after the Springs Scheme is gazetted, the Headworks costs have, in order to give landowners an indication of the cost break-ups, been apportioned on an "area" basis. Road frontage is not a basis for cost apportionment.

- 4 What is meant by the statement "...The current value on a dollar per square metre basis was considered to be not adversely affected by the decision of the Council and the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to a Town Planning Scheme for the area" in the Committee comments under the head "Land Values"?

It was considered that the proposed Scheme has not resulted in a decline in current market values.

Item 5.1.2 – Continued ...

- 5** Which firms of valuers were engaged to provide these dollar per square metre values to Council and why weren't they provided in the viability analysis as readvertised by Council?

Satterley Property Group, Time Conti Sheffield and Sullivans and these figures were provided.

- 6** Which firms of consultants and legal advisers were engaged to determine that landowners were not adversely affected in the decision of Council to finally adopt the Scheme?

This was a conclusion reached by the Council having the benefit of the reports from the companies identified in question 5 and the advice of Sinclair Knight Merz on the development costs.

- 7** Could Council please provide proof to landowners in the Springs that the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has agreed to a Town Planning Scheme for the area?

The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure granted consent to advertise the Scheme on 3 May 2000 and again on 14 June 2001. The Hon Minister is yet to consider whether to adopt the Scheme for final approval.

5.1.3 Graham Hayes – Lot 4 (57) Riversdale Road

Mr Hayes asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr Hayes' questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development, Mr Hayes asked:

- 1** Why does the Committee Comment include a section titled "Reputations of those involved in the Scheme" and speak in past tense in reference to the reputation of Council's Scheme Manager and Council's Solicitor?

Minutes are couched in the past tense.

- 2** Why does the Committee's Comment include a reference to landowners at one on one interviews as "saying one thing and doing another"?

There was a divergence in views expressed verbally compared with the written submissions.

Item 5.1.3 – Continued ...

- 3** How many landowners attended the group meeting arranged by Council during the readvertising, how many Springs Committee members attended and how many Planning and Development Committee members attended this meeting?

One landowner attended the open information forum arranged between the hours of 7:00pm and 9:00pm. Staff from Urban Focus and Council were available during that time to assist with any queries. Councillors Bass and Dornford were in attendance at different times.

- 4** Why does the Committee Comment that “The test of true leadership of a Council often relates to decision require forward planning and visionary thinking, particularly when they are contrary to the views of a local minority”, when the majority of landowners in the Scheme reject it?

In terms of land ownership there is a clear indication of the support for the Scheme. The Council must make a decision that is the best in terms of the redevelopment of the area not on the agreement of the development aspirations of individual landowners.

- 5** How is it that the Scheme is so important to the City that it seemingly requires compulsory landpooling and mortgage broking or compulsory acquisitions from landowners; when the owners of one lot in the Scheme can now make their own decision as to their status of participating or non-participating in the Scheme?

The need for landpooling is evident from the Development Plan adopted.

- 6** Why are all landowners in the Scheme denied their own determination as to participation or non-participation in this Scheme?

The Development Plan is the basis for deciding those landowners for whom it is necessary to be participating landowners.

Non-Participating Landowners properties have been designated as being excluded from the Scheme as they have been assessed as being substantially improved and with a low likelihood of being subdivided or redeveloped within the short to medium term.

5.1.4 Mr W Foy – 14 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale

Mr Foy asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr Foy's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development, Mr Foy asked:

- 1 My mother and I made formal submission on the readvertising of the Scheme which was determined at number 14 of Attachment C. Why was our street address, 14 Hawksburn Road, not included in the list?

Number 14, Attachment C was the submission from the Springs Landowners Group. Various properties were affected and this was listed as such.

- 2 Council's recommendation on our submission was "Response is identical to Submission 12". My mother and I are not members of a Superannuation Fund, what relevance does this recommendation have to us and our submission?

The arguments presented were the same as other submissions.

- 3 We did not purchase our land in 1999, or resell it in 2001. We purchased our home at 14 Hawksburn in 1969. Why does Council refer to 1 and 5 Hawksburn Road in response to our submission?

This question has been answered. Refer to response to questions 1 and 2 above.

- 4 As Council may well have to compulsorily acquire our home at 14 Hawksburn Road and have us move out, would you please do us the courtesy of getting our home address correct?

Yes.

5.1.5 Mr Peter Stewart – 3 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale (in Springs)

Mr Stewart asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr Stewart's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development, Mr Stewart asked:

- 1** I note the declaration by the Scheme Manager of a financial interest in this item. The declaration says that ... "his wife, Judith Evans, is a co-director of Coburg Nominees Pty Ltd trading as Urban Focus and is a half owner of Lots 1 and 2 Malvern Road within the proposed Town Planning Scheme No 13 "The Springs" area". A search of titles shows no ownership by a Judith Evans in the TPS 13 area. How accurate is this declaration?

The effect is to recognise the interest of Mr Colin Evans only.

- 2** Submission No 7 in Attachment C is from JV White, D&K Evans and M&K Evans concerning property at Lots 1 and 2 Malvern Road. Which of these respondents is the Judith Evans, a director of the Scheme Manager?

J V White.

- 3** Submission No 7 is one of only two submissions from private landowners supporting the scheme and upheld by Council recommendation. Would council consider allowing these two private landowners who support the Scheme to go forward into the Scheme and allowing those who do not support it the same freedom of choice to not participate?

No.

5.1.6 Mr Ross O'Neil – 12 Rowe Avenue, Rivervale

Mr O'Neill asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr O'Neil's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development, Mr O'Neill asked:

- 1 Why does Council continue to send correspondence to the Springs Private Landowners at the incorrect address in Roleystone when I advised you of my co-ordination of the Group several months ago?

The change in address is noted and we apologise for the oversight.

- 2 Why has the Mayor not responded to my letter dated 28 August 2001 referring to the last meeting of the Springs Committee on 18 July 2001?

The Director - Development responded on behalf of the Mayor, letter dated 25 October 2001 (response to letter dated 18 October 2001 to which a copy of the 28 August 2001 letter was attached).

- 3 Why hasn't the Springs Committee met to consider and determine the readvertised Scheme as it considered and determined the advertised Scheme in 2000?

It would be inappropriate for "The Springs" Working Group to be involved in the assessment of submissions. This was the case in 2000 as well as 2001.

- 4 Why has Council failed to acknowledge the 19 signatures and 26 property addresses listed in the Springs Group submission on the readvertising of the Scheme?

There is a statutory process to be followed with the Scheme and Council is required to comply with all tasks and responsibilities specified in the legislation. Full copies of all submissions are forwarded to the WAPC.

- 5 Why is Council totally ignoring the wishes and advice from the majority of the private landowners in the Scheme expressed in our submission?

In terms of land ownership there is a clear indication of the support for the Scheme. The Council must make a decision that is the best in terms of the redevelopment of the area not on the agreement of the development aspirations of individual landowners.

Item 5.1.6 – Continued...

- 6** Why does the Committee comment specifically marginalise the majority of the landowners in the Scheme by calling us a vocal minority?

The Council must act on behalf of the whole community and rejects the notion that landowners who form a group have some implied right to plan the way they want.

5.1.7 KH & PD Morgan

Mr and Mrs Morgan asked the following questions at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which were taken on notice. Mr and Mrs Morgan's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

With reference to the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes dated 12 November 2001, Item 8.7.6, TPS 13 "The Springs" development. Since the close of advertising, it would appear that the Springs landowners have been presented with an entirely new formula for calculating the contribution each cell makes towards the A and B headwork's costs as found in the report before Councillors. Mr Morgan asked:

- 1** Why do we have a change of formula at this late stage?

There is no change in the formula and the unwillingness to liaise with the Scheme managers is evidenced by this question.

- 2** Why does this formula appear to heavily favour Cell 3 in reducing that Cell's contribution from around 30% to less than 14%?

The Scheme Text provides for the Headworks to be apportioned on a "value basis". As Council will not be undertaking valuations until after the Springs Scheme is gazetted, the Headworks costs have, in order to give landowners an indication of the cost break-ups, been apportioned on an "area" basis. Road frontage is not a basis for cost apportionment.

- 3** Are Councillors aware that Cell 3 includes land owned by Council and JV White who, according to the Scheme Manager's declaration, is the Scheme Manager's wife who is a director of Coburg Nominees, trading as Urban Focus?

Yes.

- 4** Does Council's conflict of interest cause a further conflict of interest in Councillors voting to adopt TPS 13 in its final form this evening?

No.

5.1.8 Timothy Turner – 63 Riversdale Road

Mr Turner asked the following question at the Council Meeting held on 19th November 2001, which was taken on notice. Mr Turner's question was responded to in correspondence dated 14th December 2001.

As a capital raising exercise, how does Urban Focus comply with Corporations law?

Urban Focus is required under the Management Agreement to comply with all relevant legislation.

5.2 Questions on Which Written Notice Has Been Given Prior To The Meeting

Note: Council responses read by the Chief Executive Officer.

5.2.1 Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale – Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc.

1. Does the Council recognise there may be a growing problem with youth forming small gangs and intimidating people within the City of Belmont?

Whilst there have been incidents of youths gathering in groups, especially after school hours, it is not considered that such gatherings are intended to form gangs with the intent of intimidating residents.

NGS Guards and Patrols are of the same opinion as indicated above.

*Only recently there have been problems with a group of youths (school age children) gathering near the Senior Citizens Centre. **See Question 4.***

Youth Services staff are not aware of any youth 'gang' related activities in the City of Belmont. Whilst on outreach duties staff make contact with young people at Belmont Forum who congregate in groups for the purpose of socialising and shopping. A couple of young people are known to have an association with gangs, however, these gangs are not present or active in the City of Belmont.

Staff make regular contact with young people through Youth Service programmes and Outreach and seek to mediate any conflict that may occur between young people or between young people and other adult community members when and where it is appropriate to do so.

Item 5.2.1 – Continued ...

2. Are callout/reports of individual incidences by the security patrols categorised? If so, what are the figures relating to individuals, gangs/groups of youths?

The Security Patrol Service provides daily reports of incidences that occurred on the previous shifts, however, incidences are categorised under the following headings, not gangs, because as answered in Question 1, we do not have specific issues relating to gangs:-

*Anti-Social Behaviour
Vandalism
Suspicious Persons
Customer Requests*

3. When schools have student free days (professional development days) and school holidays, what measures does Council have in place to deal with the higher rate of youth on the streets and associated risks? If the answer to this question is no, please refer to question 4.

In the past, Council has placed a static guard at the Skate Park during the summer school holidays, which is a popular place for young people to gather in large numbers. NGS Guards and Patrols can vary their shifts to cater for busy periods.

4. Will the Council increase security and ranger patrols to coincide with times of maximum risk to individuals? An area of particular concern during school terms is the bus stop in Wright Street near the front entrances to the Council offices driveway.

As indicated in question 1, there has been a problem with youths congregating in the above area after school hours in recent times and behaving in an anti-social manner. The local Police have been made aware of this. Council's Rangers and Security Patrol Officers have increased surveillance in this area to help curb this behaviour and have referred the names of a number of trouble makers to the School Police Liaison Officers for their action.

5. Does the Council provide, or is it aware of any organisation that provides a service similar to the Noongar patrols used in the City of Perth. Would the City of Belmont assist in the establishment of such a service within the City of Belmont?

No.

Item 5.2.1 – Continued ...

The anti-social behaviour that exists within the City of Belmont is not confined to any one group and it is considered that the Belmont Police, together with the current Security Patrol and Ranger services are appropriate at this stage.

Whilst the ratepayers in the City of Belmont provide for the Security Patrol service via their rates, any increase in services would need to be borne by the ratepayers.

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.

5.2.2 Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale – Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc.

Use of parkland adjoining Perman Place and Wicca Street for overflow parking for Christmas shoppers by the Belmont Forum shopping centre.

1. Why should ratepayers forego the use of their recreational facilities to allow for additional parking for Christmas shoppers?

The Belmont Forum Shopping Centre provides a major service for residents and ratepayers of Belmont and as with many other regional shopping centres throughout the metropolitan area, parking becomes a major problem during the busy Christmas shopping period.

Allowing for additional parking in some form provides an additional service to ratepayers/residents to cater for this particularly busy time of the year.

The staff parking on part of Wicca Park frees up parking within the shopping centre carparks and minimises the impact of parking on streets surrounding the shopping precinct.

There are a number of significant areas within Wicca Park which are still available for recreational use.

2. Is there a fee charged to the owners of the Belmont Forum for the use of ratepayers' public open space for parking?

No.

3. If the answer to the last question is yes, where does this money go?

See answer to question two.

Item 5.2.2 – Continued ...

4. Will ratepayers have to pay for any maintenance/repair of the lawn after it has been used for parking?

The use of Wicca Park is conditional upon Belmont Forum Shopping Centre management being responsible to make good any damage that may be incurred.

5. If remuneration is not received for the use of this recreational facility, we request that a fee be charged for its use and the monies obtained donated to a charitable organisation within the City of Belmont.

The Belmont Forum Shopping Centre contributes to a number of Council's programmes which in turn benefit the Belmont community. The issue of Council charging a fee for the temporary use of this reserve will be considered at a forthcoming Works and Technical Services Committee meeting.

5.2.3 Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale - Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc.

1. Has Council fully factored in the loss of working time to Council employees associated with the relocation of the City of Belmont's Council workshop/maintenance base?

- (a) Estimated travelling time for the tractor from new maintenance site to Faulkner Park 30 minutes one way?

On deciding to relocate the Council's operation to Planet Street, Carlisle, consideration was given to the travel time to work sites in Belmont. Alternative depot sites considered were at least as far from the centre of the City as is the Planet Street site.

The distance from the new depot to Faulkner Park is only 2.3 kilometres further than the distance from the present depot to Faulkner Park. At a travel speed of 30 kilometres per hour, this equates to an increase in travel time of less than five minutes in each direction.

Item 5.2.3 – Continued ...

- (b) Negotiating and crossing Orrong Road, which, since the opening of the tunnel, is carrying far in excess of estimated projected number of vehicles than was anticipated?

Generally, traffic travelling to and from the new depot will only travel on Orrong Road for a short distance (a little over half a kilometre) and will do so out of the peak traffic period. Consequently, there is expected to be little impact by Orrong Road travel on travel times to and from the depot.

5.2.4 Mr Paul Hitt, 85 Fitzroy Road, Rivervale

1. Has the Council received a reply from the Westralia Airports Corporation regarding Ref page (4) 5.2.1 question 4 in the council minutes dated 24/09/2001. If a reply has been received could you please provide details of the outcome?

No. A reminder has been sent to the Westralia Airports Corporation.

2. In the newspaper article Headline (More homes, fewer people predicted) Dec 4-10 presented in the Southern Gazette can you please confirm that the latest statistics presented were up to and including 1996?

In the same article Mr Neville Deague acknowledged that new development had taken place within the City of Belmont, which had helped to reverse the declining population within the City of Belmont.

Yes.

3. Is the "Rationalisation of Public Open Space Committee" using statistics that are five years out of date and have little relevance to the present and future population trends within the City of Belmont?

No. Past and future population figures are assessed to determine recreation needs, but other factors are also considered such as changing recreation patterns and needs.

Item 5.2.4 – Continued ...

In reference to 8.6.2 page 57 of the council minutes dated 19/11/2001 Public Open Space last paragraph. (Lot 101 Frederick Street and Lot 33 (112) Hardey Road Belmont Proposed Subdivision).

1. If the ten percent contribution of public open space provision is forfeited in favour of a cash in lieu payment to the City of Belmont due to the development's close proximity to Centenary Park will this payment go into an account directly related to servicing or providing public open space for the residents of Belmont?

Yes.

2. What is the number of building approvals passed by the City of Belmont within the last five years where a cash in lieu of the current Public Open Space policy has been met by a developer?

It is considered that what is meant by this question is the number of applications for subdivision approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) over the last five years where one of the requirements was cash in lieu of public open space.

This request involves research of every application for subdivision forwarded to Council from the WAPC for the last five years. It is considered necessary for Mr Hitt to explain why he requires this information before the resources of Council are put to answering the question.

5.2.5 Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

Whilst the following questions refer to Cell 3 they apply equally to Cells 4, 5 and 6.

1. Are the nett dollar per square metre returns in each cell calculated on the gross or nett square metre area of the cell?
2. How is the nett return of \$328M² calculated for Cell 3?
3. Does the Council accept the dollar per square metre returns as published as a true and accurate reflection of the static analysis figures?

The Mayor advised that as the questions were detailed and only received this afternoon, they would need to be taken on notice.

5.3 Questions From The Floor

5.3.1 Mr Steven Carlsson, 32 Menzies Street, Rivervale

Mr Carlsson enquired when he would be able to make an objection to a proposed parapet wall on 34 Menzies Street, Rivervale?

The Mayor advised that Council had yet to deliberate on this matter, being Item 8.6.2 of the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes of the 10th December 2001.

5.3.2 Mrs Barbara Bartlett, 7 Patterson Road, Kewdale

Mrs Bartlett enquired when is Council making a decision on the proposed renaming of Kewdale?

The Director – Development advised that Council would deliberate on the matter at Item 8.7.3 of the Planning and Development Committee meeting minutes of the 10th December 2001, however noted that the recommendation is to retain the name “Kewdale”.

5.3.3 Mr Michael Ryan, 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale

Mr Ryan enquired whether the agendas for the Planning and Development Committee are a public record, or when do they become a public record?

The Chief Executive Officer advised that the agenda of Council’s Standing Committees are replicated and included into the minute of the Committee, becoming public therefore at the same time as the minutes are released to the public.

Mr Ryan enquired whether he therefore needs to take it on faith that there are no changes between the agenda and minutes?

The Chief Executive Officer advised that the agenda is duplicated as the minutes, with the addition of Committee Comments, and final recommendations to Council. The Chief Executive Officer suggested that if Mr Ryan is seeking a copy of the incorporated Committee agenda, that he put his request in writing so Council can consider it.

5.3.4 Mr Peter Stewart, 3 Hawksburn Road, Rivervale

Mr Stewart referred to recent reports in the *Southern Gazette* and *West Australian* and enquired whether the Mayor is able to confirm or deny whether an inquiry by the Department of Local Government is being conducted into the City of Belmont?

The Mayor advised that he was not aware of any justification for an inquiry into City of Belmont activities.

Mr Stewart reiterated that his question was whether there is an inquiry being held in respect to the City of Belmont.

The Mayor repeated his previous answer.

Mr Stewart drew attention to the fact whether there was an inquiry, not whether there is justification for one.

The Mayor advised that to his knowledge there is no inquiry into the activities of the City of Belmont.

*****8.07pm**

The Mayor declared Public Question Time closed.

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

6.1 Ordinary Council Meeting Held 19 NOVEMBER 2001

GODSELL MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 19 November 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

6.2 Annual Electors Meeting Held 29 November 2001

Chief Executive Officer's Note

The Local Government Act 1995 requires the following compliances in regard to Council's consideration of the Annual Electors Meeting minutes:

S5.32 outlines that the Chief Executive Officer is to ensure that copies of the minutes are made available for inspection by members of the public before the council meeting at which decisions made at the electors meeting are first considered.

Copies have been made available in the Library (as from 10 December 2001).

S5.33 states (subject to some exceptions) that all decisions made at an elector's meeting are to be considered at the next ordinary council meeting, and if at that meeting, a local government makes a decision in response to a decision made at an elector's meeting, the reasons for the decision are to be recorded in the minutes of the council meeting.

I do not believe that this section applies to the "decisions" of the Annual Electors General Meeting to receive the various reports (Mayor's, Auditor's, Standing Committee's etc...) and to show a vote of confidence in the Councillors and Staff of the City of Belmont.

GODFREY MOVED, RICHARDSON SECONDED, that the minutes of the Annual Electors Meeting held on 29 November 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

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

Nil.

8 PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

8.1 MEMORIAL – WICCA PARK – MR R J PEACH

Report by Chief Executive Officer

APPLICATION

To advise of a memorial received from Mr Rhett John Peach of 269 Acton Avenue, Rivervale.

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

BACKGROUND

A memorial has been received from Mr R J Peach in relation to Belmont Forum staff being allowed to park at Wicca Park during the lead up to Christmas.

The memorial was addressed to Peter Clarke, Manager – Ranger Services and reads as follows:

"I, Mr Rhett John Peach of 269 Acton Avenue, on the right side of Wicca Park, think it is a stupid idea how you the Council, give the Belmont Forum Shopping Centre staff permission to park their vehicles in the park like a car park from Monday 3rd December until Saturday 29th December 2001, quite often until 9.30pm – 10.00pm on the nights mentioned below:

<i>Thursday 6 December</i>	<i>8.00am – 9.00pm</i>
<i>Thursday 13 December</i>	<i>8.00am – 9.00pm</i>
<i>Wednesday 19 December</i>	<i>8.00am – 9.00pm</i>
<i>Thursday 20 December</i>	<i>8.00am – 9.00pm</i>
<i>Friday 21 December</i>	<i>8.00am – 9.00pm</i>

The Forum should have an alternative car park made for staff only. An underground car park would keep their cars safe, cool when hot and could be used all year round.

My personal complaint is that I have birds in aviaries, and the lights that would be used on the above nights means my birds will try and fly, thinking it is day if disturbed by movement or noise. This can lead to death or permanent injury. So if this should occur, you or Belmont Forum will happily reimburse me the cost of the dead or injured bird/s.

Item 8.1 – Continued....

Also it makes it very restrictive where you can walk and play with your dog/s or pets. Children have next to no area to play, being a school holiday, having to watch out for the cars. You also get the odd rev-head who arcs his wheels and/or speeds on arrival or departure. Security telling you to keep away from the parked vehicle as you walk across the park to a friend's house or the shops.

There are other people in the area who also don't enjoy Wicca Park being turned into a car park, as stated on the reverse side of this letter. I know you said it cannot be stopped this year, when I spoke to you, but I would be very disappointed if it occurs next year."

COMMENT

A copy of nearby residents' comments are provided at Attachment # 1.

GODSELL MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the memorial be received, with a review being held by the Works and Technical Services Committee.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

9 BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

Nil.

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 WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 3 DECEMBER 2001

Receipt of Minutes

GODSELL MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 3 December 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Item 8.1.1 was withdrawn at the request of Councillors Blair and Powell.

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

RICHARDSON MOVED, BLAIR SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.2.1, 8.3.1, 8.3.3, 8.4.1-8.4.3, 8.5.1, 8.5.2 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 3 December 2001, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of item 8.1.1).

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

11.1.1 Withdrawn Item 8.1.1 – Removal of Trees, 1 Valentine Road, Kewdale

POWELL MOVED, BASS SECONDED, that the Committee Recommendation not be adopted and the matter be referred back to the Works and Technical Services Committee for further consideration.

CARRIED 7 VOTES TO 5

**For: Blair, Bass, Doney, Powell,
Murfin, Dornford, Teasdale**

Against: Passeri, Godsell, Marks, Richardson, Godfrey

**11.2 ADMINISTRATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
4 DECEMBER 2001**

Receipt of Minutes

DONEY MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Administration and Community Services meeting held on 4 December 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Nil.

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

DONEY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1, 8.2.1 – 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 4 December 2001, be adopted en bloc.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

11.3 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 10 DECEMBER 2001

Receipt of Minutes

RICHARDSON MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that the minutes of the Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 10 December 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Item 8.2.2 was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Teasdale.
Item 8.6.2 was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Marks.

Item 11.3 – Continued ...

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

RICHARDSON MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1 – 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.3, 8.2.4, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.4.1 – 8.4.4, 8.6.1, 8.6.3, 8.7.1 – 8.7.7 of the Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 10 December 2001, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of items 8.2.2 and 8.6.2).

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

11.3.1 Withdrawn Item 8.2.2 – Progress Report – Cities for Climate Protection Programme

TEASDALE MOVED, BASS SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation not be adopted and –

1. **The information be received.**
2. **The costs associated with the appointment of an Environmental Officer be referred to the next Resources and Policy Committee meeting as per the following:-**
 - i. **Cost of an Officer**
 - (a) **Vehicle**
 - (b) **Computer**
 - (c) **Wages**
 - (d) **Office**
 - (e) **Conference Expenses**
 - ii. **Is it considered by Council that James King and Brian Wall are not competent to carry out this role?**
 - iii. **Is it Council's intention to set up an Environmental Department that will spend considerable funds on overheads and little on the ground?**
 - iv. **Why is Council considering the appointment of an Environmental Officer, when the EMRC will supply one as required (at a cost)?**
 - v. **Is it Council's intention to resurrect the environmental budget that it has previously resolved to delete?**
 - vi. **What will be the scope of work of this officer?**

LOST 2 VOTES TO 10

For: Teasdale, Bass
Against: Passeri, Blair, Richardson, Doney, Godsell, Godfrey, Murfin, Marks, Dornford, Powell

28

CONFIRMATION DATE: 11 FEBRUARY 2002

Item 11.3.1 – Continued ...

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

CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 1

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

Against: Bass

**11.3.2 Withdrawn Item 8.6.2 – Lot 800 (34) Menzies Street, Rivervale –
Proposed Single Storey New Residence with Parapet Walls**

MARKS MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation be amended to:

- “1. The revised proposal, which includes a parapet wall with a lower height, be referred to the adjacent landowner for comment.***
- 2. Council approve the revised proposal if the adjacent landowner supports the proposal. Further, that if an objection is received the matter be deferred to a Special Council meeting for determination.”***

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

11.4 RESOURCES AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 11 DECEMBER 2001

GODFREY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the minutes of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting held on 11 December 2001, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Item 8.8.3 was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Richardson.

Item 11.4 – Continued ...

ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT

GODFREY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.4.1 – 8.4.6, 8.5.1, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.8.1 and 8.8.2 of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting held on 11 December 2001, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of item 8.8.3).

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

*****8.41pm** Having earlier declared an interest in this item, Councillors Passeri and Dornford departed the meeting. Councillor Blair as Deputy Mayor assumed the chair.

11.4.1 Withdrawn Item 8.8.3 – Analysis of Investments as at 30 November 2001

GODFREY MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that that the Committee Recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.

CARRIED 10 VOTES TO 0

*****8.42pm** Councillors Passeri and Dornford returned to the meeting. The Mayor re-assumed the chair.

12 REPORTS OF OFFICERS

12.1 Information Only Items

Report by 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 that may be of general interest to Councillors.

COMMENT

General information and memorandums:

DATED	SUBJECT
22/11/01	Official Opening of Tomato Lake Boardwalk and Launch of Walking Groups
23/11/01	City of Belmont Town Planning Scheme No 13 – "The Springs"
23/11/01	Response to Syndi Chan's letter dated 16 November 2001
	Dance studio at Unit 15/398 Great Eastern Highway, Ascot
23/11/01	Possible Car Racing Track at Perth Airport
30/11/01	Executive Staff Development and Performance Reviews
30/11/01	Staff Farewell – Stephanie Taylor, Youth Services Co-ordinator
30/11/01	Letters of Appreciation
07/12/01	VIP Plus – Alternative Education Program
14/12/01	Belmont Community Watch Monthly Report
14/12/01	Renaming and Renumbering of Chamberlain Road, Rivervale
14/12/01	Staff Christmas Party and Office and Library Hours over Christmas

Item 12.1 Continued...

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 23 November 2001:

12.1.1 WAMA Week Issue No. 46.01 – 16 November 2001.

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 30 November 2001:

12.1.2 WAMA Week Issue No. 47.01 – 23 November 2001.

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 7 December 2001:

12.1.3 WAMA Week Issue No. 48.01 – 30 November 2001.

Councillor Information Items circulated on the 14 December 2001:

12.1.4 Local Government News (formerly WAMA Week)
Issue No. 1 – 7 December 2001

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

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

13 REPORTS OF DELEGATES

13.1 REPORT ON NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT 2001 – COUNCILLOR PETER PASSERI AND COUNCILLOR MARION BLAIR

The theme of this year's Conference was COMMUNITY RENEWAL - CITIZENS IN ACTION. There were 750 registered Delegates present at the Congress which was officially opened by the Governor General Dr Peter Hollingworth AC, OBE, followed by Cr John Ross, President, ALGA.

There were four keynote speakers over the duration of the Conference, in our opinion all four were excellent.

Ms Vicki Buck, former Mayor of Christchurch, NZ gave a spirited but light hearted overview of how Local Government is structured in New Zealand, of her experiences as the former Mayor of Christchurch and how she as a firm believer that Local Government can make a difference, set out to prove this by changing the rules and **just doing it**. In her own words, **If I was going to do the job I had to have fun**.

Mr Peter Howarth. Peter was born in Sydney and after becoming successful in real estate, property development, doughnut shops, fitness centres, property equity and rural investment, decided he didn't want to live in the city any more and semi retired to a cattle property of some 30,000 acres at Nundle and Quirindi. Peter's paper - ***Making Small Rural Towns Sustainable*** was about the small NSW town called Nundle - an hour or so South of Tamworth - that with a little vision and leadership went from a tired, dying town to a vibrant thriving tourist driven Community, showing what can be achieved when communities work together and have risk capital plus new energy and ideas introduced.

Mr Peter Kenyon, (a Western Australian who, when he is at home, lives at York) - gave a presentation - **Bank of Ideas**. Peter is a social entrepreneur and community enthusiast, who has travelled extensively throughout Australia, New Zealand and Africa, and worked in those areas with over 600 communities seeking fresh and creative ways to stimulate inspiring and novel approaches to community and economic renewal. Peter is well worth listening to and it is our intention to lobby the EMRC to perhaps have Peter do a presentation here in Perth for our member Councils.

Item 13.1 – Continued ...

Mr James (Jim) Hall gave a spellbinding presentation of the role he and his team, the GIS Utility of the Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications, played immediately following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York on September 11th this year by establishing an Emergency Mapping and Data Centre (EMDC) in the City Emergency Operations Centre. The EMDC operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week for six weeks and more, producing maps and information for all aspects of the emergency response and recovery effort. Jim's presentation included a pre-emergency overview of GIS in New York and the GIS Utility in particular, then a short video was screened of his boss, Mr Alan Leidner, describing the emergency events at a GISMO (GIS user group) meeting, the presentation then went on with a description and graphical display of the events, products and GIS activities during the first six weeks of the emergency and closed with a review of the lessons learned and observations of the emergency and the GIS role in it. The presentation emphasised the team effort that was involved during the emergency.

If Councillors are interested, more detailed information will be available on the ALGA website in approximately three weeks.

There were initially 56 resolutions/motions placed before the General Assembly during the Plenary Sessions over the three days, and a further 17 late items on the Wednesday, all were discussed, debated and carried or lost. The results will also be published later.

There were also workshops on the following issues, and were later put to resolution/motions.

- Benefiting from your Community's Cultural Diversity.
- Transport and Asset Management.
- New Urbanism
- Increasing the role of Women in Decision Making (2 sessions).
- Disaster Risk Management.
- E-Government.
- Opportunities in Natural Resource Management.

By going to different workshops we were able to cover more issues. These will also be presented in more detail on the Webpage. Councillor Blair will also be reporting in more detail on some of the issues regarding the Increasing Role of Women in Decision Making.

Because the Prime Minister had changed his representative to the role of Federal Minister for Local Government and the Territories, to a Minister not yet sworn in (Wilson Tuckey), the previous Minister spoke and presented the National Awards for Innovation in Local Government.

Item 13.1 – Continued ...

Presentation of Local Government Awards were also presented by

- The Heart Foundation Kellogg Local Government Awards.
- Steel Can Recycling Council.

Whilst the National Congress of ALGA is a very mentally and physically demanding Conference, both of us found it to be important and stimulating to attend. We wish to convey our thanks to Council for being able to represent the City of Belmont at the 2001 ALGA Conference.

Councillor Blair:

REPORT ON NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT 2001 – INCREASING THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN DECISION MAKING

Supported by the Australian Local Government Women's Association, the Office of the Status of Women and the National Office of Local Government.

The workshop invited participants to consider appropriate action to increase the participation of women in local government decision making, both as elected members and within council administration.

The last decade has seen many changes in Local Government. Greater responsibility of service delivery has been devolved from the state to local municipalities and the community has a growing expectation that they will be consulted. As a result of community demands, there has been a broadening of services delivered by Local Government to include an increasing focus on community development, environmental management and longer term strategic planning. These changes have resulted in new skills and attributes being required and women can contribute significantly to these in the future.

It is acknowledged that throughout the history of Local Government women still make up less than 30% of all elected members, 16% of mayors and less than 10% of senior executives.

The highlight of the session was the launch of the National Framework for Women in Local Government. The Framework invites Councils to prepare their own plans, appropriate to their local communities. 16 Councils from Western Australia helped to contribute to the booklet.

Item 13.1 – Continued ...

I had the pleasure of announcing to the workshop that we will be launching the Australian Local Government Women's Association in Western Australia on National Women's Day on March 8th, 2002.

Thank you once again to the City of Belmont for allowing Mayor Passeri and myself to attend this very informative national general assembly.

GODFREY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that the report on the National General Assembly on Local Government by Councillors Passeri and Blair, be noted and received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

13.2 BELMONT CITY FAIR 2001 – CHAIRMAN'S REPORT, CR MIKE GODSELL

I can honestly say, and I am sure that I speak for the whole Focus Group, when I say that the Belmont City Fair of 2001 would have been our very best ever.

The Focus Group has been subject to quite a bit of change in this last year, one major change being our transfer from Administration to Marketing.

In past years we have repeatedly asked ourselves "Do we want to remain a Community Fair for the people of this district?" and the answer to now has always been "Yes". The Group stated that the Fair should remain a yearly event for local Charity Groups to come together to fundraise for their particular Organisation.

It was put to the Focus Group this year that we reshape the Fair as it has remained in its present successful format for many years. The major reshaping was to move the stage to the top of the hill near the Library, a move that we were all a bit uneasy with but were prepared to give it a try for this year. This move allowed us to conduct a 'Remembrance Day Ceremony' at the War Memorial which was carried out on Sunday, 11th November, 2001 at 11.00a.m. with great reverence.

As with other years, the hands-on workers on the Focus Group were on the 'show ground' bright and early to resolve and untangle the many small things that go wrong and stop them turning into major events.

The Fair carried on an air of excitement right through the weekend with many varied stalls to grab the people's interest.

The Fun Fair was as popular as ever for the younger members of the crowd with a pleasure backup of pony and camel rides.

Item 13.2 – Continued ...

The 'country feeling' was once again given to the Fair when the axemen of Western Australia made the chips fly as they made short work of their logs.

You would have to agree that it is a very visual sport and the team comprises many National and State Champion Axemen.

The SES, as always, get a very special mention as without them the Fair just would not be the same and almost impossible to run. They are there to be called on 24 hours a day for the whole weekend and we, the Organisers, thank them very much for their participation.

The Belmont Forum was open for the whole weekend and several promotions were tried again this year with only marginal success.

Although there were many badges taken for the 'Badge Competition' only a handful made their way back to the Fair for a prize.

Neville Passmore, the well known Radio Gardening Personality, came along to present the Awards for the best gardens of our City. These were put into several categories and a few friends and relations of the recipients turned up to watch the presentations. The gardens judged were of a very high standard.

The largest stage we have ever had was used by every conceivable type of act and gave an air of professionalism to the entertainment.

The entertainment on Saturday culminated with the Evening Show. Because of the widespread advertising, people turned up in their thousands, whole families with picnic hampers ready to have a very enjoyable evening in the warm night air. They were not disappointed as the evening's entertainment began with some very resounding music by the 'Belmont City College Band' which, of course, contains many students from the Belmont district.

The School band was followed by the highlight of the evening, the fabulous 'Timewarp'. This very colourful, young, vibrant, loud and thoroughly entertaining group lit up the whole fairground! I, for one, only heard excellent comments from the crowd present and many people said that they do not get anything like this in their city.

People sang with 'Elvis Presley' and danced with the 'Village People' all through the show until it was time for the now expected 'Fireworks Extravaganza'.

The Fair has come a long way from a truck full of children and balloons back in 1986 to what it has been built into today.

Item 13.2 – Continued ...

To Lorraine, our Marketing Manager, with the help of Amy, many thanks for their pre-Fair preparation and hard work during the event, in addition to making many notes so as next year the Fair can again be used as a marketing tool to further promote our City of Opportunity.

My thanks as Chairman go to the 'hands of people' like Rob, who ran the stage and sound equipment, which is now a major job and will require assistance next year.

Jackie and Lorraine in their caravan sweat box running and announcing everything from lost keys and kids to drawing the Stall Raffles.

Walter and Gill who moved, fetched, pushed and pulled whenever they were asked and, of course, 'Lyn' who worked tirelessly in the lead up to and for the whole weekend, but having been the Fair's Co-ordinator in years past, handled all of the situations like a seasoned veteran.

We have had many, many hours of fun over the years of the Fair but, as soon as the element of fun is lost from the Fair and the Stallholders think more of money than having a 'Community Day', then something will have been lost as the Fair is all about people, 'our people'!

BLAIR MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the report on the 2001 Belmont City Fair by Councillor Godsell, be noted and received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

13.3 CLOVERDALE AND KEWDALE STREET AUDIT – 4 DECEMBER 2001

On Tuesday, 4 December the Belmont Safer WA Committee conducted its second street audit in the suburbs of Cloverdale and Kewdale as part of the Committee's ongoing strategy of implementing crime prevention initiatives in the City of Belmont.

I, together with Cr Powell and members of the Belmont Safer WA Committee, Police Officers, Neighbourhood Watch representatives, NGS Community Watch Patrol and Council Officers took part in the street audit.

I am pleased to report to Council that the street audit was a success and whilst no major issues were raised by residents, a number of minor issues will be forwarded to the appropriate authorities for action.

Item 13.3 – Continued ...

It was particularly pleasing for those conducting the audit to receive positive comments from residents, especially that someone was out seeking their views on issues in their particular neighbourhoods.

The success of this street audit and the positive comments received from residents confirms the actions being taken by the Belmont Safer WA Committee in developing these types of crime prevention initiatives. It is proposed to conduct further street audits in other suburbs in the new year.

RICHARDSON MOVED, BLAIR SECONDED, that the Mayor's report of the Cloverdale and Kewdale Street Audit held on Tuesday 4th December 2001, be noted and received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

13.4 GEAC MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY

From the 4th to the 7th November 2001, I attended the GEAC Management Conference.

All the objectives that were set prior to going to the conference were attained.

Site visits to the City of Sydney Library, Baulkham Hills and Warringah gave me the opportunity to look at software, hardware, talk to staff and also see ideas for our office refurbishment.

After attending the sessions at the conference and being included in the management meetings with GEAC and other user groups I am confident that the City of Belmont has invested wisely in Information Technology for the future.

13.5 TWILIGHT SYMPHONY CONCERT – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY

On the 2nd December 2001 I attended on behalf of Mayor Passeri and representing the City of Belmont, the Twilight Symphony Concert. The event was very successful. It was held in Burswood Park and proudly sponsored by the Town of Victoria Park, Lotteries Commission, Burswood Park Board and the Burswood Resort. The West Australian Symphony Orchestra performed 'world classics' of well-known pieces under the stars. The function was well attended and all donations were made to Appealathon.

13.6 RSL BELMONT – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR GODFREY

On Sunday 16th December 2001, I attended the meeting at the RSL Belmont. 47 members were present. A large Christmas raffle was drawn. The RSL were very pleased with the Remembrance Day ceremonies organised by the City of Belmont in Faulkner Park. They are looking at installing a synthetic green for bowls. Councillor Godsell has donated \$200 towards a new cabinet for the Club.

BLAIR MOVED, BASS SECONDED, that the reports from Councillor Godfrey be noted and received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

13.7 LAUNCH OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION – REPORT BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR

The Association was formed in August 2001 by Local Governments across metropolitan, regional, rural and remote Western Australia and officially launched in December 2001.

In the logo, the triangle has been the traditional emblem of Local Government in WA for many years, and provided the new Association with a solid foundation, bringing the strength, knowledge and experience of the past into our new representative organisation.

The logo symbolizes a new and exciting direction for the Association and the evolution of Local Government representation in WA into a single, united and dynamic voice, speaking on behalf of Councils across the State.

As a united sector, we will work together to ensure all Local Governments can provide an excellent service to their communities.

RICHARDSON MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that the report of Councillor Blair be noted and received.

CARRIED 12 VOTES TO 0

14 URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION

Nil.

15 MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Nil.

16 CLOSURE

Prior to closing the meeting the Mayor acknowledged the presence in the gallery of Council Ian Mickel, President of the Western Australian Local Government Association and welcomed him to the City.

The Mayor then thanked all Councillors for their efforts during a difficult year of important decisions; thanked the Council officers and staff for their professional efforts during the year and extended to all present a wonderful and safe festive season.

There being no further business to discuss, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8.51pm.