



**City of Belmont**  
**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**MINUTES**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**28 August 2000**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>		
<b>1.</b>	<b>OFFICIAL OPENING.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES &amp; LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	APOLOGIES.....	1
2.2	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	1
<b>3.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION) .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....</b>	<b>2</b>
5.1	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING.....	2
5.1.1	Mrs Christel Ferrari - 22 Tibbradden Circle, Ascot.....	2
5.1.2	Mr Michael Robson, Secretary, City of Belmont Ratepayers and Residents Association - 24 Homewood Street, Cloverdale .....	5
5.2	QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING .....	8
5.2.1	Mr Mick Ryan - 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale .....	8
5.2.2	Mrs Janet Powell - (President - Ratepayers and Residents Association) - 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale .....	9
5.2.3	Mr Mike Robson (Secretary Belmont Resident and Ratepayers Association) .....	9
5.3	QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.....	10
5.3.1	Mr John McGuire .....	10
5.3.2	Ms Janet Powell (President - Residents and Ratepayers Association) - 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale .....	10

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
	5.3.3 Mr Bradley Amphlett - 72 Tibbradden Circle, Ascot.....	11
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....</b>	<b>12</b>
6.1	ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 14 AUGUST 2000.....	12
<b>7.</b>	<b>QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION) .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
8.1	MEMORIAL - KNUTSFORD AVENUE TRAFFIC HAZARD.....	13
8.2	MEMORIAL - TOWN PLANNING SCHEME 13 - "THE SPRINGS" .....	14
<b>9.</b>	<b>MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE .....</b>	<b>16</b>
11.1	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	16
11.1.1	Cr Swann - Leave Of Absence .....	16
11.2	GENERAL.....	17
11.2.1	City of Belmont/Belmont Oasis Family Fun Day .....	17
11.3	LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE.....	19
<b>12.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF COMMITTEES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
12.1	WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD 21 AUGUST 2000 .....	19
12.2	RESOURCES AND POLICY COMMITTEE HELD 22 AUGUST 2000 .....	20
<b>13.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF OFFICERS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
13.1	INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS.....	21
<b>14.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF DELEGATES .....</b>	<b>22</b>
14.1	CR PASSERI - ANNUAL WASTE AND RECYCLE CONFERENCE .....	22
<b>15.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>16.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>17.</b>	<b>MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>18.</b>	<b>CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>23</b>

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE, 215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE ON MONDAY 28 AUGUST 2000, COMMENCING AT 7.32 PM**

**PRESENT**

Cr P R Passeri, JP, Mayor	West Ward
Cr M H Blair, Deputy Mayor	Central Ward
Cr M M Bass	East Ward
Cr P Marks	East Ward
Cr G J Godfrey	East Ward
Cr L M Coops	Central Ward
Cr A T Richardson, JP	West Ward
Cr G Doney	West Ward
Cr A P Murfin, OAM, JP	South Ward
Cr D J Symonds	South Ward
Cr R T Swann	South Ward

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr B Genoni	Chief Executive Officer
Mr N Hartley	Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Mr S Cole	Director - Finance
Mr D Harris	Acting Director - Engineering
Mr A Reed	Senior Ranger

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

There were 15 members of the public, and 2 member of the Press (Southern Gazette) present.

**1. OFFICIAL OPENING**

The Mayor welcomed those in attendance and noted that the Belmont Sister City Student Delegation was present tonight in the Chamber. The Mayor noted that the Belmont Delegation will depart for our City's sister city Adachi in Japan in late September.

**2. APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**2.1 APOLOGIES**

Cr M C Godsell	Central Ward
----------------	--------------

**2.2 LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil.

### 4. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Mayor advised of the recent death (21<sup>st</sup> August 2000) of Mayor Furusho, a previous Mayor of Adachi who helped conclude the signing of the Belmont/Adachi Sister City relationship. He also visited Belmont in 1988 and 1994 as the leader of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Year Commemorative Citizens Delegations.

The Mayor asked the Chamber to stand for one minute silence as a mark of respect.

### 5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

\*\*\*7.36pm

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

#### 5.1 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING

##### 5.1.1 Mrs Christel Ferrari - 22 Tibbradden Circle, Ascot

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 14 August 2000, Mrs Ferrari's eight questions were taken on notice. These questions were answered in a letter dated 25 August 2000, which reads as follows:-

**"1. Why did Belmont Council allow the developers of Nulsen Haven to raise the height of the land without initially notifying existing adjoining property owners, knowing that this would cause loss of amenity and aesthetic value to their properties?"**

Council controls this part of the sub-division process and is committed to informing neighbouring properties in circumstances where the proposed fill is considered to have exceeded a reasonable level.

The fill is designed to match the existing ground level of the heritage listed Nulsen Haven residence and the trees required to be retained. It is acknowledged that there will be a change to the finished height of affected boundary fences, and that because of the contemporary trend for "small lot" subdivisions, even small variations can seem quite noticeable. Whilst it is acknowledged that there could be an arguable change to the aesthetics of the blocks in question, there does not appear to be overwhelming evidence of any significant loss of amenity.

As a general summary, with the move towards a community demand for small lot subdivisions, changes in ground levels between neighbouring properties are becoming commonplace in Belmont (and to a much greater degree the wider metropolitan area).

*Item 5.1.1 continued*

- 2. Was one of the reasons for allowing the height of the land to be increased, the fact that the land was purportedly on the 100 year flood plan and thus a condition of council that the land be raised?**

No, this is not correct. The finished level of the sub-division has been determined by the level of the existing Nulsen Haven residence. The road levels have been set at appropriate heights to enable easy access to the new lots surrounding the Nulsen Haven residence. The finished height is approximately 600mm above the minimum ground height set by Council (flood plain level).

- 3. If (2) above was true, why were residences built in the Tibbradden Estate allowed to be built on present levels, a large majority of which are on the 100 year flood plan.**

As outlined above, the assumption in question 2 was not correct. However, the setting of minimum ground levels for sub-divisions located within a 100 year flood plain is based upon known levels identified at particular locations on the river. Generally, these levels steadily increase along the flood plains as one moves up river. In this particular case, the flood levels increase approximately 100mm - 150mm along the length of the Tibbradden Estate and the Nulsen Haven sub-division.

- 4. Was one of the reasons for the raised height of the development, to give the visual effect of the Nulsen Haven building being lower in height, and if so, why was this decision considered above the interests of existing adjoining property owners?**

The decision to increase the finished ground level was partly undertaken on the basis of the aesthetics of the new houses as viewed against the existing Nulsen Haven building. Certainly however, there was no intention to unduly prejudice or disadvantage the adjoining residences.

- 5. When approval was granted to the developers to raise the land, did Council take into consideration:-**

**(a) The ensuing drainage problems that would occur between the raised development and adjoining property owners on the lower side?**

**(b) That an overlook problem would occur?**

**(c) That:-**

**(i) All rear fencing of existing property owners in Tibbradden Circle would need to be removed and reinstated on top of a retaining wall which may or may not be aesthetically satisfactory to the adjoining owners on the lower side of the wall;**

**(ii) That (i) above, potentially introduces inherent drainage and structural failure problems to the properties on the lower side of the wall which to this point have still not been addressed satisfactorily;**

**(iii) That, alternatively, a separate fence and retaining wall on the developers land would be built against existing fences and overlook them by at least 600mm in height, forcing adjoining landowners to look at two fences instead of one and in some instances to look at two fences of opposing materials;**

**(iv) That if (iii) above is carried out, potential health and drainage hazards arise with the debris and vermin that will collect between the two fences, and will cause rotting and rusting of existing fences, claims against owners and considerable expense to owners, a solution to which at this point has not been addressed;**

**(v) That as a result of the height of the fences, morning sun will be blocked out.**

**(d) That, all of the above, will devalue the properties of the adjoining owners.**

- (a) The drainage system has been engineered to industry standards and ground water will be directed to an internal sub soil drainage system. Whilst not expected, should any problems occur, Council has powers to enforce rectification works.**

**Item 5.1.1 continued**

- (b) The new fence will be 1.80 metres in height measured from the new soil height, therefore any overlooking issues have been minimised.
- (c) (i) All fencing issues are dealt with in accordance with the state government's Dividing Fences Act. This Act of parliament applies to all property owners in Western Australia and the situation is no different to when the new owners progressively moved into the initial Tibbradden sub-division where the common neighbours negotiate their boundary fencing requirements with each other, generally without Council's interference or any requirement for approval. It is Council's understanding that the developer has paid for half the cost of all the existing fences and will also pay the full cost for all the fences to be relocated.
- (ii) As outlined above, the retaining wall and the soil drainage system have been designed by qualified Engineers and whilst not expected, should any problems occur, Council has powers to enforce rectification works.
- (iii) We understand that the developer tried to negotiate with all the common property owners to relocate the existing fences, however, this appears to have been unsuccessful. At this time, we believe that the developer is considering the construction of a completely new fence inside their own property boundary, unless of course a compromise can be reached. The ultimate fence(s) constructed will be that which is agreed to by the relevant owners concerned.
- (iv) Should agreement not be reached between the owners concerned in regard to a single fence and that a separate fence be constructed, then a gap of approximately 200mm will occur. However, each property owner may wish to remove the original fence and take advantage of the slight increase in land caused by the location of the new fence. This is also a relatively common occurrence, and can easily be rectified by removing the original fence.
- (v) It is not considered that the height difference caused by the new fence will significantly diminish the morning sun.
- (d) There is no known evidence to confirm that changes in site levels (of the amount in question) between properties diminish property values. As previously mentioned, site level changes are commonplace and tiered sub-divisions provide flat building sites.

**6a. As a result of the devaluation of the properties, will Council recommend to the Valuer General, a reduction in rates for all properties affected as compensation? Another part to this question??**

Council does not have the ability to influence the assessed value of individual properties, however each owner is quite at liberty to appeal their (Gross Rental Value) rate valuation with the Valuer Generals office. There is no charge for this appeal and details of the process are available from our Rates Information Officers.

**6b. Will Council inspect the limestone wall on the Tibbradden Circle side for a period of one year at three monthly intervals to ensure that there is no seepage, drainage problems or structural damage over this period of time?**

Council will ensure that all construction is undertaken using approved methods and materials, as happens throughout the Municipality. Council officers will undertake inspections, provided that each owner supports this requirement in writing as Council Officers will not enter their property uninvited and without due cause. It would be advisable to write to Council to confirm the acceptance for each 3 monthly inspection.

**Item 5.1.1 continued****7. When approving the development, did the Council take into consideration the unsafe angle at which the extension of Hay Road points towards the house on the opposite corner of the intersection with Tibbradden Circle?**

The road design has been approved by Council and is based on relevant industry standards. The intersection is considered to be safe considering the type of subdivision and the controlled speed environment brought about by the road widths and layout.

**5.1.2 Mr Michael Robson, Secretary, City of Belmont Ratepayers and Residents Association - 24 Homewood Street, Cloverdale**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 14 August 2000, Mr Robson's five questions were taken on notice. These questions were answered in a letter dated 24 August 2000, which reads as follows:-

"As you are aware, the questions submitted by yourself at the 14 August 2000 Council meeting were taken on notice by the Mayor. I am pleased to now be able to provide you with a written answer to those questions.

In relation to the first three questions, a general comment is required before addressing the specifics. Council's Budget consists of a series of estimates that are formally reviewed in October and March each year. These reviews are designed to address new priorities or make necessary adjustments to the Budget throughout the financial year. The ultimate strategic objective being to finish the financial year in a strong financial position, whilst accommodating as many projects on behalf of our community, as is possible.

It is also worth pointing out Council's adopted Budget refers to the 30 June 2000 actuals, as estimates and Note 11 in Notes to the Accounts states:

*"At the time of preparation, actual figures for 1999-2000 had not been finalised, therefore, all 'actual' comparatives should be read as estimates".*

**1. Mayoral Allowance Expenditure:- Item 380 (Mayoral-Allowance) of the financial report has had a full year expenditure of \$34,300. This expenditure is in excess of the budget amount. Can Council disclosure to myself the nature of all items of expenditure which make up the Mayoral - Allowance, their respective expenditures and the reason for the item being over expended?**

The Mayoral Allowance Budget for 1999-2000 consisted of the following components:

• Sitting Fee (as per Local Government Act)			\$12,000
• Mayoral Allowance (as per Local Government Act & Council Resolution)			
- 1 July 1999 to 30 September 1999	(\$12,000 per annum)	\$3,000	
- 1 October 1999 to 30 June 2000	(\$20,000 per annum)	\$15,000	\$18,000
• Communication Allowance (as per Local Government Act)			\$1,500
• Private Use of Mayoral Vehicle (as per Council Resolution)			
- Purchase 1 December 1999	(\$4,800 per annum)		\$2,800
			<u>\$34,300</u>

**Item 5.1.2 continued**

Council resolved in September 1999 to adjust the Mayoral Allowance for the period 1 October 1999 to 30 June 2000. At this point in time, an estimate of the Mayoral Allowance was made for the October Budget Review - that amount being \$31,500. In November 1999, Council resolved to increase the Mayoral Allowance to compensate for the added value attributable to private use of the mayoral vehicle (that was to be purchased on 1 December 1999). It was not deemed necessary to again adjust the Budget as it was considered that a reasonable allocation had been made to the October Budget Review.

The Mayoral Allowance paid to the Mayor for 1999-2000 together with Sitting Fees and the Communication Allowance, is therefore in accordance with Council's resolutions.

**2. Fleet & Plant General (fuel) Expenditure:- Item 224 (Fuel) of the financial report has had a full year expenditure of \$10,136 which is nearly double the budgeted figure. Can Council disclose to myself the reason(s) for the over-expenditure?**

In relation to your second question, 224 is a generic code used for all fleet related fuel accounts. As your question was not specific to any particular function, an assumption has been made that it relates to Function 110 – Finance.

The budgets for fuel usage is prepared on the basis of historical usage and then adjusted appropriately (taking into account such things as inflation, anticipated fuel prices and organisational usage) for the following year. There are a number of Council vehicles that have their fuel usage allocated to this account. These include the Director – Finance, Manager - Financial Services, Manager – Information Technology, Manager – Business Development and the Purchasing Officer's van.

Upon obtaining a detailed printout of the fuel account, some incorrect allocations were detected and will be transferred to their appropriate accounts. These incorrect allocations totalled \$1,174.94. This leaves the situation of the fuel account as follows:

<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$5,900	\$9,222	\$3,322

It appears that the vehicle made available for the newly created position of Manager - Business Development (as resolved by Council) was not included in the original calculations for fuel, nor was it adjusted at the Budget Review. The account therefore remains as an over expenditure.

**3. IT - Communications Expenses:- Item 324 (IT - Communications) of the financial report has had a full year of expenditure of approximately \$89,000 between the divisions of general, contracts and capital expenditure of the Computing section. Can Council disclosure to myself the reason(s) for the over expenditure?**

Your third question relates to 324 – IT Communications. Again, your question is not specific as to what function you refer to, so an assumption has been made that it relates to the Computing Section.

The three areas raised are:

		<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>
115.00.0.324	Operating Expenditure	7,800	21,780
115.02.0.324	Contract Expenditure	14,000	25,275
115.00.2.324	Capital Expenditure	45,000	43,303
		<u>\$66,800</u>	<u>\$90,358</u>

**Item 5.1.2 continued**

Information Technology - Communications, presents many challenges for any organisation, particularly when there is a necessity to communicate data to sites other than the main Administration Building. Council has on its network, remote locations such as the Depot, Community Centres etc. Finding cost effective ways of maintaining reasonable levels of communication to these centres is a constant challenge and with changing technology, is difficult to accurately budget.

There is no singular item that relates to the over expenditure, however, costs of ISDN lines and supporting software to provide fire-wall protection etc has cost more than anticipated. Security of Council's Information Technology system is always a high priority and an appropriate level of expenditure must be incurred to protect Council's investment in Information Technology.

**4. Belmont Security Patrol Expenditure:- What was the total expenditure for the operation and associated costs for the Belmont Security Patrol?**

The fourth issue raised relates to the total expenditure for the operation and associated costs of the Belmont Security Patrols. The total expenditure as currently known for 1999-2000 inclusive of Activity Based Costing etc is as follows:

<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>
\$343,872	\$337,124

**5. Mobile Library Funding Allocation:- The Mobile Library is a long standing service which has been poorly advertised in recent years and has suffered through this inaction. With respect to the funding crisis which now befalls the service, will council now do the following:**

- (i) close the Councillors' bar, which services less than twenty people and reallocate the funds to the Mobile Library?; and**
- (ii) advertise the service for the benefit of all ratepayers and residents, particularly the more senior persons of our community?**

Your final question relates to the Mobile Library Funding.

Council as part of its budget discussions and after considerable debate, resolved to extend the opening hours of the Ruth Faulkner Library by opening the service on Wednesdays. As part of the overall consideration of this initiative, the decision was also made to discontinue the Mobile Library Service that was established to accommodate vastly different circumstances almost twenty five years ago (the savings of which assisted to offset the additional main library hours costs). The Library budget currently provides a home delivery service to residents who cannot access the main library and this will continue and be expanded if necessary.

Our Manager-Library Services has attempted to personally contact all mobile library customers to explain the reasoning behind Council's decision and how they can take advantage of the extended services available from the Ruth Faulkner Library. It is understood that as a result of these discussions, some of the mobile library customers have already taken advantage of the Home Delivery Service. I am not aware of any Councillor request to have the matter of the reopening of the Mobile Library Service reconsidered by Council.

As part of the budget process, all aspects of Council's expenditure are scrutinised and the Councillor's and Civic expenditure areas are no exception. This scrutiny is carried out over the extended budget consideration process and funds provided are considered in light of the broad range of responsibilities and obligations of Council and individual Councillors. Of course the Council's entertainment areas accommodate many more than the "less than twenty people" referred to.

**Item 5.1.2 continued**

Council holds a number of civic receptions each year including receptions for the volunteers who assist with our Meals on Wheels and other aged and disabled services, receptions for those volunteers who assist with the local SES group, plus a range of others. You would be aware that Council also offers light refreshments to the public gallery following each Council meeting and I understand this offer is much appreciated by those in attendance. If Council was to reconsider the reopening of the Mobile Library Service then all of our expenditure areas, including civic expenses, would need to be reviewed in order to accommodate the added expense of the continuation of this service."

**5.2 QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING****5.2.1 Mr Mick Ryan - 60 Riversdale Road, Rivervale**

1. *Further to the Director - Development's statement published at the Council's last meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2000, that the attached flier was "grossly misleading in order to subvert the exchange of Hardey Park for Lot 712". Council Mr Deague please explain what was grossly misleading about the document?*

I believe the Director - Development was commenting on the fact that the flier purports that Eric Ripper is the initiator or is a supporter of this flier which he (Mr Ripper) advises is not the case and he in fact, supports the land exchange because of its significant benefits to the Belmont and wider community. In addition the flier fails to point out that the portion of Hardy Park is being exchanged for a more advantageous area of foreshore land.

2. *Could the Mayor please advise whether the local member Mr Eric Ripper MLA did or is able to supply the names to Council and contact numbers of the large majority of callers he was able to convince in favour of the Hardey Park - Lot 712 Land Exchange?*

This is a question best directed to Mr Ripper.

3. *On the same subject, have any measures been taken by Council to arrange Public Forums to discuss the Hardey Park - Lot 712 exchange as called for by Mr Eric Ripper MLA?*

Council undertook an extensive calculation process before coming to its decision and received overwhelming community support (94% I believe) in addition to which the most direct descendants of the Hardey Family, after which the Park was named, concur with Council's proposal because of the community benefit.

**5.2.2 Mrs Janet Powell - (President - Ratepayers and Residents Association) - 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale**

1. *Has Council had the Deed of Trust removed from the land that was bequeathed for Public Recreational purposes for the people of Belmont?*

No.

2. *Are Council still trying to have the Deed of Trust lifted?*

No, not generally from the approximate 0.8 hectares bequeathed but Council is from 5.8 hectares of the 15 hectares of Council purchased land included in the Trust in error.

3. *As it has been 4 years since Council demolished the Baseball Stadium will it reinstate this land back to park to the people until this issue is decided upon?*

There is, a large expanse of riverfront land available for public access and recreation in the vicinity of this location and Council does not consider it necessary to include the subject land for public recreation in addition to hugely increased recreation areas created by the Ascot Waters Development.

4. *Will Council develop the low cost housing component agreed to when getting the Better Cities Funding?*

The developers of Ascot Waters were required to provide an "affordable" housing component in this development and there has already been partial completion of this component of the Ascot Waters development. There were 17 dwelling units (known as "affordable housing") originally proposed and to date 6 have been built by the Ascot Waters Consortium. The remainder will be developed as the project progresses.

**5.2.3 Mr Mike Robson (Secretary Belmont Resident and Ratepayers Association)**

1. *At the Resources and Policy Committee Meeting held on 16 November 1999 an estimate of the private use of the mayoral vehicle was put at 50%, which equates to \$2,800 for the 1999/2000 budget period. Expenditure in the Mayoral Allowance indicates that all this was used. I ask the following:*

- (i) *Was the private use of the vehicle measured for the period?*  
 (ii) *If it was measured, why do the accounts not reflect the correct amount used?*  
 (iii) *If it was not measured, will the Council consider the measurement of the private and public use of the mayoral vehicle to correctly assess the expense attributable to the Mayoral Allowance?*

The Mayor advised he would take the questions on notice.

**Item 5.2.3 continued**

2. *Did the Council consult in any way with the residents whom are to be affected by the extension of the underground power project?*

The Chief Executive Officer advised that consultation is proposed within the next couple of weeks.

**5.3 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR****5.3.1 Mr John McGuire**

1. *Asked how much extra the Council will raise in rates this financial year?*

Director - Finance advised that rates increased by 4.4% plus a small amount of "natural growth" and that he would advise Mr McGuire of the exact dollar amount following the meeting.

2. *Asked who would be represented on the regional Safer WA Committee?*

The Mayor advised that members would include the Mayors and Chief Executive Officers of the Local Governments of Belmont, South Perth and Victoria Park plus a small number of other stakeholders.

3. *How often will the regional Safer WA Committee meet?*

The Mayor advised that this hasn't been settled yet, but he would expect approximately monthly.

4. *Will there be a report back procedure from these meetings?*

The Mayor advised that he would be reporting back to Council, probably via the Administration and Community Services Committee.

**5.3.2 Ms Janet Powell (President - Residents and Ratepayers Association) - 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale**

1. *Council advised me "a lethal injection is our preferred method however we have no suitable facilities, wash area, table, fittings, etc". Could you please explain to me what fittings and etc. are?*

The Deputy Chief Executive Officer advised that there would be a requirement to supply whatever equipment/facilities necessary to meet the relevant health and other requirements (eg. cupboards, storage space, impervious surfaces).

2. *Why is Belmont Council still using firearms to destroy animals under the guise of no equipment or facilities when the RSPCA, the Town of Victoria Park, the City of South Perth, Animal Liberation and local Veterinarians all advise me that a table (preferably metal) is the only equipment necessary when euthanasia is used?*

Council now uses the services of a local veterinary service to dispose of its unwanted dogs except for animals considered too dangerous to dispose of in this fashion.

3. *Why is it in the Town of Victoria Park Minutes June 27<sup>th</sup> 2000, that "Belmont Council prefer to shoot their dogs because dogs had incurred problems when disposed of by injections" when a few days previous you told the public gallery and media here in Belmont that Council prefers the injection method?*

The Mayor advised that he could not comment on what is included in the Town of Victoria Park's Minutes but advised that the information contained in the last set of Council Minutes could be relevant.

4. *Does the Council realise that the RSPCA have written regulations that specify the way animals are destroyed and pre killing procedure must be dealt with as well the actually killing including a stress free end. Does Belmont comply with these procedures?*

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

5. *Due to the rising concern of residents and state politicians regarding the Hardy Park Land Development, will Council be calling a public meeting to clarify the details of the development and hear the concerns of ratepayers and residents?*

The Chief Executive Officer re-read his answer to a previous question outlining that previous consultation had occurred, namely it publicly advertised the proposal, wrote to a number of residents and placed a display advertisement on the site.

### **5.3.3 Mr Bradley Amphlett - 72 Tibbradden Circle, Ascot**

1. *Mr Amphlett asked when he could expect a reply to the petition recently forwarded to Council.*

The Mayor advised that he had signed a letter on Friday in response to this issue.

**\*\*\*7.57pm** As there were no further questions, the Mayor declared Public Question Time closed.

**6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**6.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 14 AUGUST 2000**

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 14 August 2000, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

***RICHARDSON MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 14 August 2000, 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

P/KNU

### 8.1 MEMORIAL - KNUTSFORD AVENUE TRAFFIC HAZARD

Report by Chief Executive Officer

#### APPLICATION

To advise of a memorial received requesting the installation of speed inhibiting devices on Knutsford Avenue.

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

#### BACKGROUND

A memorial has been received requesting the installation of speed inhibiting devices on Knutsford Avenue. The petition reads as follows:-

*"We, the undersigned residents of Knutsford Avenue, Kewdale respectfully request that the council gives serious consideration to the installation of speed inhibiting devices in the areas indicated in the attached sketch. Since the opening of the Belmont Tavern, several minor accidents have occurred. Vehicle occupants leaving the tavern area, via the two car park exits near the drive-in bottleshop, as indicated in the sketch, have shown distinct displays of insobriety by their driving habits, screeching tyres and swerving all the way up and down Knutsford Avenue. Through-traffic from Wright Street to Fulham Street, and vice versa, also seem to regard this section of street as a race track. Unless something is done to curb the speed, it is just a matter of time before someone is injured, if not fatally.*

*Another by-product of the tavern has been patrons, both male and female, urinating in the car park and behind the building. One can only hope the tavern management will act responsibly in this matter, as promised, when the original license was granted."*

The memorial was signed by 5 residents.

#### COMMENT

Nil.

#### COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

***SYMONDS MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that the matter be referred the Works and Technical Services Committee for its consideration.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

TPS/13A

**8.2 MEMORIAL - TOWN PLANNING SCHEME 13 - "THE SPRINGS"**

Report by Chief Executive Officer

**APPLICATION**

To advise Council of a memorial received seeking an extension of time to comment on the advertised Town Planning Scheme 13.

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

**BACKGROUND**

A memorial has been received seeking an extension of time to comment on the advertised Town Planning Scheme 13. The petition reads as follows:-

*"We the undersigned landowners in The Springs redevelopment area wish to seek an appropriate extension of time, in which to comment on the currently advertised proposed Town Planning Scheme 13.*

*We would ask for the following information:-*

- 1. That a current plan showing the latest changes be adopted, and forwarded to all the individual landowners involved as soon as possible;*
- 2. That the Council confirm whether they will furnish the landowners with an independent expert feasibility study, as mooted at the meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> August 2000. Or alternatively, advise that the landowners are to rely on the figures supplied by Urban Focus (both at the meeting and in individual consultations prior to this meeting) on which to draw their own conclusions. In either case could the full Urban Focus figures be forwarded to all landowners as soon as possible, as many do not have them to hand at the time of writing, and they will be needed for comparative purposes in any event.*

*Once the above information has been supplied we are of the opinion that an additional 60 (sixty) days for comment would seem appropriate and reasonable, to give time for the individual landowners to seek independent advice as advised by Council.*

*So that Council is made aware of the individual landowners commitment or otherwise to the proposed scheme, a section has been included should the individual landowners wish to make comment."*

The memorial was signed by 28 residents.

*Item 8.2 continued*

**COMMENT**

Nil.

**COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**GODFREY MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that the matter be referred the Planning and Development Committee for its consideration.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**9. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**10. BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING**

Nil.

## 11. CORRESPONDENCE

### 11.1 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

CON/25

#### 11.1.1 Cr Swann - Leave Of Absence

Report by Chief Executive Officer.

#### **APPLICATION**

To advise Council of correspondence received from Councillor Swann requesting leave of absence from 24<sup>th</sup> September 2000 to 7<sup>th</sup> October 2000, inclusive and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2000 to 20<sup>th</sup> October 2000 inclusive.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Councillor Swann has requested leave of absence from all Council and Committee meetings for the period 24<sup>th</sup> September 2000 to 7<sup>th</sup> October 2000, inclusive and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2000 to 20<sup>th</sup> October 2000 inclusive.

#### **COMMENT**

Nil.

#### **COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

***COOPS MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that Councillor Swann be granted leave of absence from all Council and Committee meetings for the period 24<sup>th</sup> September 2000 to 7<sup>th</sup> October 2000, inclusive and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2000 to 20<sup>th</sup> October 2000 inclusive.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**11.2 GENERAL****BLD24C****11.2.1 City of Belmont/Belmont Oasis Family Fun Day**

Report by Chief Executive Officer

**APPLICATION**

To advise Council of a letter received from the Centre Manager of the Belmont Oasis Leisure Centre reporting on the City of Belmont/Belmont Oasis Family Fun Day.

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

**BACKGROUND**

A letter has been received from the Centre Manager of the Belmont Oasis Leisure Centre reporting on the City of Belmont/Belmont Oasis Family Fun Day. The letter reads as follows:-

*"I am pleased to confirm that the inaugural City of Belmont/Belmont Oasis Family Fun Day was a great success.*

*Throughout the day we welcomed more than 2000 people through the doors, much to the delight of our major sponsors that included Coca Cola, PMFM 92.9, The Esplanade Hotel, Community News Southern Gazette, Rebel Sport, Peters Brownes and of course the City of Belmont.*

*As major sponsor the City of Belmont received excellent exposure included:*

- *Logo inclusion on event programs and direct mail distribution to local schools (10,000 fliers).*
- *In store distribution of another 10,000 fliers through Rebel Sport's huge retail outlet at the Carousel shopping mall.*
- *Full page display advertisement - Southern Gazette Community Newspaper*
- *Four editorial articles leading up to the event and one post event wrap up article - Southern Gazette Community Newspaper.*
- *30x30 second commercials broadcast over PMFM 92.9.*
- *Live announcement and acknowledgement throughout the day by event MC, Dean Clairs of PMFM 92.9.*
- *Acknowledgement via a live radio cross to the PMFM 92.9 Road Runners*
- *Major sponsor banners and signage with prime position throughout the centre during the event.*
- *Logo inclusion on a street banner - corner Alexander and Abernethy Roads.*
- *Belmont Oasis foyer display - 2 weeks.*
- *Exposure through one week shopping centre display at Belmont Forum.*
- *Official opening honours and presentation of major prizes for the community colouring in competition.*

**Item 11.2.1 continued**

*Our customer feedback suggests that the most popular attractions and activities on the day were the giant rock climbing wall, surf rider and the baby farm animals. Also very popular were the Crazy Critters song and dance performances, the mega prize dives and the oodles of noodles pool race. The Family Fun Day event had a wide range of fun activities for every to enjoy and also included an all day super skate, face painting, balloon tying and even a tarzan rope bombie competition. Every child that attended was given a free show bag full of goodies to take home with them.*

*The event will be following over the next two weeks by live appearances at local school assemblies by Paddy Platypus with more free giveaways, even further reinforcing Belmont Oasis as the place to be.*

*Importantly, more than 40 of the Belmont Oasis staff team generously volunteered their time to make the event a great success. This is a strong indicator of the commitment and enthusiasm of the staff team here at the centre.*

*Already we are receiving numerous inquiries as to when the next event will be on. I would recommend to Council that you consider running a similar event next year, given the excellent public relations impact and positive promotion benefits for the City. I would also suggest that this year's and next years event feature in the next edition of the Belmont Bulletin, showcasing the City's very real commitment to the community.*

*On a personal note, and on behalf of the team at Belmont Oasis, we thank the City of Belmont for making this event possible. Our particular thanks are also extended to the Councillors and staff who joined us on the day."*

**COMMENT**

At the Belmont Community Recreation Association meeting of 24 August 2000, they recommended that Council support the proposition of an Annual Family Fun Day at the Belmont Oasis.

**COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**RICHARDSON MOVED, COOPS SECONDED, that the matter be referred to the Administration and Community Services Committee for its consideration.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**11.3 LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE**

Nil.

**12. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Please select the Committee Meeting minutes that you wish to view.**

[Works and Technical Services Committee - 21 August 2000](#)

[Resources and Policy Committee - 22 August 2000](#)

**12.1 WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD 21 AUGUST 2000**

**Receipt of Minutes**

***BLAIR MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that the minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 21 August 2000, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

***BLAIR MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that recommendation items 5.1, 7, 8.1.1, 8.2.1 - 8.2.6, 8.3, 8.4.1 - 8.4.9, and 8.5.1 - 8.5.2 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 21 August 2000, be adopted en bloc.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

## **12.2 RESOURCES AND POLICY COMMITTEE HELD 22 AUGUST 2000**

### **Receipt of Minutes**

***RICHARDSON MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting held on 22 August 2000, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

### **ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

***BASS MOVED, COOPS SECONDED, that recommendation items 5.1, 7, 8.2.1 - 8.2.4, 8.4.1, 8.5.1, 8.7.1 - 8.7.3, and 8.8.1 - 8.8.3 of the Resources and Policy Committee meeting held on 22 August 2000, be adopted en bloc.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**13. REPORTS OF OFFICERS****13.1 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
--	-----

*"Operational Plan 01/1(c) - To keep Councillors informed of relevant industry and officer activities, regular update reports be presented to the respective committees".*

**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:

<b>DATED</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
10/08/00	Personal Computers for Councillors
11/08/00	Family Fun Day - Belmont Oasis Leisure Centre
16/08/00	Visit by Minister for Local Government
25/08/00	Complimentary Movie Passes from Reading Cinemas
25/08/00	Street Numbering - Pearl Road, Cloverdale

**Councillor Information Items circulated on the 18 August 2000:**

**13.1.1 WAMA Week Issue No. 31.00 - 11 August 2000**

**Councillor Information Items circulated on the 25 August 2000:**

**13.1.2 WAMA Week Issue No. 32.00 - 18 August 2000**

**COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

***SYMONDS MOVED, SWANN 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**

## 14. REPORTS OF DELEGATES

### 14.1 CR PASSERI - ANNUAL WASTE AND RECYCLE CONFERENCE

Whilst attending the Annual Waste and Recycle Conference at the Burswood earlier this month, I came across this item that I would like to share with you (my apologies to members of the Works Committee as they have already heard it).

The item perhaps accentuates the reasons why we should encourage more people to recycle just a little more.

The title of the item is "What a load of rubbish".

The Fresh Kills landfill on New York City's Staten Island is the world's largest landfill, Following are some interesting facts about Fresh Kills:

- It accepts 14,000 tonnes of waste per day.
- It is 25 feet higher than the Statue of Liberty.
- It releases 2,650 tonnes of methane gas into the atmosphere daily, this represents 5.7% of all US methane emissions.

Needless to say that when this tip site is closed at the end of 2001m alternative methods of waste disposal for New York are urgently required.

It should also be noted that though the total annual refuse from the City of Belmont is approximately 17,000 tonnes, it almost fades into insignificance when compared to New York's daily 14,000 tonnes.

### **COMMITTEE & OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

***SYMONDS MOVED, MURFIN SECONDED, that Councillor Passeri's report on the Annual Waste and Recycle Conference be received and noted.***

***CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0***

**15. URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION**

Nil.

**16. NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING**

Nil.

**17. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS**

Nil.

**18. CLOSURE**

There being no further business to discuss, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8.07pm.