



**City of Belmont**  
**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**MINUTES**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**9 SEPTEMBER 2002**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	<b>OFFICIAL OPENING</b> .....	1
2.	<b>APOLOGIES &amp; LEAVE OF ABSENCE</b> .....	1
2.1	APOLOGIES.....	1
2.2	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	1
3.	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> .....	2
4.	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)</b> .....	2
5.	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME</b> .....	2
5.1	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE AT PREVIOUS MEETING.....	2
5.1.1	Mr Paul Hitt, Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc. c/-14 McLachlan Way, Belmont .....	2
5.2	QUESTIONS ON WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN PRIOR TO THE MEETING .....	5
5.2.1	Mr Kevin Bettridge, 3/18 Mort Street, Rivervale .....	5
5.2.2	Mr Ray Harris, 481 Abernethy Road, Cloverdale .....	13
5.2.3	Ms Rachel Pietracatella, 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale (President, City of Belmont Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc.).....	13

## 9 SEPTEMBER 2002

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
5.3	QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.....	14
5.3.1	Mr John McGuire, 11 Hillcrest Road, Kewdale .....	14
5.3.2	Mr Scott Haley, 8 Davis Street, Ascot.....	14
5.3.3	Mr Bob Gilchrist, 70 Pearl Road, Cloverdale .....	14
5.3.4	Ms Tracey Carey, 17 (or 18?) Keymer Street, Ascot.....	14
5.3.5	Mr Rob Greenwood, 151 Coolgardie Avenue, Redcliffe .....	15
5.3.6	Mr Paul Hitt, 14 McLachlan Way, Belmont .....	16
5.3.7	Mr Ray Harris, 481 Abernethy Road, Cloverdale .....	16
5.3.8	Mr Kevin Bettrige, 3/18 Mort Street, Rivervale.....	16
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1	ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 26 AUGUST 2002.....	17
<b>7.</b>	<b>QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION) .....</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1	CR MARGIE BASS, 77 KEYMER STREET, BELMONT .....	17
<b>8.</b>	<b>PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
10.1	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	19
10.2	GENERAL.....	20
10.2.1	Mr R Acott, 2 Mercato Court, Kewdale** .....	20
10.3	LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE.....	20
<b>11.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF COMMITTEES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
11.1	WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 2 SEPTEMBER 2002.....	21
11.1.1	Withdrawn Item 8.1.2 – Removal of Street Tree Adjacent to 2 Mercato Court, Kewdale .....	21
11.1.2	Withdrawn Item 8.3.3 – Tender 18/2002 – Adachi-Ku Park .....	22
11.1.3	Withdrawn Item 8.4.1 – Proposed Civic Precinct Consolidation and Renovations .....	22
11.2	COMMUNITY AND EXECUTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 3 SEPTEMBER 2002.....	23
11.2.1	Withdrawn Item 8.4.1 – Keeping of Dogs, Lot 116, 12 Mozart Mews, Rivervale.....	24
11.2.2	Withdrawn Item 8.5.2 – Review of Ward Boundaries/Councillor Representation.....	25
11.2.3	Withdrawn Item 8.5.3 – Lease – Belmont Child Care Centre (1 Grand Parade, Redcliffe).....	25

**9 SEPTEMBER 2002**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF OFFICERS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
12.1	INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS.....	27
12.2	LATE ITEM - PROPOSED SALE OF LAND –LOT 107 (215) ORRONG ROAD, RIVERVALE .....	28
<b>13.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF DELEGATES .....</b>	<b>28</b>
13.1	CR TEASDALE – MILL STREET MAIN DRAIN .....	28
13.2	CR PASSERI – CITY OF BELMONT 2002 ART AWARDS .....	29
<b>14.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>16.</b>	<b>CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>30</b>

**\*\*Attachment 1 – Item 10.2.1 refers**

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE, 215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE, ON MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2002, COMMENCING AT 7.31PM**

**PRESENT**

Cr P R Passeri, JP	West Ward
Cr M H Blair	Central Ward
Cr G Dornford (from 7.34pm)	Central Ward
Cr M C Godsell	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 E Teasdale	South Ward
Cr J Powell	South Ward

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr B Genoni	Chief Executive Officer
Mr N Hartley	Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Mr R Lutey	Director - Engineering
Mr N Deague	Director – Development
Mr S Cole	Director – Corporate Services

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

There were 29 members of the public and one member of the press (Southern Gazette) present.

**1. OFFICIAL OPENING**

The Mayor opened the meeting and welcomed those in attendance.

**2. APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**2.1 APOLOGIES**

Cr A P Murfin, OAM, JP	South Ward
------------------------	------------

**2.2 LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Godsell declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.1 (Item 8.3.3 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting minutes dated 12 August 2002). The nature of the interest being that Cr Godsell works for the architect involved in the landscape tender for Adachi-ku Park.

Councillor Dornford declared a financial interest. The interest is in Item 11.2 (Item 8.5.3 of the Community and Executive Services Committee meeting minutes dated 3 September 2002). The nature of the interest being that Cr Dornford is the lessee of the Belmont Child Care Centre.

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

### **5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

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

##### **5.1.1 Mr Paul Hitt, Belmont Residents/Ratepayers Action Group Inc. c/-14 McLachlan Way, Belmont**

Mr Hitt asked the following questions at the Council meeting held on 26 August 2002, which were taken on notice. Mr Hitt's questions were responded to in correspondence dated 4<sup>th</sup> September 2002, and are reproduced below:

1. Will the development of the new bike track result in an increase of Council's public liability insurance costs?

*To the best of our understanding, no, because there are much broader issues that drive Council's public liability insurance premiums, such as global re-insurance costs.*

- 1(a) If the answer to question one is yes, how much will the increase be?

*Not applicable.*

2. Will Council consider placing seating at Redcliffe Park for seniors, people with disabilities and other community members?

*On the basis that this question indicates that the Residents/Ratepayers Action Group is aware of a demonstrated need for the installation of seating on Redcliffe Park, its provision will be included for consideration in the 2003/2004 Municipal Budget.*

*Item 5.1.1 – Continued...*

3. Will Council consider widening the footpath/cycle path around Tomato Lake Reserve to ease congestion and minimise the risk of accidents to pedestrians and cyclists?

*The path around Tomato Lake was considered in the preliminary 2002/2003 Municipal Budget, however as part of the City's overall budget deliberation, this particular job was amongst a number not able to be funded. It will again be listed for consideration in 2003/2004. Any works undertaken would commence around the north-western lake and would include widening the path.*

4. What is the proposed population projection within the City of Belmont for the year 2010?

*The Planning Department has not calculated population forecasts as yet, but will do so when the Census 2001 data is available, as an accurate base is needed. It is understood that the Census data for Belmont will be available within the next few months.*

5. Will Council give consideration to providing similar funding to City of South Perth (Southern Gazette, page two, August 12-18) to support community groups involved in projects that improve community services, cultural and arts development, economic and environmental projects?

*A search of the 13-19 August edition of the Southern Gazette delivered to the City of Belmont provides no details of any City of South Perth funding support article. If Mr Hitt could provide a copy of the details he has available to him, consideration could then be given to the matter.*

6. Did Council consider their report by the Planning Department of 18 February 2002, item 8.4.3, page 84, point 3 when answering 5.2.1 page 5, Ordinary Council meeting of 24 June 2002 as Council's comments seem to be contradictory?

*Point 3 of the 18 February Planning Department item 8.4.3 states "A review of the extent of Centenary Park needs to be carried out to determine whether all of this area is required for recreation purposes. Some public open space may be proposed within the proposed development of the Western Power site. It has been suggested that perhaps on portion of Centenary Park a retirement village could be established and integrated with the development of the Western Power site." Item 5.2.1 of the Ordinary Council meeting of 24 June 2002 responded to the question "is there a proposal to reclaim a portion of Centenary Park to accommodate the construction of aged housing/nursing home?" to which the answer (amongst other things) was 'no'".*

Item 5.1.1 – Continued...

*Both reports are correct, there was a 'suggestion' made that perhaps on portion of Centenary Park a retirement village could be established and integrated with the development of the Western Power site, however Council has not resolved to pursue any such a proposal. Further, there is no proposal before Council to reclaim a portion of Centenary Park to accommodate the construction of aged housing/nursing home.*

- 6(a) Can you please advise who suggested, "that perhaps on a portion of Centenary Park a retirement village could be established and integrated with the development of the Western Power site"?

*As was stated as part of the answer to Mr Hitt's question at Item 5.2.1 of the Ordinary Council meeting of 24 June 2002 –*

*"in any organisation that is continually striving to improve its practices and facilities, encouragement is given for as wide a range of ideas to be floated as possible".*

*The City of Belmont is certainly always keen to consider a variety of suggestions or ideas that may be beneficial to our community and it would be blinkered of Council to not encourage such contributions. It is however, fair to say that by far the majority of such ideas are not pursued for a whole range of reasons.*

*I am sure you would agree that for the obvious and responsible reasons of -*

- (a) not wishing to unnecessarily alarm people,*
- (b) not wishing to discourage future ideas from being floated, and*
- (c) not wishing to waste time and resources,*

*it is not appropriate for a Local Government to put forward for public debate every idea or suggestion that is raised, particularly as most are rejected quickly or after varying levels of investigation.*

*As far as Centenary Park is concerned, whilst there has been periodic complaints about the use of this park for rugby, no consideration of aged housing/nursing homes at Centenary Park has been presented to Council to date. However if the residents of the City would like this issue to be considered, such a study could be pursued."*

*It cannot be recollected which Councillor(s) or officer(s) came up with the suggestion as outlined above however it should be reinforced that until Council formally resolves that the 'idea' or 'suggestion' be progressed (or not) they have no formal City endorsement.*

Item 5 – Continued...

**\*\*\*7.33pm** For the benefit of the public present the Chief Executive Officer stated the rules of Question Time.

**\*\*\*7.34pm** Cr Dornford entered the meeting.

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

### **5.2.1 Mr Kevin Bettridge, 3/18 Mort Street, Rivervale**

1. Is it true that some Adachi memorabilia has been damaged beyond repair because of either incorrect storage or handling?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee answered, please refer to the answer given to this question at the 26<sup>th</sup> August Ordinary Council meeting at item 5.2.1 (9).*

2. Is it true that there are some Adachi memorabilia in private homes that belongs to the people of Belmont?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee answered, please refer to the answer given to this question at the 26<sup>th</sup> August Ordinary Council meeting at item 5.2.1 (10).*

3. Why is it necessary for the Mayor (who is also a Committee Member of the Belmont Sister City Association) to attend the Australian Sister City Association Conferences in Bendigo, Victoria, when the Secretary of the Belmont Sister City Association, Jan Teasdale, is attending in her role as the Vice President of the ASCA?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee stated that it is pleasing that Mr Bettridge has the confidence of the Secretary of the Belmont Sister City Association, Mrs Jan Teasdale, to represent the various interests of the City of Belmont, the Belmont Sister City Association (BSCA) and the Australian Sister Cities Association (of which Mrs Teasdale is a member in her own right and is the current Vice Chairman) however the Council believes there is value in both persons attending. Both the Mayor and Jan Teasdale have been long-term members of the Belmont Sister City Association and in their respective official positions, play key roles in attending to the sister city commitments of the City of Belmont. Their attendance will allow us to learn from the experiences of others and to further enhance the value of our own sister city relationship.*

*Item 5.2.1 – Continued...*

4. Why could not Mayor Passeri save the residents of Belmont the cost of airfares, registration of \$770, accommodation costs at \$150 a night and other expenses associated with the five-day conference?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee advised, please refer to the answer given at (3) above.*

5. Is it true that Peter Schifferli (Council's Business Development Manager) and Jan Teasdale, at a meeting in November 2001, decided to expand the Belmont Sister City Association's role to have business links between Adachi and Belmont without consulting the Management Committee of the Belmont Sister City Association?

*The Mayor stated that Clause 2.1.2 (11) of the Belmont Sister City Constitution includes "business exchange" as one of the several initiatives that both the Cities of Adachi and Belmont wished to progress and promote over the life of our sister city partnership (a number of these initiatives were outlined in the answer to a question put to Council by Mr Bettridge at the Council meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> July 2002 (item 5.2.1 refers)).*

*The simple answer to the question is "no", however further background will assist in clarifying the situation.*

*Following an informal meeting between Mrs Teasdale and the City's Manager of Business Development in early November, the CEO of the City of Belmont wrote to the Sister City Association on the 14 November seeking their views and comments as to whether it would be timely to explore business links between Adachi and Belmont that Adachi has been keen to pursue over the years. This matter was considered by the Sister City Association at its November meeting and a reply was sent to the City dated 10 December inviting the Manager of Business Development to their committee meeting on the 23 January 2002. Prior to that he was asked to meet the Sister City Association appointed representatives to examine the proposal in more detail.*

*It is important to understand that as a result of these meetings, it was decided to ask the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council (EMRC) to take on the primary role in facilitating business links with Adachi. At its meeting of the 28 February the EMRC agreed to support and lead the economic initiative and a small task group was formed which included representatives from EMRC, Cities of Belmont and Swan and two Belmont Sister City Association representatives (Mrs Teasdale and Mr Maslen). A formal letter was sent to the Mayor of Adachi on the 11 April 2002, which resulted in them sending two business representatives to discuss future business links.*

*Item 5.2.1 – Continued...*

*As alluded to above, it is not the intention of the Sister City Association to play a prominent role with any ongoing business links promotion with Adachi, but it is prepared to assist where it can and to provide cultural advice and access to its contacts in Adachi that it has built up over the last (almost) 20 years.*

*We trust that the residents, employees and businesses of both Belmont and Adachi will see economic and cultural benefits prevail from this expansion of our historic relationship.*

6. What qualification has the Belmont Sister City Secretary, Jan Teasdale, have in the international business arena to undertake such a role? Indeed, have any of the Belmont Sister City Committee Members have any experience in this area?

*The Mayor advised that Council has not sought the details of any specific qualifications of the people you refer to but as was pointed out in (5) above, it is not the intention of the Sister City Association to play a prominent role with any ongoing business links promotion with Adachi. The recent business delegation hosted by the EMRC involved business and economic professionals from EMRC, and the Cities of Swan and Belmont. The delegation met with a number of business groups (two Chambers of Commerce), Austrade, Department of Industry and Technology, WA Tourism Commission, Westralia Airports Corporation as well as various visiting businesses and tourism sites. A representative from the Sister City Association did attend the welcoming reception as well as the final meeting with the Japanese delegation. Both Mrs Teasdale and Mr Maslen kindly hosted the delegates in their own homes for their first night in Perth.*

7. What is the work that Jan Teasdale is doing that has justified Council giving her a 25% increase in her Secretary's Honorarium, which has increased from \$4000 to \$5000?

*The Mayor replied that the Secretary has a large number of responsibilities to ensure the successful operations of the association and also, the various activities associated with responsibilities like the student exchanges and other initiatives. Council is extremely pleased with the work undertaken by Jan Teasdale. It has the utmost confidence in her ability to undertake the task of Sister City Secretary and is very happy to be able to access her services for the sum outlined above - a cost much less than would be applicable if the City was to provide this service from its own staff resources (which has been the case in the past).*

Item 5.2.1 – Continued...

8. Why cannot Council, or the BEC, or the Belmont Chamber of Commerce carry out securing business links with Adachi, who are better sourced and experienced capable people for such a venture, instead of “using” groups that have friendship as a basis for their relationship?

*The Mayor stated that there is no reason why each of the above organisations cannot work together to forge business links with Adachi (including the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council). As pointed out above, it is not the intention of the Sister City Association to play a prominent role in the business links with the Adachi, however to their and the City’s Manager-Business Development’s credit, they have initiated a business link. The Belmont BEC, Belmont Chamber of Commerce and the North East Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce have all been encouraged to become involved in this initiative. Representatives from these organisations did meet with the Adachi Delegation and have been kept informed of developments. As the business potential is significant, we anticipate both Council and these organisations will continue to co-operate in attracting business investment and trade for the region.*

9. Why is it that the Belmont Sister City Association’s office never seems to be opened for enquiries, and the telephone is an answering machine, and what are the office hours?

*The Mayor advised that this is a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

10. In carrying out their Portfolio duties, why do not chairpersons have access to Belmont Sister City telephone and or fax/computer facilities to save on personal costs? If the Belmont Council can subsidise the ASCA, have they advised Committee persons that they can use the above facilities?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee replied that to a large degree, involvement with the Belmont Sister City Association is on a voluntary basis, just like many other clubs and groups in the City. A small portion of the City’s sister city budget is allocated to “office expenses” and part of this cost is for telephone/fax expenses. It would be quite appropriate for the office bearers referred to, to have access (via the Sister City Secretary) to the Sister City office equipment, although it is understood that only moderate direct expense is incurred by these people. The members of the Sister City Association enjoy the opportunity of being involved with the program, it is understood that they consider their contribution to be their way of volunteering their services to an activity that they have an affinity with, and one that has both local and global benefits.*

Item 5.2.1 – Continued...

11. Is it true that the Secretary also uses the Belmont Council photocopier and posting facilities?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee stated that the sister city relationship is a formal agreement between the Cities of Belmont and Adachi. The Belmont Sister City Association (generally via the Secretary through the City's Chief Executive Officer) has access to all of the City's resources (including photocopiers, posting facilities, and its staff etc.) within the limitations of the BSCA's and the City's budget for the various sister city activities.*

12. How is it that there are members on the Belmont Sister City Association who do not live in the Belmont Municipality?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee advised that Management Committee members are elected at the association's Annual General Meeting. There are no restrictions relative to residency address for those people wishing to nominate for membership of the Sister City Association and in any event, it is understood it would be illegal to impose such a restriction. The City is in fact, very pleased that we have people from outside of our district who are willing to donate their time, resources and expertise to promote and progress the sister city relationship between Belmont and Adachi. A relationship that directly benefits the community and businesses of our City.*

13. The selection panel for deciding who will be "Chaperones" to Adachi are Trevor Maslen (an ex-bus driver), Cr Marion Blair (an ex-hairdresser) and Cr Phil Marks (a lawnmowing contractor). Who appointed these people to the position? And what is their expertise in this area?

*The Chief Executive Officer stated that the compilation of the selection panel was endorsed by a formal resolution of the Belmont Sister City Association Committee of Management meeting held on Wednesday 20 February 2002. The selection panel for chaperones consists of the Chairman of Belmont Sister City Association (as the Chairman of the interview panel); either the Mayor of the City of Belmont or the Chairman of City of Belmont's Community and Executive Services Committee (or their nominated Councillor representative); and the current year's Tour Leader. The panel is made up of people who have a genuine interest in the ongoing success of the sister city relationship and between the panel members, there is a range of expertise in the areas of human resource management, the requirements of the BSCA Committee of Management, Japanese/Australian culture, and other student/chaperone exchange issues (like the standards that are expected of delegations and their members).*

*Item 5.2.1 – Continued...*

*The assessment process is undertaken in a professional and competent manner and the City is satisfied that the panel have recommended the Students and Chaperones they believe to be “the best persons for the respective roles”. Each applicant is asked exactly the same questions and are rated dependent on their level of response, according to a rating scale, by each panel member. The panel then proceeds to a consensus rating. The successful applicant is selected on the results of their interview and a comparative assessment is made for the other applicants against the successful applicant. Applicants who can best demonstrate at the interview, their experience with working with young people, their team building skills, ambassador skills, and their local knowledge and commitment will achieve higher ratings. Some applicants are employed in areas which can provide them with experience in these selection criteria but they are still required to successfully demonstrate these at the interview. The panel does not select applicants based on their employment or career. The judgement of the rating is based on the applicant's responses demonstrating their experience together with the panel's perception of the suitability of the applicant to be able to appropriately represent the City of Belmont, be able to create a cohesive group and be responsible for the students, particularly whilst in Japan.*

14. This “selection panel” appointed a Council Purchasing Officer, who does not live in Belmont, as a “Chaperone” for the next trip to Adachi with all expenses paid. Why?

*The Chief Executive Officer advised that one of the criteria for Chaperone applicants is that they must either reside or work within the 'City of Belmont'. The interview panel recommended to Council the person you refer to, no doubt because they believed that he was “the best person for the role” (of Chaperone). Chaperones have a very important role to play in the exchange. Chaperones have a great deal of responsibility (for the safety and wellbeing of the Belmont students) and commit an enormous amount of time to ensure the success of the exchange and that the students are moulded into a cohesive group that will promote themselves, Belmont and Australia in a positive and friendly manner whilst in Japan. In regard to the comment on expenses, the Chaperones are not entitled to have “all expenses paid” as Council generally only meets the discounted airfare and limited accommodation costs.*

15. A “Selection Panel” has consistently refused a female member of the Belmont Sister City Association Committee at an interview to act as “Chaperone” to Adachi despite extensive knowledge of Japanese culture, is very articulate, mature and has children and grandchildren. Why has this member been continually overlooked by those with lesser knowledge and experience and chosen others who have no such or very little experience and knowledge of Japan and its culture to be “Chaperones”?

*Item 5.2.1 – Continued...*

*The Chief Executive Officer replied that the Chaperone interview process is both professional and confidential and it would neither be professional nor confidential, to provide details of why any particular applicant was either successful, or not, in a public manner, such as in an answer to a question at a Council meeting. The selection of the successful applicant does not necessarily mean that any or all the other applicants are regarded as unsuitable. All unsuccessful applicants are offered feedback of their interview and encouraged to apply again, in the future, by the Chairman of the selection panel.*

16. Why isn't the "Selection Panel" an independent Committee or the decisions on "Chaperones" made by the Belmont Sister City Association Management Committee?

*The Chief Executive Officer replied that the existing interview panel process has worked very well for a number of years and it is not considered necessary to alter this process, at least at this point in time. The knowledge and understanding of the panel members of such issues as the Japanese culture, the exchange program activities, hosting issues, climate considerations and sustenance differences is critical when proposing questions to applicants (and in answering applicant's questions also). Refer also to the comments made as part of the answer to question #13.*

17. Where is the valuable picture, given by the City of Adachi, of an Imperial Court Dress made of origami paper that is used for occasions such as Coronations and Weddings?

*The Mayor advised that the City is not aware of the item referred to, however if Mr Bettridge would like to supply further details, we would be pleased to follow the matter up.*

18. It is believed that much traditional Japanese craft has gone missing that was entrusted to the Belmont Sister City Association for its keeping? Who is responsible for the keeping of the Adachi Memorabilia?

*The Mayor replied that if items have been "entrusted to the Belmont Sister City Association for its keeping" then presumably the Belmont Sister City Association is responsible for such, within their staff/financial resource limitations.*

19. Is there Adachi memorabilia stored in cartons at the Association's office?

*The Mayor advised that this is a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

*Item 5.2.1 – Continued...*

20. Are there “Condition Reports” on the movement of Adachi memorabilia?

*The Mayor advised that this is a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

21. There was an “Inventory” for all Adachi memorabilia. Can it be produced for inspection?

*The Mayor replied that this might be a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

22. Is it true that a “Life Member” (Peg Parkin) of the Belmont Sister City Association was refused permission to speak at a Belmont Sister City Meeting, and also wasn’t allowed to vote at the same meeting?

*The Mayor advised that this is a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

23. Is it not true that in the “Constitution” of the Belmont Sister City Association that: 4.1(c) Life Members have the right to vote at Meetings?

*The Mayor advised that this is a question best addressed directly to the Belmont Sister City Association.*

24. Is it true that a Belmont Councillor (no ex), acting as a Tour Leader to Adachi, advised students to take an empty suitcase, as the Japanese are generous with their gifts?

*The Mayor replied that the City is not aware of whether such a statement was, or was not made.*

25. Is it true that a parent complained that her daughter did not receive the same number of gifts as the other students after a trip to Adachi?

*The mayor stated that the City is not aware of any such complaint being made to it.*

26. At a Belmont Sister City meeting some time ago, a senior Council Officer told a Committee member that he could not criticise the Council. Why is it considered above criticism?

*The Chief Executive Officer replied that the Deputy Chief Executive Officer is the only senior officer who has attended sister city meetings for some time and he has no recollection of such a remark being made.*

Item 5.2.1 – Continued...

27. Do Belmont City Council Officers, who are committee members of the Belmont Sister City Association, get paid for their time to attend meetings?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee advised that City of Belmont staff are paid in accordance with their relevant award (or their contract conditions) as Council is legally obliged to do. If a staff member is required to be in attendance at a sister city meeting (which are generally held out-of-hours) they will be paid in accordance with their employment entitlements. The award provisions may require the City to remunerate the staff member for being in attendance, however contract staff are not entitled to overtime payments.*

28. Did Mayor Passeri consider it appropriate, as a member of the Belmont Sister City Association, to be present at the ComEx meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> August 2002 where he “Moved” to endorse Item 8.1.5 to accept the Committee and Officer Recommendation on the changes to the “Memorandum of Understanding” between the Council and the Belmont Sister City Association?

*Cr Doney, Presiding Person of the Community and Executive Services Committee stated that the Mayor is a member of the Community and Executive Services Committee and is entitled to participate in the meeting to the limits of the Local Government Act, as is any other ComEx Committee member.*

### **5.2.2 Mr Ray Harris, 481 Abernethy Road, Cloverdale**

Why does Council chop down 100 year old Morton Bay Fig trees at 5.30am (Sunday 8 September 2002) at Hardey Park and remove the body of the tree without a trace?

*Mr Ric Lutey, Director of Engineering advised that the Port Jackson Fig tree was removed for Main Roads WA on a Sunday because that is the only day they will allow closure of a lane of Great Eastern Highway. As much as possible was removed on the day for the same reason – to minimise disruption to traffic on Great Eastern Highway on the busiest days of the week.*

### **5.2.3 Ms Rachel Pietracatella, 62 Treave Street, Cloverdale (President, City of Belmont Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc.)**

Could you please confirm whether Council has recently asked all churches in the City of Belmont to pay an annual fee of \$50 for the upkeep of Council street signage?

If this is true, could the Council please explain the term “upkeep of signage”. Is it a cleaning fee or does Council intend to erect new signage to better direct parishioners who have maybe lost their way?

*Item 5.2.3 – Continued...*

*The Director of Engineering stated that he presumed the fee related to the annual fee charged by the City for directional signage requested by various bodies. The fee covers the replacement of signs as and when needed.*

### **5.3 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

#### **5.3.1 Mr John McGuire, 11 Hillcrest Road, Kewdale**

1. How often are the 'Library' toilets checked and cleaned?

*The Deputy Chief Executive Officer advised that they are checked and cleaned daily.*

2. Which department is responsible?

*The Chief Executive Officer advised, the Building Section.*

#### **5.3.2 Mr Scott Haley, 8 Davis Street, Ascot**

Mr Haley asked whether the Ascot racing area is proposed to be incorporated into one ward (the East Ward) and which Councillor promoted the idea, as it is a positive and unifying proposal for the Ascot racing community.

*The Mayor advised that this matter would be dealt with this evening as part of the Community and Executive Services Committee meeting minutes at item 11.2, and this information may be available at that time.*

#### **5.3.3 Mr Bob Gilchrist, 70 Pearl Road, Cloverdale**

Is the husband of Cr Bass in any way involved in building work at 1 Grand Parade (leased by Cr Dornford), or any other of Cr Dornford's businesses?

*Cr Bass advised, no.*

#### **5.3.4 Ms Tracey Carey, 18 Keymer Street, Ascot**

Ms Carey stated that she would like the East/Central Wards to be left unchanged, so that Ascot residents are represented by both the Councillors of East and Central Ward.

*The Mayor advised that he noted Ms Carey's objection.*

*Item 5 – Continued...*

### **5.3.5 Mr Rob Greenwood, 151 Coolgardie Avenue, Redcliffe**

1. How is it in the best interest of City of Belmont ratepayers for Council to plan to sell the existing 4.07ha Council Works Depot (cnr Fairbrother and Fisher Streets, a site fairly central in the City of Belmont) and to develop a works depot on a 4.6ha site in Carlisle south of, and outside of the City of Belmont?
2. What are the likely annual increases in vehicle running expenses and staff travelling time to and from a proposed works depot in Carlisle compared to those existing from Fairbrother Street?
3. If it is intended to develop the Carlisle site as Council's works depot for the next 20 to 30 years, then why shift to a less central location likely to burden Belmont ratepayers with substantial extra annual running expenses for the life of the depot?
4. If siting a works depot in Carlisle is likely to result in an extra 10 minutes staff time and vehicle running costs in each direction for every trip made by Council staff to and from that depot, then what is the likely total cost to ratepayers over the life of the depot?
5. If the reason for shifting to Carlisle was to move to a bigger site (4.6ha), then why now propose to sell off 1.6ha of that new site effectively reducing it to 3ha, that is, to one hectare less than the present site in Fairbrother Street?
6. How does a decision which clearly increases Council inefficiency by increasing vehicle running times and therefore Council vehicle emissions, sit with Council's supposed support for Agenda 21, and State and Federal governments' attempts to reduce greenhouse gases and achieve global warming reduction targets?

*The Mayor advised that the above questions would need to be taken on notice.*

**\*\*\*8.08pm The Mayor inquired that as Question Time had lapsed, did Council wish to extend Question Time?**

**TEASDALE MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that Question Time be extended for a further 10 minutes.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

*Item 5 – Continued...*

### **5.3.6 Mr Paul Hitt, 14 McLachlan Way, Belmont**

Due to costs related to the construction of Adachi Park on the river frontage, would Council consider reviewing any constructions related to the park and relocating any such construction to the area in front of the Council buildings as the basic theme of the area is suitable for such a park. This would help to reduce costs and be more in keeping with promoting the Swan River as a natural feature of Western Australia and Belmont, to people travelling to and from the City of Perth.

*The Mayor advised that Council has chosen the location at the Swan River and was not proposing to relocate it as suggested.*

### **5.3.7 Mr Ray Harris, 481 Abernethy Road, Cloverdale**

Will Council be removing the remaining trees adjacent to Hardey Park on Great Eastern Highway?

*The Director – Engineering advised that Main Roads WA have given a great deal of consideration to the future of the trees. A public consultation process has been conducted previously and due to future roadway design limitations, and the health of the trees, they will not be able to be retained. These trees will likely be affected by the roadworks proposed to occur in 2008.*

### **5.3.8 Mr Kevin Bettrige, 3/18 Mort Street, Rivervale**

Why is the new Civic Centre refurbishment to cost in excess of \$7million?

*The Mayor advised that the design currently proposed by Council is different from the one Council planned several years ago as there is now a need for a larger building, in addition, services costs such as replacing the air conditioning, have also increased the anticipated price.*

**\*\*\*8.18pm As there were no further questions, the Mayor declared Public Question Time closed.**

## 6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### 6.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD 26 AUGUST 2002

#### OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 26 August 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

***BLAIR MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 26 August 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.***

**CARRIED 10 VOTES TO 1**

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

*Against: Dornford*

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

### 7.1 CR MARGIE BASS, 77 KEYMER STREET, BELMONT

Cr Bass has provided (4 September 2002) the following questions of which due notice has been given.

1. How many conferences have been attended in the past year?
2. What was the cost of these conferences, including all associated costs (e.g. airfares/subscription accommodation)?
3. What are the recommended conferences for the next twelve months?
4. Could the Chief Executive Officer explain to the ratepayers why this Council has taken from the Ordinary Council Meeting agenda the:

“Notice of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting”; and  
“Motions of which Previous Notice has Been Given”.

5. Explain how Councillors raise issues that may not be on the agenda (eg. motions) and why Council believes this to be more appropriate.

*In regard to questions 1, 2 and 3, officers were unable to research the answers to these questions by the time this agenda was printed.*

*In regard to question number 4, at the 9<sup>th</sup> September 2001 Ordinary Council meeting, Council agreed to make amendments to the City's Standing Orders Local Laws 1998 (as presented to Council on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2001 via the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2001 Administration and Community Services Committee). The 15<sup>th</sup> May 2001 Administration and Community Services Committee report presented to Councillors provided an explanation for the changes proposed, one of which was, the deletion of Order of Business Clause 3.9 "Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given" (and the subsequent deletion of the Council meeting agenda item headed "Notice of Motions for Consideration at the Next Meeting").*

*The above Committee item report outlined that there was proposed to be a new clause inserted under Administrative Matters Clause 18.6 "Motions for Consideration" and that **this suggestion arose from the Department of Local Government's recommendation that such motions should rightfully be directed through the local government's existing committee structure, rather than through the Council meeting.***

*The proposed Local Law changes were advertised in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act to invite ratepayer and resident input. No submissions were received within the six week public comment period (although it is acknowledged that Cr Bass did lodge a late submission along the same lines as the questions raised this evening) and the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> September refers.*

*An explanation of how Councillors raise issues is outlined in the City's Standing Orders Clause 18.6 "Motions for Consideration" and Council Policy C1.2.4 "Agenda – Item Submitted by Councillors" which states (respectively) -*

- "(1) A member wishing to have an issue raised for consideration, must give written notice of the request to the Chief Executive Officer.*
- (2) The CEO –*
  - (a) with the concurrence of the Mayor, may exclude from the notice paper any notice of motion deemed to be out of order (or not relating of the good government of persons in the district); or*
  - (b) may on his or her own initiative, after consultation with the mover of the motion, make such amendments to the form but not the substance thereof as will bring the notice of motion into a due form of motion; and*
  - (c) must refer the matter to the appropriate Committee meeting (or if the matter is urgent, a Council meeting) and provide a report including relevant and material facts and circumstances pertaining to the notice of motion."*

Item 7.1 – Continued...

*“As per Council’s Standing Orders, there is no provision for Notices of Motions (i.e. “urgent business”) to be raised by Councillors directly at Council meetings. Councillors may however, advise the Chief Executive Officer that they wish to have a matter deliberated upon by Council and the Chief Executive Officer shall refer the matter to the appropriate Committee, or directly to Council if he considers this is appropriate. Councillors should ensure that there is sufficient staff time available to gather related information for the preparation of an officer report to accompany their issue to the Committee/Council.”*

*In regard to question number 5, it is understood that Council believes the changes to be more appropriate for the reason outlined in the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2001 Administration and Community Services Committee report, namely, **that it agreed with the Department of Local Government’s recommendation that such motions should rightfully be directed through the local government’s existing committee structure, rather than through the Council meeting.***

## **8. PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS**

Nil.

## **9. BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING**

Nil.

## **10. CORRESPONDENCE**

### **10.1 LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

**10.2 GENERAL****10.2.1 Mr R Acott, 2 Mercato Court, Kewdale\*\*****\*\*Attachment 1 – Item 10.2.1 refers**

Report by Chief Executive Officer

**APPLICATION**

To advise Council of a letter received from Mr Acott in relation to street trees.

**BACKGROUND**

Submitted as an attachment to these minutes is a copy of Mr Acott's letter and photos. Mr Acott requests Council's consideration of removing the tree located in Mercato Court.

**COMMENT**

The letter relates to Item 8.1.2 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> September Works and Technical Services Committee meeting minutes (to be dealt with at Item 11.1 of tonight's agenda).

**TEASDALE MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that the correspondence from Mr Acott be received.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**10.3 LATE CORRESPONDENCE OF AN URGENT NATURE**

Nil.

**11. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES****11.1 WORKS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD 2 SEPTEMBER 2002****Receipt of Minutes**

***TEASDALE MOVED, RICHARDSON SECONDED, that the minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 2 September 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

Items 8.1.2 and 8.3.3 were withdrawn at the request of Councillor Teasdale  
Item 8.4.1 was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Bass

**ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT**

***GODSELL MOVED, MARKS SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.4.2 – 8.4.6, 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 2 September 2002, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of items 8.1.2, 8.3.3 and 8.4.1).***

**CARRIED 10 VOTES TO 1**

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

*Against: Dornford*

**11.1.1 Withdrawn Item 8.1.2 – Removal of Street Tree Adjacent to  
2 Mercato Court, Kewdale**

***TEASDALE MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that the Committee recommendation not be adopted and that this item be referred back to the Works and Technical Services Committee for further consideration.***

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**\*\*\*8.25pm** Having earlier declared an interest in the following item, Cr Godsell departed the Chamber.

**11.1.2 Withdrawn Item 8.3.3 – Tender 18/2002 – Adachi-Ku Park**

**TEASDALE MOVED, RICHARDSON SECONDED, that the Committee Recommendation be adopted without amendment or modification.**

**CARRIED 9 VOTES TO 1**

*For: Passeri, Richardson, Doney  
Blair, Powell, Godfrey  
Teasdale, Marks, Bass*

*Against: Dornford*

**\*\*\*8.26pm** Cr Godsell returned to the Chamber.

**11.1.3 Withdrawn Item 8.4.1 – Proposed Civic Precinct Consolidation and Renovations**

**BASS MOVED, DORNFORD SECONDED, that in respect of the proposed civic precinct consolidation and renovations project and to allow further consideration of the various options available to the City, Council –**

- 1. Notes the status of the court action commenced by Homestyle Pty Ltd.**
- 2. Council officers report back to Committee, costs for a purpose built Administration building.**
- 3. That before Council endorse any recommendations for refurbishing or buildings, these plans be displayed at the Belmont Forum and advertised in local newspapers for public comment.**

**LOST 3 VOTES TO 8**

*For: Teasdale, Dornford, Bass*

*Against: Passeri, Richardson, Doney  
Godsell, Blair, Powell  
Godfrey, Marks,*

Item 11.1.3 – Continued ...

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

**CARRIED 8 VOTES TO 3**

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

*Against: Teasdale, Dornford, Bass*

**11.2 COMMUNITY AND EXECUTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD 3 SEPTEMBER 2002**

**Receipt of Minutes**

**DONEY MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the minutes of the Community and Executive Services Committee meeting held on 3 September 2002, as printed and circulated to all Councillors, be received.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

Item 8.4.1 was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Marks  
Items 8.5.2 and 8.5.3 were withdrawn at the request of Councillor Doney

**ADOPTION OF THE BALANCE OF THE REPORT**

**DONEY MOVED, POWELL SECONDED, that recommendation items 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.2.1, 8.3.1 and 8.5.1 of the Administration and Community Services Committee meeting held on 3 September 2002, be adopted en bloc (i.e. with the exception of items 8.4.1, 8.5.2 and 8.5.3).**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

**11.2.1 Withdrawn Item 8.4.1 – Keeping of Dogs, Lot 116,  
12 Mozart Mews, Rivervale**

**MARKS MOVED, GODSELL SECONDED, that the committee recommendation not be adopted and that in order to give Council the opportunity to consider all relevant issues –**

- 1. That Council approve the application submitted by Mr Paul Hewer and Mrs Andrea Rochow-Hewer for the keeping of three dogs at 12 Mozart Mews, Rivervale.**
- 2. Council also consider adding a discretionary clause to its policy stating “...despite all conditions Council retains the right to approve the keeping of more than two dogs, at Council discretion”.**

**Cr Bass foreshadowed the following, if the above motion is lost:**

*“that the committee recommendation not be adopted and that the matter be referred back to the Community and Executive Services Committee in order that it can reconsider Policy 9.1.2, prior to giving consideration to the application.”*

The substantive motion was put and ...

**LOST 3 VOTES TO 8**

**For:** Dornford, Godsell, Marks

**Against:** Passeri, Richardson, Doney  
Teasdale, Bass, Blair  
Powell, Godfrey

**BASS MOVED, TEASDALE SECONDED, that the committee recommendation not be adopted and that the matter be referred back to the Community and Executive Services Committee in order that it can reconsider Policy 9.1.2, prior to giving consideration to the application.**

**CARRIED 10 VOTES TO 1**

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

**Against:** Blair

### 11.2.2 Withdrawn Item 8.5.2 – Review of Ward Boundaries/Councillor Representation

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

**Cr Bass foreshadowed a motion if the above motion is lost, namely:**

*“that in order to give the opportunity for further consideration, the committee recommendation not be adopted and that the changes proposed by Cr Godsell (ie., the amended East/Central Ward boundary) be deferred to the next meeting of the Community and Executive Services Committee”.*

The substantive motion was put and...

**CARRIED 7 VOTES TO 4**

**(ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)**

*For: Passeri, Richardson  
Godsell, Godfrey, Teasdale  
Marks, Blair*

*Against: Doney, Bass, Powell, Dornford*

**\*\*\*9.19pm** Having earlier declared an interest in this item, Cr Dornford departed the Chamber.

### 11.2.3 Withdrawn Item 8.5.3 – Lease – Belmont Child Care Centre (1 Grand Parade, Redcliffe)

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

*Item 11.2.3 – Continued...*

**Cr Bass foreshadowed the following motion if the above motion is lost, namely-**

*The Committee recommendation not be adopted and in order to allow the lessee the opportunity to discuss options with the City, the information be noted and received and that –*

- 1. Further to the 9<sup>th</sup> July Community and Executive Services Committee recommendations, the Planning and Development Committee be requested to defer dealing with any application for shade structures at 1 Grand Parade Redcliffe until the matter of the replacement of trees/compensation thereof, is settled between Council and the Lessee; and*
- 2. The matter of the replacement of the trees removed without authorisation (with suitable trees of an acceptable size and structure) or appropriate compensation thereof, with the officers of the City liaising with the Lessee to settle this matter.*

The substantive motion was put and ...

**CARRIED 9 VOTES TO 1**

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

***Against:*** Bass

**\*\*\*9.25pm Cr Dornford returned to the Chamber.**

**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
--	-----

*"Operational Plan O1/1(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>
28 August 2002	Memo regarding Inquiry
30 August 2002	Staff Farewell – Ruth Cook
30 August 2002	Great Eastern Highway/ Belmont Intersection Works
06 September 2002	WALGA Vacancies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local Government House Trust Board of Management</li> <li>➤ Peel Region Planning Committee</li> <li>➤ WA Local Government Superannuation Plan</li> <li>➤ Manual for Managing Urban Stormwater Quality in WA</li> <li>➤ Local Government Working Group of the Swan Catchment</li> <li>➤ Committee for Combating Marine Oil Pollution</li> <li>➤ Forest Health Advisory Committee</li> </ul>
06 September 2002	Local Government News: Issue No. 35.02 – 30 August 2002
06 September 2002	WALGA Infopage – 22 August 2002
06 September 2002	Local Government News – 4 September 2002
06 September 2002	Citizenship Ceremony – 20 September 2002
06 September 2002	Staff Appreciation
06 September 2002	Disclosure of Financial Interest (Legal Advice)
06 September 2002	Access to Civic Centre for 2002 Mayoral Dinner
06 September 2002	Delivery Bags
06 September 2002	Late Item – 12.2 – Proposed Sale of Land – Lot 107 (215) Orrong Road, Rivervale

Item 12.1 – Continued...

### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That the information provided to all Councillors and listed in this “Information Only Items” report be noted and received.

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

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

### **12.2 LATE ITEM - PROPOSED SALE OF LAND –LOT 107 (215) ORRONG ROAD, RIVERVALE**

The Chief Executive Officer advised that as the offer was not able to be confirmed prior to this evening’s meeting and on the basis that there may now be two parties interested in the purchase of this property, he would be progressing a public tender for this parcel of land.

## **13. REPORTS OF DELEGATES**

### **13.1 CR TEASDALE – MILL STREET MAIN DRAIN**

Cr Teasdale reported – “This week at my request I received from the Water and Rivers Commission, a draft document on Drainage Improvement framework for the Mills Street main drain.

The document as yet is not endorsed by the Water and Rivers Commission or the Swan River Trust, as submissions have been called for by 13 September 2002.

The Mill Street main drain has –

- A catchment area of 1230 hectares
- Contains 26 sub-catchments
- 23 compensating basins, 21% of which are in Belmont

The document suggests using as a rule of thumb that at least 30% of a compensating basin should be planted to have any significant affect on water quality.

Redgum Court compensating basin demonstrates the siege mentality, that if you need a ‘*comp basin*’ dig a hole and walk away. Unsatisfactory by today’s standards.

*Item 13.1 – Continued...*

The report has great detail and recognises the “Environmental and Ecological” benefits that the catchment area can have on our district.

I look forward to the report being tabled at the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting.”

**BLAIR MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the report of Cr Teasdale be noted and received.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

### **13.2 CR PASSERI – CITY OF BELMONT 2002 ART AWARDS**

Cr Passeri reported – “On Monday evening 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2002 I attended the official opening of the City of Belmont 2002 Art Exhibition and announcement of the award winners.

The exhibition and awards were sponsored by two major sponsors in Belmont Forum Shopping Centre, Gull Petroleum and minor sponsor Westralia Airports Corporation. Without their help the exhibition would not take place. We hope to have their continued involvement for future exhibitions.

This year we had over 150 artists submitting in excess of 250 artworks, a truly successful response, hopefully 2003 will be even better. The displaying of the exhibition at the shopping centre was also a huge success.

Award winners were:-

Gull Petroleum first prize to Laurie Smith with “Faulkner Park”.  
Gull Petroleum second prize to D’Hang Yammanee with “Mirror of Light”.

Belmont Forum Shopping Centre awarded five highly commendable awards and the winners were:-

John Ainsworth with “Down at the Dam”  
Margot Rawle with “Here”  
Julie Podstolski with “Strange Days”  
Laurie Smith with “Front Yard”  
David Duncan with “Cord”

Westralia Airports Corporation provided two youth encouragement awards and they were won by Joanne McNeill from Belmont City College and Luk Schetch, a year two student from Cloverdale Primary School.

*Item 13.2 – Continued...*

The City of Belmont presented an encouragement award for local artists, this was won by Jenny Nayton with a landscape.

Council also selected two artworks for acquisition for the City, being “Murchison” by Jack Van Bruchem and “Windy Harbour” by Ron McBride.

My thanks again to the sponsors, I also wish to thank the judges for their work which is always difficult and sometimes controversial. Thanks also to the staff from the City of Belmont, Andrew Ward, Jodi Cronan, Trish Mycock and the many others for all of your efforts.

I would also thank the Councillors and staff and their spouses who made the effort to come along and promote the event. Lastly, to all of the artists who entered and indeed did make the night a success.

To those who have not taken the opportunity to view the exhibition you can still visit the display each day through to the 14<sup>th</sup> September.

**RICHARDSON MOVED, GODFREY SECONDED, that the report of Cr Passeri be noted and received.**

**CARRIED 11 VOTES TO 0**

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

Nil.

**15. MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

Nil.

**16. CLOSURE**

There being no further business to discuss, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9.32pm.