TOWN OF VICTORIA PARK

Ordinary Council Meeting

Minutes – 12 April 2022

WE'RE OPEN
VIC PARK

Please be advised that an **Ordinary Council Meeting** was held at **6:30pm** on **Tuesday 12 April 2022** as an electronic meeting.

Her Worship the Mayor Karen Vernon
14 April 2022

Table of contents

1 Declaration of opening

Mayor Karen Vernon opened the meeting at 6.30pm.

Cr Ife gave the acknowledgement of Country.

Acknowledgement of Country

Ngany djerapiny Wadjak – Noongar boodja-k yaakiny, nidja bilya bardook.

I am honoured to be standing on Whadjuk - Nyungar country on the banks of the Swan River.

Ngany kaaditj Noongar moort keny kaadak nidja Wadjak Noongar boodja. Ngany kaaditj nidja Noongar birdiya – koora, ye-ye, boorda, baalapiny moorditj Noongar kaadijtin, moort, wer boodja ye-ye.

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land and respect past, present and emerging leaders, their continuing cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land, which continues to be important today.

Ngany youngka baalapiny Noongar birdiya wer moort nidja boodja.

I thank them for the contribution made to life in the Town of Victoria Park and to this region.

2 Announcements from the Presiding Member

2.1 Recording and live streaming of proceedings

In accordance with clause 39 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*, as the Presiding Member, I hereby give my permission for the administration to record proceedings of this meeting.

This meeting is also being live streamed on the Town's website. By being present at this meeting, members of the public consent to the possibility that their image and voice may be live streamed to public. Recordings are also made available on the Town's website following the meeting.

2.2 Public question time and public statement time

There are two opportunities to ask questions and make statements at the beginning and at the end of the meeting. Each public question and statement time will be held for 30 minutes. Any additional time must be by agreement from the meeting and will be in five-minute increments.

There are guidelines that need to be adhered to in our Council meetings and during question and statement time people speaking are not to personalise any questions, or statements about Elected Members, or staff or use any possible defamatory remarks.

In accordance with clause 40 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*, a person addressing the Council shall extend due courtesy and respect to the Council and the processes under which

it operates and shall comply with any direction by the presiding member.

A person present at or observing a meeting shall not create a disturbance at a meeting, by interrupting or interfering with the proceedings, whether by expressing approval or dissent, by conversing or by any other means.

For this electronic meeting, registrations to attend this electronic meeting were required to be made online. Questions and statements that received by members of the public prior to the meeting and who are not in attendance will be read by the presiding member and a relevant senior staff member will be called on to provide answers if required. Questions and statements related to an agenda item will generally be considered first. All those dealing with matters of a general nature will be considered in the order in which they have been received.

The April ordinary council meeting is again being held by electronic means, pursuant to a determination and authorisation I made under Regulation 14D of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*, having regard to the extent of community transmission of COVID19 that has occurred since our last Council meeting on 15 March continuing to pose a risk to the health and safety of elected members, Town staff and the public from face to face indoor meetings.

2.3 No adverse reflection

In accordance with clause 56 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019,* both Elected Members and the public when speaking are not to reflect adversely on the character or actions of Elected Members or employees.

2.4 Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019

All meetings of the Council, committees and the electors are to be conducted in accordance with the Act, the Regulations and the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*.

2.5 Mayor's agenda

On 23 March I met with the Victoria Park Raiders Junior Football Club to discuss problems with the current floodlighting at Higgins Park.

On 24 March, I chaired the Mindarie Regional Council Ordinary meeting.

On 30 March, I met with Zaneta Mascarenhas, the Labor candidate for the Federal seat of Swan to discuss her funding commitment of $2.5 million towards McCallum Park Active Zone.

I then chaired a meeting of the Inner City Mayors and CEOs Group, where we discussed 40kmh speed zones, e-scooter share schemes, electric vehicle infrastructure, and council training and development.
Later that afternoon I attended a Forum for members of Audit and Risk committees in the Public Sector, organised by the Office of the Auditor General.

On 31 March, the CEO and I met with Kristy McSweeney, the Liberal candidate for Federal seat of Swan to discuss the need for funding for the Town's projects at McCallum Park Active Zone and Edward Millen Park upgrade as part of our Federal election advocacy.

On 1 April, the CEO and I met with the Victoria Park Raiders Junior Football Club to discuss issues with the existing floodlighting at Higgins Park.

That evening, I attended the opening event of the Town's Arts Season, which was a debut textile and visual exhibition called Sugar, Spice & Everything Nice.

On 2 April, I attended the debut screening of (My Home), a filmic poem and live performance, another Arts Season event. Arts Season is on all month until 30 April.

3 Attendance

Mayor	Ms Karen Vernon
Banksia Ward	Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson Cr Peter Devereux Cr Wilfred Hendriks Cr Luana Lisandro
Jarrah Ward	Cr Jesse Hamer Cr Bronwyn Ife Cr Vicki Potter
Chief Executive Officer	Mr Anthony Vuleta
Chief Operations Officer	Ms Natalie Adams
A/Chief Financial Officer	Mr Luke Ellis
Chief Community Planner	Ms Natalie Martin Goode
Manager Governance and Strategy	Ms Bana Brajanovic
Manager Property Development and Leasing	Mr Paul Denholm
Secretary	Ms Natasha Horner
Meeting Support	Ms Jasmine Bray
Public	3

3.1 Apologies

Nil.

3.2 Approved leave of absence

Jarrah Ward	Cr Jesvin Karimi

4 Declarations of interest

Declaration of financial interest

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	12.4 Operating Subsidies 2022-2023 Round One
Nature of interest	Indirect financial
Extent of interest	An elderly family member receives services through Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizen's Centre and Homes Incorporated.

Declaration of proximity interest

Nil.

Declaration of interest affecting impartiality

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	12.1 Modified Amendment No. 56 to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (residential density up-coding) - Miller's Crossing, Carlisle
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	As a community member, I presented a petition to council at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 18th February 2020 on Millers Crossing asking for it to be retained and purchased as public open space.

Name/Position	Cr Vicki Potter
Item No/Subject	12.4 Operating Subsidies 2022-2023 Round One
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I work for an organisation that is the recipient of an operating subsidy.

Name/Position	Mayor Karen Vernon
Item No/Subject	12.4 Operating Subsidies 2022-2023 Round One
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	In 2021, I attended a meeting of the Board of Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizens Centre and Homes Inc to discuss their request for continuation of Town-supplied operating subsidies from 2022 onwards.

Name/Position	Cr Wilfred Hendriks
Item No/Subject	12.4 Operating Subsidies 2022-2023 Round One
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I am a committee member of the Harold Hawthorne Community Centre.

Name/Position	Cr Bronwyn Ife
Item No/Subject	12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	Some of the members of the AFLW Masters Team are friends of mine.

Name/Position	Cr Vicki Potter
Item No/Subject	12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I work for an organisation that is home of the Mackie St Singers.

Name/Position	Mayor Karen Vernon
Item No/Subject	12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have previously attended events held by the Lathlain Primary School Parents & Friends Association, including previous Community Christmas concerts.

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I was a past member of the Lathlain Primary School Parents and Citizens Association.

Name/Position	Mayor Karen Vernon
Item No/Subject	12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	During 2021, I attended meetings of the committee and President of Submitter 2 to discuss their future needs, although not a lease of the café facility at Leisurelife.

Name/Position	Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson
Item No/Subject	13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have attended events at the Centre for the Arts.

Name/Position	Mayor Karen Vernon
Item No/Subject	13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have had meetings with 2 organisations that have indicated some interest in leasing 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park once it was refurbished, including the party mentioned in the confidential attachment to the officer report.

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have attended events for the organisation contained in the confidential documents.

Name/Position	Cr Wilfred Hendriks
Item No/Subject	13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have attended events held at the VPCA.

Name/Position	Cr Bronwyn Ife
Item No/Subject	13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have attended events hosted by the Centre for the Arts.

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	13.6 Teague Street Traffic Safety Investigation
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I am friends with the resident that moved the initial motion that is Resolution 13 at the Annual Meeting of Electors on 28 July 2021.

Name/Position	Cr Wilfred Hendriks
Item No/Subject	15.5 2022 Minor review of Council policies
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I am a member of the Rotary Club of Victoria Park and the Vic Park Men's Shed. I am also a committee member of the Harold Hawthorne Community Centre. All of these groups receive funds and/or sponsorship from the Town.

Name/Position	Cr Wilfred Hendriks
Item No/Subject	17.2 Mayor Karen Vernon - Items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have met with members of the Raiders Football Club.

Name/Position	Cr Luana Lisandro
Item No/Subject	17.2 Mayor Karen Vernon - Items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have had conversation and been approached by the Vic Park Raiders Football Club in relation to floodlighting at Higgins Parks.

**Note: This declaration was made at the time of the item.*

Name/Position	Cr Bronwyn Ife
Item No/Subject	17.2 Mayor Karen Vernon - Items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	Members of the Vic Park Raiders Football team have contacted me to discuss their lighting needs.

**Note: This declaration was made at the time of the item.*

5 Public question time

5.1 Response to previous public questions taken on notice at Ordinary Council Meeting held on 15 March 2022

Mayor Karen Vernon on behalf of Ratepayers Association of the Town of Victoria Park

1. Is there is a public health order behind the Premier's announcement made on 31 January?

The directions were given by the State Emergency Coordinator and were outlined in the Proof of Vaccination Directions No. 3. It should be noted that the timing of the signing of the directions (2 February 2022), foreshowing of the requirements (13 January 2022) and announced implementation date (31 January 2022) occurred over a number of days.

5.2 Public question time

Rebecca Reiger (pre-submitted)

1. Can I ask that Council, impose an immediate 'stop work order' on the company that has been contracted to upgrade the Monopole at 54 Devenish Street by the 4 major telecommunications companies immediately?

The Chief Community Planner advised that the works have been defined as low impact under the Telecommuncations Act and are exempt from the requirement for development approval therefore there is no legal basis to issue a stop work order.

Ronhhda Potter (pre-submitted)

In relation to 12.1 and the officer's recommendation for a Local Development Plan addressing:

a. the shared desire of the Town and local community for the mature trees within and surrounding the land to be retained and conserved; and
b. ensuring that future development of the land is of a high-quality design standard, consistent with the WAPC's stated reasoning for the modification that the future development of the sites may serve as a showcase of high-quality medium density housing in accordance with the provisions of the WAPC's Draft Medium Density Codes.

1. What measures will be taken to have consistent oversight and engagement to ensure these points will be adhered to?

The Chief Community Planner advised that should the Minister agree with the Town's recommendation for a Local Development Plan, the Town will then procced with drafting an Local Development Plan which would be publicly advertised similar to a local planning policy.

2. Is there any opportunity for the local community and interested environmental groups to be involved in this process?

The Chief Community Planner advised that once the Local Development Plan is publicly advertised the community can be involved. She added that any planning application received for the site will also be assessed against the Local Development Plan.

Vince Maxwell (pre-submitted)

1. In reference to answers provided at the Agenda Briefing Forum last week about the Waste Local Law, the acting Chief Operations Officer advised that $350 infringements will only be issued against repeat offenders and that the Town intended to use a three strikes policy. Can you please advise which specific clause(s) in the Waste Local Law make(s) reference to either repeat offenders or to a three strikes policy?

The Chief Operations Officer advised that these are current practices adopted by Council officers which are not specifically mentioned in the standard local law.

2. When a ratepayer or resident contacts the Town in relation to a waste collection matter they are advised that they have to call Cleanaway directly. If Cleanaway are managing all waste related complains and enquiries why does the Town need to employ additional staff?

The Chief Operations Officer advised that Cleanaway do not manage all waste-related complaints and enquiries. She advised that part of the Town's waste contract with Cleanaway includes provision of some customer service and there were no additional staff request for specifically-employed for waste collection.

3. Residents do not have a contract with Cleanaway, why is the Town directing residents to speak with the Town's third party contractors with whom they have no contractual relationship?

The Chief Operations Officer advised that there is a contact number in the Waste and Recycling calendar and it is for missed bin collections but all other queries should be directed to the Town.

Steve Walker (pre-submitted)

Regarding OCM Agenda Item 12.2 Transport Strategy and Parking Management:

1. Will Town of Victoria Park finally admit that neighboring local government authorities of City of Belmont and City of Canning did not get referrals in 2021 requesting them to provide comment on your draft strategies?

The Chief Community Planner advised that the City of Belmont, City of Canning and the City of Perth were notified of the Town's preparation of the Draft Transport Strategy and the public comment period via their involvement in the South East Corridor Council Alliance and in the Inner City Working Group.

2. Please detail the date, time, and method that your claimed requests for comment on the draft 2021 Transport Strategy were made to City of Belmont, City of Canning, and City of Perth?

The Chief Community Planner took the question on notice.

3. Who exactly from City of Canning got the coffee chat where an informal, verbal request for comment on the Town of Victoria Park draft 2021 Transport Strategy was asked?

The Chief Community Planner took the question on notice.

Lisa Holland

1. How many events have been or are likely to be cancelled as a result of COVID-19, how much cost saving will be to the ratepayer and what will this saving be directed to in the future?

The Chief Community Planner advised that in terms of future events, ANZAC day is not cancelled but is modified and there are no predictions for any other events to be cancelled however events are assessed on a case by case basis. She took the cost-saving question taken on notice.

2. On what basis has the Town decided they will not enforce proof of vaccination, do they consider that they are protecting their staff sufficiently in their work environment, and did you take legal advice?

The Manager Governance and Strategy advised that the State Emergency was declared, the mandates apply to some premises but does not apply to the Town's Administration building so proof of vaccination was not required for the Annual Meeting of Electors.

Mayor Karen Vernon advised that if the Town intended to require proof of vaccination it would have been a result of a decision by the Town or an implementation of policy, which would require a period of consultation and include a risk assessment. She advised that every Local Government is entitled to adopt their own policies. She advised that other prevention measures such as mask wearing, social distancing, hand sanitizers were undertaken for entry into the Town chambers. She recalls around 23 members of the community were attending the Annual Meeting of Electors.

3. So you didn't have to get legal advice?

Mayor Karen Vernon advised that the Town has been seeking legal advice at various times in relation to the State Government's legal requirements imposed and the information provided has been utilised.

6 Public statement time

Elizabeth McFarlane

I play in the Year 9/10 girls team at the Vic Park Raiders. Unfortunately we can't play our games at our clubs home ground, Higgins Park due to insufficient lighting as girls matches are played on Friday nights. Over the past few years we have had home games at Ellenbrook, Noranda, Queens Park and the past few years at Curtin. This year we are trying a new home ground in Bentley. We'd really love to be able to play at home, at Higgins Park. We've been on a mission to improve the lighting for many years. Our mission has been delayed whilst the future use of Higgins Park was debated throughout 2020 and stalled in 2021. The future of lights is now wrapped up in the Higgins Park Masterplan which may take many more years to unfold. We understand that there are electrical works that need to be undertaken to upgrade the supply of electricity to the park as well as a detailed lighting design plan. We ask you to please prioritise our lights, remove them from the scope of the Masterplan by treating them as a separate project, as well as consider their inclusion in the 2022/23 budget.

Rebecca Reiger (pre-submitted)

I ask that council write to the company and refuse that allow the upgrade to go ahead until they have addressed the motions that were raised about this particular upgrade and passed at the recent Annual Electors meeting. Despite saying that this upgrade isn't a Council issue, someone in council many moons ago allowed the construction of this tower and so council it appears can stop the upgrade and I'm asking that council do this, in writing, on mine and many other very concerned rate payers behalf.

Ronhhda Potter (pre-submitted)

I would like to make a statement about the proposed Scheme amendment for the land along Millers Crossing

It is disappointing to lose this precious Public Open Space in Carlisle, whilst I acknowledge the developments of Koolbardi Park and Zone 2 in Lathlain have improved our Public Open Space, seeing how busy these spaces are only emphasises how in demand public open space is, particularly in Carlisle.
The areas in question here are not only used by people as a link between Carlisle and Lathlain, it is also used by our Bird life, particularly the Carnabies as a link between Curtin University and roosting sites in Lathlain and Belmont.

Whilst I am pleased to see the conservation of mature trees in the development plan, I am concerned that the Town will lose control over such issues, something that would not have happened if we owned this land.

With relation to parts a and b in point 3 of the recommendation, seeking to create a balance with....
a. the shared desire of the Town and local community for the mature trees within and surrounding the land to be retained and conserved; and
b. ensuring that future development of the land is of a high-quality design standard, consistent with the WAPC's stated reasoning for the modification that the future development of the sites may serve as a showcase of high-quality medium density housing in accordance with the provisions of the WAPC's Draft Medium Density Codes.

I would hope that our Councillors and Town set up some tight standards around this that genuinely engage our community and interested parties, including environmental and birdlife experts.

I have major concerns around the impact of any development here on our climate, we are a town that have declared a Climate Change Emergency, we now need to put practical measures into place to protect our environment, particularly the rising heat and how the eradication of trees and green spaces impact on this.

I would also like to address comments around the advantage of building high density here in relation to transport, it is really important to note that this site although along the train line, is not very close to train stations, with future developments coming to Carlisle and near Oats St station, we must have a balance of development vs open space. Whilst I appreciate comments around high density developments to address urban sprawl in the outer suburbs, we must focus on our town and be leaders in environmentally sustainable developments that create a balance between high quality housing and retaining mature trees and public open space.

It is also so important to keep our community up to date on what is happening in this space.

I hope that our Elected Members identify any gaps here in this item and address these with any amendments that ensure this precious green space is protected and any developments are of an extremely high standard.

Steve Walker (pre-submitted)

Regarding Agenda Item 12.2 Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan.

I've had valid, real concerns. Some of that has played out during the November 2021 ABF, OCM, and April 2021 ABF Question time.

As a reasonable person, and in this case –lead public submitter in reply to the 2021 draft strategies, the Town of Victoria Park officer/s could have emailed me directly at any time since the 16/11/2021 Ordinary Council Meeting to answer the questions/queries posed in my 14 page submission.
Five months later, I'm left with publicly raising some of them via April 2022 Council Meeting process. If current Town of Victoria Park officers were hesitant in publicly answering any of these questions, then why not have avoided further public scrutiny by emailing me directly. I would have kept most of the answers to myself.

There is an on-going problem of larger and larger private vehicles proliferating on the streets of Victoria Park. These big vehicles seem to flaunt road rules, speed, and increase dangers for pedestrians.

Page 77. Long term cycling network. Need for primary route to connect Centenary Avenue, by Curtin University, toward Perth CBD. Suggest work with City of Canning.

To the Parking Management Plan document.
Page 44, 3.5 Advocacy, has two Actions of:
- Advocate on behalf of the travelling public for more frequent public transport services and any route changes for bus services.
- Advocate for any proposed new bus routes to assist in transport mode shift.

Given that, why still,
Page 23. Slow on public transport 'advocacy' mechanism. '3-5 years' is very inappropriate!
Page 32, Travel Mode Shift. Actions. If so, then why low priority as stated on Page 23. Why?

The Shepperton Road movement corridor.
I want to urge Town of Victoria Park Council Members and residents to not fear an upgraded Shepperton Road to its ultimate design.
The fact is, the current McGowan State Government, and Minister for Transport IS working toward this.

It is partially acknowledged and noted by Staff in the finalized Transport Strategy Initiative Number 29.
The ultimate upgraded Shepperton Road will prioritise public transport by using dedicated public transport lane in each direction. This will encourage private vehicle users to mode-shift onto buses. Safety will massively increase, and new lighting, and landscaping will be provided. Why trade-off pedestrian crashes, cyclist crashes, vehicle crashes, for delaying the transition of Shepperton Road into its ultimate six-lane configuration?
There is nothing to fear, this on-going project needs more advocacy support from Town of Victoria Park Council and Town of Victoria Park.
Private-vehicle traffic won't be encouraged BECAUSE the cross-regional traffic is drawn to Tonkin Highway and Orrong Road.
Many in the community continue to raise the narrow intersection of Miller Street/ Shepperton Road as a safety issue. As of 2022 it appears a new, 3rd eatery has opened on that corner eatery site. Though I still do not know if it has been on-sold, leased, OR if MainRoadsWA has acquired the site recently. Yet I say again, if the WA State Government owned that piece of land (197 Shepperton Road) and the opposite piece of residential land (199 Shepperton Road), it could better upgrade the intersection by placing the traffic signals on their final alignment.
Why not be supportive of that solution, than all the incremental modifying that wastes millions of dollars of public monies, and hundreds of hours of staff time. Why?

Sooner is better for upgrading individual sections of Shepperton Road to their six-lane ultimate design.

7 Confirmation of minutes and receipt of notes from any agenda briefing forum

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (58/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson

That Council:

1. Receives the notes of the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.
2. Confirms the minutes of the Annual Meeting of Electors held on 29 March 2022.
3. Confirms the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 15 March 2022.
4. Confirms the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 25 October 2021.
5. Confirms the minutes of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 22 July 2021.
6. Confirms the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 22 June 2021.
7. Receives the notes of the Access and Inclusion Advisory Group meeting held on 9 March 2022.
8. Receives the notes of the Lathlain Park Advisory Group meeting held on 10 March 2022.
9. Receives the notes of the Urban Forest Implementation Working Group meeting held on 20 February 2022.
10. Receives the notes of the Urban Forest Implementation Working Group meeting held on 20 December 2021.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

8 Presentation of minutes from external bodies

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (59/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson

That Council:

1. Receives the minutes of the Metro Inner-South Joint Development Assessment Panel meeting held on 14 March 2022.
2. Receives the minutes of the WALGA State Council meeting held on 2 March 2022.
3. Receives the minutes of the Mindarie Regional Council meeting held on 24 March 2022.
4. Receives the minutes of the WALGA State Special Council meeting held on 30 March 2022.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

9 Presentations

9.1 Petitions

Nil.

9.2 Presentations

Nil.

9.3 Deputations

Nil.

10 Method of dealing with agenda business

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (60/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That the following items be adopted by exception resolution, and the remaining items be dealt with separately:

a) 11.1 Council Resolutions Status Report
b) 11.2 Quarterly reporting - April 2022
c) 12.3 Social Infrastructure Strategy - Request for Final Adoption
d) 12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants
e) 13.1 TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment
f) 13.3 Proposed disposal of office space at Aqualife by way of lease
g) 13.4 Proposed disposal of cafe spaces at Leisurelife and Aqualife by way of lease
h) 13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence
i) 13.6 Teague Street Traffic Safety Investigation
j) 14.1 Financial Statements - February 2022
k) 15.2 Review of Policy 225 - Hire and use of Town banner and flag sites
l) 15.4 Review of Policy 001 - Policy management and development
m) 15.5 2022 Minor review of Council policies
n) 15.6 Policy Committee - Terms of Reference review and future meeting dates
o) 15.8 Review of Local Government Property Local Law 2000

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

11 Chief Executive Officer reports

11.1 Council Resolutions Status Report

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Governance and Strategy
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Outstanding Council Resolutions Report - March 2022 [**11.1.1** - 25 pages] 2. Completed Council Resolutions Report - March 2022 [**11.1.2** - 8 pages]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the Outstanding Council Resolutions Report as shown in attachment 1; and
2. Notes the Completed Council Resolutions Report as shown in attachment 2.

Purpose

To present Council with the Council resolutions status reports.

In brief

- On 17 August 2021, Council endorsed status reporting on the implementation of Council resolutions.
- The status reports are provided for Council's information.

Background

1. On 17 August 2021, Council resolved as follows:

   That Council:

   1. Endorse the inclusion of Council Resolutions Status Reports as follows:

   a) Outstanding Items – all items outstanding; and

   b) Completed Items – items completed since the previous months' report to be presented to each Ordinary Council Meeting, commencing October 2021.

   2. Endorse the format of the Council Resolutions Status Reports as shown in Attachment 1.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL01 – Everyone receives appropriate information in the most efficient and effective way for them	The reports provide elected members and the community with implementation/progress updates on Council resolutions.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
All service areas	Relevant officers have provided comments on the progress of implementing Council resolutions.

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	Not applicable.				Low	
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

2. The Outstanding Council Resolutions Report details all outstanding items. A status update has been included by the relevant officer/s.

3. The Completed Council Resolutions Report details all Council resolutions that have been completed by officers from 24 February 2022 to 30 March 2022. A status update has been included by the relevant officer/s.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (61/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Notes the Outstanding Council Resolutions Report as shown in attachment 1; and
2. Notes the Completed Council Resolutions Report as shown in attachment 2.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

11.2 Quarterly reporting - April 2022

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Corporate Strategy and Risk Advisor
Responsible officer	Chief Executive Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Quarterly Report - Corporate Business Plan - Completed Last Quarter - April 2022 [**11.2.1** - 3 pages] 2. Quarterly Report - Corporate Business Plan Progress Report - April 2022 [**11.2.2** - 30 pages] 3. Quarterly Reports Q 3 - Five-year capital works program including the 2021 2022 Annual Strategic Projects [**11.2.3** - 17 pages] 4. Quarterly Report - Economic Development Strategy - April 2022 [**11.2.4** - 12 pages] 5. Quarterly Report - Urban Forest Strategy - April 2022 [**11.2.5** - 9 pages] 6. Quarterly Report - Reconciliation Action Plan - April 2022 [**11.2.6** - 7 pages] 7. Quarterly Report - Disability Access and Inclusion Plan - April 2022 [**11.2.7** - 13 pages] 8. Quarterly Report - Community Benefits Strategy - March 2022 [**11.2.8** - 21 pages]

Recommendation

That Council receives the quarterly written progress reports, for April 2022, relating to the:

a) Corporate Business Plan

b) Five-year capital works program, including the 2021/2022 Annual Strategic Project Plan

c) Economic Development Strategy 2018-2023

d) Urban Forest Strategy

e) Reconciliation Action Plan

f) Disability Access and Inclusion Plan

g) Community Benefits Strategy

h) Climate Emergency Plan

Purpose

To present quarterly progress updates to Council on the actions, projects and outcomes listed within the plans and strategies included in the recommendation.

In brief

- At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 16 July 2019, Council resolved that quarterly written progress reports be presented to Council on the Corporate Business Plan, Annual Strategic Project Summary, five-year capital works program and a selection of strategies and plans. A resolution in July 2021 requested that a progress report on the Climate Emergency Plan also be included.
- The progress reports were requested to enable Council to confidently oversee the Town's performance, allocation of finances and allocation of resources, as well as improve transparency and accountability to the Council and community.
- All progress reports for this quarter are attached to this report to be received by Council.

Background

1. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 16 July 2019, Council resolved:

   That Council requests that the Chief Executive Officer:

   1. *Develops an Annual Strategic Project Summary for 2019/2020, containing a summary of the projects that are aligned to strategic outcomes in the Strategic Community Plan 2017-2027.*
   2. *Presents the 2019/2020 Annual Strategic Project Summary for adoption at the September Ordinary Council Meeting.*
   3. *Presents to Council, commencing from the October Ordinary Council Meeting, quarterly written progress reports on the actions, projects and outcomes within the Town's following plans and strategies:*
      a. *Corporate Business Plan*
      b. *2019/2020 Annual Strategic Project Summary*
      c. *5 Year Capital Works Program*
      d. *Economic Development Strategy 2018 – 2023*
      e. *Urban Forest Strategy*
      f. *Reconciliation Action Plan*
      g. *Disability Access and Inclusion Plan*

2. The quarterly written progress reports were requested to enable Council to assess performance against strategies and plans, identify risks and significant variations in project performance and budgeting, receive information needed to be able to make informed decisions, and be able to take action to address any issues that arise. They were also requested to give Council and the community a higher level of transparency and accountability relating to strategic actions, plans and projects.

3. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 20 July 2021, Council resolved:

   That Council:
   1. Receives the community consultation results for the draft Climate Emergency Plan.
   2. Endorses the Climate Emergency Plan 2021 – 2031.
   3. Instructs the Chief Executive Officer to include the Climate Emergency Plan in the Quarterly written progress Reports to Council, commencing in the next quarter for 2021.

4. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 12 October 2021, Council resolved to request quarterly progress reports on the programs within the Community Benefits Strategy 2019-2024.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL01 – Everyone receives appropriate information in the most efficient and effective way for them	Council are provided with the information that they have requested in the way they determined is best for them.
CL02 - A community that is authentically engaged and informed in a timely manner.	The community are regularly informed of progress on projects, plans and strategies undertaken by the Town.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Operations	Operations coordinate the progress reports for the 2021/2022 Annual Strategic Project Summary, Climate Emergency Plan and Five-Year Capital Works Program.
Governance and Strategy	Governance and Strategy coordinate the progress reports for the Corporate Business Plan.
Place Planning	Place Planning coordinate the progress reports for the Economic Development Strategy 2018 – 2023 and Urban Forest Strategy.
Community Development	Community Development coordinate the progress reports for the Community Benefits Strategy, Reconciliation Action Plan and Disability Access and Inclusion Plan.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	.
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	

Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	Negative public perception towards the Town if progress expectations are not being met.	Minor	Possible	Moderate	Low	Risk to be treated by providing commentary and reasoning within progress reports where expectations are not being met. Avoid risk by frequently reporting to Council, allowing Council and community to be informed of progress in a timely manner and potentially mitigate further progress delays.
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

5. Written progress reports will enable the Council to oversee the Town's performance and allocation of the Town's finances and resources. They will also help to inform the community about the Town's progress in relation to the plans and strategies.

6. These reports on the actions, projects and outcomes, for the plans and strategies listed in the Council resolution, have been attached to this report. Further commentary for each report has also been included below.

Corporate Business Plan

7. The status of actions from the CBP are as follows.

Strategic outcome	Total actions	No. of actions completed	No. of actions in progress	No. of actions overdue

Social	27	16	11	0
Environment	78	42	36	0
Economic	24	18	6	0
Civic Leadership	133	92	41	0

8. Actions completed within the reporting quarter are as follows.

Completed actions
CL6.2.1 - Review the Investment Policy
CL7.1.5 - Create an organisation-wide customer service training program
CL7.1.6 - Investigate the upgrade of the Customer Request Management System
CL8.1.7 - Complete memorandum of understanding for South-East Corridor Alliance
EN2.1.2 - Update the 10-year Rights of Way capital works program
EN3.1.4 - Implement the Integrated Movement Network Strategy
EN5.1.5 - Implement an asset management system
S2.1.2 - Review the Digital Hub's strategic marketing plan

2021/2022 Annual Strategic Project Summary

9. The status of projects from the annual strategic project summary are as follows.

Total projects	**No. of projects on track**	**No. of projects potentially delayed**	**No. of projects delayed**
19	14		5

Five Year Capital Works Program

10. The status of actions from the Five-Year Capital Works Program are as follows.

2021 – 2022

Total projects	**Works in Progress**	**Not yet started**	**Complete**

163	87	23 (4 of which have been deleted)	53

Approved project list for FY23 to FY25 to be updated post budget adoption.

2022/2023

Total projects	Works in Progress	Not yet started	Complete
88		88	

2023/2024

Total projects	Works in Progress	Not yet started	Complete
42		42	

2024/2025

Total projects	Works in Progress	Not yet started	Complete
27		27	

Deferred / Not nominated

Total projects	Works in Progress	Not yet started	Complete
11		11	

Economic Development Strategy 2018 – 2023

11. The Economic Development Strategy 2018- 2023 (EDS) outlines 50 actions required to achieve the seven pathways for sustainable economic growth over the next five years. The EDS was adopted by Council in March 2019.
12. The summary table below represents the number of actions progressed and completed since the adoption of the EDS.

Outcome	Total actions	No. of actions completed	No. of actions in progress	No. of actions not started
Pathway 1:	4	2	2	0

Leadership				
Pathway 2: Identity	2	0	2	0
Pathway 3: Local to Global Connections	5	0	3	2
Pathway 4: Smart Town- Digital Innovation	7	0	5	2
Pathway 5: Creating an Enabling Business Environment	8	1	6	1
Pathway 6: High Value Precincts	6	5	1	0
Pathway 7: High Value Sectors	18	1	16	1
Total	50	9	35	6

Urban Forest Strategy

13. The Urban Forest Strategy (UFS) Implementation Action Plan (IAP) outlines 41 actions required to achieve the six strategic outcomes defined in the UFS over a 5-year period. The UFS was adopted by council in September 2018 and the IAP in September 2019.

14. The summary table below represents the number of actions progressed and completed since the adoption of the IAP.

Outcome	No. of actions completed	No. of actions in progress	No. of actions not started
Strategic Outcome 1 Plant and protect sufficient trees by 2020 to achieve the 20% tree canopy target as supported by Council.	5	6	4
Strategic Outcome 2 Maximize community involvement and collaboration in its implementation.	1	8	0

Strategic Outcome 3 Increase tree diversity, whilst favoring local endemic and West Australian species that also support wildlife.	1	1	1
Strategic Outcome 4 Maintain high standard of vegetation health.	3	2	1
Strategic Outcome 5 Improve soil and water quality.	1	1	1
Strategic Outcome 6 Improve urban ecosystems.	0	2	3

15. A summary of the progress for each of the actions from the UFS Implementation Action Plan is attached in a separate schedule.

Reconciliation Action Plan

16. The Town's Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) was adopted by Council in November 2018.
17. The document outlines strategies and actions to support opportunities to strengthen the community, build strong relationships and foster greater awareness and understanding of Aboriginal culture and history.
18. The status of actions from the Reconciliation Action Plan are as follows.

Category	No. of actions completed	No. of actions in progress/ongoing	No. of actions not started
Relationships	14	3	1
Respect	31	4	1
Opportunities	13	4	3
Tracking and Progress	2	1	1

19. A summary of the progress for each of the actions from the RAP is attached in a separate schedule.

Disability Access and Inclusion Plan

20. The Town's Disability Access and Inclusion Plan was adopted by Council in September 2017 and is a legislative requirement for all local governments.
21. The status of actions from the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan are as follows.

Category	No. of actions	No. of actions in	No. of actions not

	completed	progress	started
Services and Events	6	0	0
Building and Facilities	4	0	0
Information	5	1	0
Quality Customer Service	5	0	0
Complaints	2	0	0
Public Consultation	3	0	0
Employment	4	1	0

22. A summary of the progress for each of the actions from the DAIP is attached in a separate schedule.

Community Benefits Strategy

23. The Community Benefits Strategy (CBS) was launched on 2 December 2019.
24. The Town of Victoria Park, West Coast Eagles, Waalitj Foundation, and the Perth Football Club partnered in the design process of the CBS to collectively bring their own strengths to the partnership. The design process resulted in the creation of four programs, each program has a main delivery partner to ensure its success.
25. The status of actions from the CBS are as follows:

Program	No. of actions completed /ongoing	No. of actions progressing	No. of actions not started
Youth engagement program	3	0	0
Healthy relationship awareness	7	1	1
Supporting local community organisations	4	3	0
Recreational groups and sports club development	4	1	1

26. A summary of the progress for each of the actions from the CBS is attached in a separate schedule.

Climate Emergency Plan

27. The Town's Climate Emergency Plan (CEP) was adopted by Council on 20 July 2021.

28. The Climate Emergency Plan aims to:

    a. Achieve a zero-carbon target for emissions generated by the Town of Victoria Park by 2030. The timeframe of 2030 has been chosen because it is the timeframe needed to curb emissions and limit the seriousness of climate change impacts.
    b. Achieve at least 40% emissions reduction through direct action (i.e. not through carbon offsets).
    c. Support the community and businesses in working towards their own zero carbon target.
    d. Improve the resilience of the Town in responding to immediate climate change impacts.

29. The status of actions from the CEP are as follows.

Category	No. of actions completed	No. of actions in progress/ongoing	No. of actions not started
1 Embed a low carbon culture	3	2	2
2 Reduce emissions of facilities and assets	3	7	
3 Reduce waste emissions	No 2021 actions		
4 Switch to low carbon and renewables		1	
5 Respond to immediate climate change impacts		5	2
6 Support and educate our community		7	1
7 Support and educate our businesses		5	2
8 Offset residual emissions	1		

30. This quarter, the key progress highlights of the Climate Emergency Plan included:

- Partnership with Climate Clever: workshop held for businesses on 10 February. Further workshop for schools and residents planned for Q4 2022. Roll out of the Climate Clever app to also occur.
- Planned educational workshops on the value of tree retention, urban farming, and sustainable landscaping, including biophilic design. A suite of workshop topics for 2022 include
  - Workshop 1 -Urban Farming / Sustainability at home: Tuesday 5 April
  - Workshop 2 -Climate proof cities – city design and transport: Wednesday 6 April
  - Workshop 3 - Green lab kid's event: Tuesday 12 April
  - Workshop 4- Biodiversity: Thursday 5 May
  - Continued sustainability-based incentives to business owners for utility and supply cost benefits, such as Rewards for Business: https://www.switchyourthinking.com/our-projects/rewards-for-business/

- Establishment of internal advisory group to oversee the implementation of the CEP. Draft Terms of Reference have been developed and curently going through internal approvals process.

- A proposal is being developed by a specialist consultant to deliver a guidance document to assist with the below. The scope has been determined and the proposal will be assessed accordingly.

Require the construction of future Council owned buildings and assets to meet either:
- A minimum 5 Star Green Star for New Buildings certification from the Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA) or equivalent, or
- Demonstrate that all minimum requirements under the Green Star for New Buildings Positive category from the GBCA have been met, or
- A minimum 5 Star NABERS Energy and Waste rating for the commercial office space

- In an effort to move to greater energy efficiency, there is a capital works item for replacement of light globes to LED in facilities – this year is for Vic Park Bowls; and the Town has purchased a new fridge and microwave for Rangers facility.

- The Town has purchased a hybrid vehicle. The Town has also requested a budget increase for 2022/23 to allow the Town to purchase some electric vehicles.

- In terms of sustainability-based incentives for residents, the Town has an Autumn Seed Service for residents through the Grow It Local program.

- Terms of Reference have been drafted for a proposed Working Group and will considered by SMT for approval in March. It is proposed that this group would comprise relevant Service Area staff.

- Overarching Health advice on heat stress management from Dept Health and Healthy WA has been communicated in weekly Facebook bulk posts until March 2022.

31. As per the Council resolution, progress reports will be presented to Council on a quarterly basis, in October, February, April and July.

Relevant documents

Corporate Business Plan
Economic Development Strategy 2018 – 2023
Urban Forest Strategy

Reconciliation Action Plan
Disability Access and Inclusion Plan
Climate Emergency Plan
Community Benefits Strategy

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (62/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council receives the quarterly written progress reports, for April 2022, relating to the:

a) Corporate Business Plan

b) Five-year capital works program, including the 2021/2022 Annual Strategic Project Plan

c) Economic Development Strategy 2018-2023

d) Urban Forest Strategy

e) Reconciliation Action Plan

f) Disability Access and Inclusion Plan

g) Community Benefits Strategy

h) Climate Emergency Plan

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

11.3 Adoption of a Strategic Community Plan

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Corporate Strategy and Risk Advisor
Responsible officer	Chief Executive Officer
Voting requirement	Absolute majority
Attachments	1. Alternative Draft Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2032 [**11.3.1** - 40 pages] 2. Proposed Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2034 [**11.3.2** - 39 pages]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Receives the alternative draft version of the Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032, as requested at the March 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting, as at attachment 1.
2. Considers both the alternate draft version (attachment 1) and the original proposed version (attachment 2) and adopts a new Strategic Community Plan, to be effective from 1 July 2022.
3. Approves the delay for the presentation of the Corporate Business Plan 2022-2027 to the July 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting.

Purpose

To present the requested alternative draft Strategic Community Plan (SCP) and request that Council endorse a SCP for the Town.

In brief

- Council resolved to request the development of an alternative draft SCP at the March 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting.
- An alternative draft has been prepared and includes all items requested by Council.
- The alternative draft does not include the Town objectives that were in the proposed SCP.
- Further delays in endorsing a new SCP could have financial, legislative, reputational and service delivery consequences.
- The presentation of the Corporate Business Plan 2022-2027 should be delayed to July 2022 because of the delay in adopting an SCP.

Background

1. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 15 March 2022, Council resolved:

   That Council:

   1. Acknowledges feedback received from the community, as at attachment 1.
   2. Acknowledges elected member feedback and changes made as a result, as at attachment 2.
   3. Notes the draft Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2034.
   4. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to bring a report back to the April Ordinary Meeting of Council with the further inclusion for consideration of an alternative draft version of the Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 that:

a) *Deletes the Mission of "Leaders in unlocking potential";*
b) *Reinstates the four pillars of sustainability (Social, Economic, Environment and Civic Leadership as contained in the current Strategic Community Plan 2017 – 2032) as the Mission;*
c) *Allocates the Community Priorities under each of the 4 pillars of sustainability in the same organisational manner as appears in the current Strategic Community Plan;*
d) *Includes 2 further Community Priorities aligned to Civic Leadership related to:*

(i) communication and engagement with community;
(ii) governance and leadership.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL08 - Visionary civic leadership with sound and accountable governance that reflects objective decision-making.	Council needs to consider the best strategy for achieving the community's vision for the future.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Communications and Engagement	Provided goals and measures relating to the requested priority – Communication and engagement with community.
Governance and Strategy	Provided goals and measures relating to the requested priority – Governance and leadership.

Legal compliance

Section 5.56 of the *Local Government Act 1995*
Regulation 19C of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulation 1996*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	**Risk event description**	**Consequence rating**	**Likelihood rating**	**Overall risk level score**	**Council's risk appetite**	**Risk treatment option and rationale for actions**
Financial	Further delays in endorsing a new SCP could result in the need to carry forward funds to launch the new plan.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT by adopting a SCP.
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	

Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Further delays in endorsing a new SCP could result in delays to the development of the Corporate Business Plan, meaning the Town would not be legislatively compliant.	Insignificant	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT by adopting a SCP.
Reputation	Failure to adopt a new SCP could result in negative public perception due to the extensive effort of both the community and staff to develop it.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT by adopting a SCP.
Service delivery	Further delays in endorsing a new SCP could result in delays to the development of the Corporate Business Plan, meaning actions that achieve community priorities may not be identified or able to be communicated to the community.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Medium	TREAT by adopting a SCP.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

2. The alternative draft SCP has been prepared and is at attachment 1. This version includes all requests resolved by Council.
3. The lifespan of the alternative draft has been amended as requested, with the aim of achieving the vision by 2032 being the same as the current SCP.
4. The alternative draft SCP includes an amended strategic direction from that of the version recommended to Council at the March 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting. It is outlined below.

Vision

The Town of Victoria Park: A dynamic place for everyone.

Purpose

Sustainably serve, empower and connect community.

Values

Proactive – Anticipate, plan and act.
Inclusive – Embrace diversity.
Integrity – Be honest, accountable and transparent.
Caring – Show empathy, consideration and kindness.
Courage – Be bold and innovative.

Mission

We will communicate with, empower and support the community and promote social, economic and environmental sustainability to create our vision.

Social – To promote sustainable, connected, safe and diverse places for everyone.
Economic – To promote sustainable, diverse, resilient and prosperous places for everyone.
Environment – To promote sustainable, liveable, healthy and green places for everyone.
Civic leadership – To show leadership by communicating with, empowering and supporting people in the community.

Community priorities

Helping people feel safe.
Facilitating an inclusive community that celebrates diversity.
Collaborating to ensure everyone has a place to call home.
Improving access to arts, history, culture and education.
Protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
Facilitating the reduction of waste.
Increasing and improving public open spaces.
Providing facilities that are well-built and well-maintained.
Enhancing and enabling liveability through planning, urban design and development.
Improving how people get around the Town.
Facilitating a strong local economy.
Effectively managing resources and performance.
Communication and engagement with community.
Governance and leadership.

5. The resolution requested the reinstatement of the current mission. A consequence of this was the proposed Town objectives being removed from the strategic direction in the alternative draft. The proposed Town objectives were created to guide the Town to achieve the proposed mission of being

"Leaders in unlocking potential," over a four-year period, by considering the type of people, community, governance, systems, operations and finances needed. As the alternative draft has a different mission, these proposed objectives no longer relate. The inclusion of the two new community priorities would also result in two areas being duplicated between the priorities and objectives as communications, engagement and governance all relate to proposed Town objectives for achieving community priorities.

6. The community priorities have been allocated to each of the four pillars of sustainability in the alternative draft. The allocation of each priority was informed by the allocation of similar themes in the Strategic Community Plan 2017-2032.

   Social

   Facilitating an inclusive community that celebrates diversity.

   Improving access to arts, history, culture and education.

   Helping people feel safe.

   Collaborating to ensure everyone has a place to call home.

   Economic

   Facilitating a strong local economy.

   Environment

   Protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

   Facilitating the reduction of waste.

   Increasing and improving public open spaces.

   Providing facilities that are well-built and well maintained.

   Enhancing and enabling liveability through smart planning, urban design and development.

   Improving how people get around the Town.

   Civic leadership

   Effectively managing resources and performance.

   Communication and engagement with community.

   Governance and leadership.

7. The two further community priorities have been included in the alternative draft. Subject-matter experts were consulted to include relevant goals, measures, strategies and services for each of the priorities, to enable the Town to be a dynamic place for everyone in the future.

8. As the Council resolution requested the further inclusion of an alternative draft version, the original proposed Strategic Community Plan 2022-2034, as presented to Council in March 2022, has also been included as an attachment.

9. Council will need to consider both plans and adopt a new SCP. An amendment will be needed to do so. Suggested wording for the amendment is:

   That point 2 be amended to read:

   2. Adopts the Strategic Community Plan [include span of years], as at attachment [include attachment number], to be effective from 1 July 2022.

10. As the development of an alternative draft and its presentation to Council in April took one month, the Town also requests that the previous Council resolution requiring a new Corporate Business Plan (CBP) to be presented to Council with the 2022-2023 annual budget no longer stand. As the new strategic direction for the Town was unknown, the development of the new CBP was paused. This has delayed

the project by a month. The amended timeline for the project, if Council resolves to delay presentation to July 2022, is outlined below.

Council adoption of SCP.	12 April 2022
Content review and development.	By 13 May 2022
Staff review of draft document.	By 27 May 2022
Elected member review of draft document.	By 10 June 2022
Consideration of feedback and amendments.	By 27 June 2022
Write Council report.	By 27 June 2022
Council adoption.	19 July 2022

Relevant documents

Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 15 March 2022

Attachments from the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 15 March 2022

PROCEDURAL MOTION

Moved: Cr Luana Lisandro **Seconded:** Mayor Karen Vernon

That clause 50 - Speaking twice of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019 be suspended for the duration of this item, in accordance with clause 58 of the *Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

AMENDMENT:

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconder:** Cr Jesse Hamer

Amend point 2 of the recommendation as follows:

"Adopts the Alternative Draft Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 (Attachment 11.3.1) as the new Strategic Community Plan, effective from 1 July 2022, subject to the inclusion of the following amendments:

Page No	Deletion	Addition
2/40	Delete the first sentence under the heading "Our Mission"	Insert under the heading "Our Mission": To achieve our vision, we will champion the four pillars of sustainability including:"
3/40		Insert under the heading "Economic": • Connecting businesses and people to our local activity centres through place planning and activation
3/40	Under the heading "Civic Leadership" delete: • Governance and Leadership	Under the heading "Civic Leadership" insert: • Accountability and good governance
20/40	Delete the first sentence under the heading "Our Mission"	Insert under the heading "Our Mission": To achieve our vision, we will champion the four pillars of sustainability including:"
21/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
25/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
25/40		Insert under the heading "Economic": • Attracting businesses and people to local activity centres through place planning and activation • Create matching narrative for this goal including reference to the EDS, Place Plans, Local Planning Strategy, Events Strategy, Invest Vic Park Prospectus , Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, the UFS
26/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
32/40	Delete the words "(from 2022)" wherever they appear	
33/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
35/40		Insert under "Related strategies" the following additional references:

		Community Charter Customer Service Charter Disability Access & Inclusion Plan
36/40	Delete the heading "Governance and leadership"	Insert the heading "Accountability and good governance"
37/40		Before Part 4, insert the "Town's objectives" section in its entirety, as appears at pages 33 – 35 of Attachment 11.3.2 Proposed Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2034.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife
Against: Nil

Reason:

The Alternative Draft Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 creates a mission explicitly based on the four pillars of sustainability in recognition of the importance our community placed during VicVision on sustainability as the lens through which their priorities and the Town's objectives should be viewed.

There is a need for some finessing of the way in which the pillars of sustainability in the current Strategic Community Plan have been integrated into the alternative draft Strategic Community Plan. The amendments are comprehensively set out in this motion and are intended to improve the readability and flow of the document.

The officer's report argues that the change in the Town's mission from "Leaders in unlocking potential" to the existing four pillars of sustainability meant that the proposed Town's objectives no longer related to the new mission. I disagree completely. Council made no resolution requesting removal of the Town's objectives from the draft alternative Strategic Community Plan. On any reading of the proposed Town's objectives, they are readily able to be seen as aligned with, and related to the four pillars of sustainability, and should be included.

There is no substantive change in the Town's strategic direction in my view from the proposed Strategic Community Plan presented at the Ordinary Council Meeting on 15 March and the Alternative draft Strategic Community Plan presented on 5 April such that the new Strategic Community Plan can be adopted.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (76/2022):

Moved: Cr Peter Devereux **Seconded:** Cr Vicki Potter

That Council:

1. Receives the alternative draft version of the Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032, as requested at the March 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting, as at attachment 1.
2. Adopts the Alternative Draft Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 (Attachment 11.3.1) as the new Strategic Community Plan, effective from 1 July 2022, subject to the inclusion of the following amendments:

Page No	Deletion	Addition
2/40	Delete the first sentence under the heading "Our Mission"	Insert under the heading "Our Mission": To achieve our vision, we will champion the four pillars of sustainability including:"
3/40		Insert under the heading "Economic": • Connecting businesses and people to our local activity centres through place planning and activation
3/40	Under the heading "Civic Leadership" delete: • Governance and Leadership	Under the heading "Civic Leadership" insert: • Accountability and good governance
20/40	Delete the first sentence under the heading "Our Mission"	Insert under the heading "Our Mission": To achieve our vision, we will champion the four pillars of sustainability including:"
21/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
25/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
25/40		Insert under the heading "Economic": • Attracting businesses and people to local activity centres through place planning and activation • Create matching narrative for this goal including reference to the EDS, Place Plans, Local Planning Strategy, Events Strategy, Invest Vic Park Prospectus , Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, the UFS
26/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
32/40	Delete the words "(from 2022)" wherever they appear	
33/40	Delete the sections entitled "Where we're headed" and "Our Underlying Principle"	
35/40		Insert under "Related strategies" the following additional references:

		Community Charter Customer Service Charter Disability Access & Inclusion Plan
36/40	Delete the heading "Governance and leadership"	Insert the heading "Accountability and good governance"
37/40		Before Part 4, insert the "Town's objectives" section in its entirety, as appears at pages 33 – 35 of Attachment 11.3.2 Proposed Strategic Community Plan 2022 - 2034.

3. Approves the delay for the presentation of the Corporate Business Plan 2022-2027 to the July 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

12 Chief Community Planner reports

12.1 Modified Amendment No. 56 to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (residential density up-coding) - Miller's Crossing, Carlisle

Location	Carlisle
Reporting officer	Place Leader – Strategic Planning
Responsible officer	Manager Development Services Manager Place Planning
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Amendment 56 Location Plan [**12.1.1** - 1 page] 2. Modified Amendment 56 and Scheme Report [**12.1.2** - 8 pages] 3. Millers Crossing tree and site feature survey - October 2020 [**12.1.3** - 4 pages] 4. Ordinary- Council- Meeting- Minutes-21- July-2020 [**12.1.4** - 15 pages] 5. Ordinary- Council- Meeting- Minutes-21- April-2020 [**12.1.5** - 17 pages] 6. Amendment 56 - Submissions Schedule - De-identified [**12.1.6** - 19 pages]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Resolves, pursuant to Section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* and Regulation 50(3) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, to proceed with Scheme Amendment No. 56 to amend the Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS1), as modified by the Minister for Planning's decision dated 2 August 2021, subject to the following additional modification:

    6. *Inserting the following subtitle and paragraph to the 'DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS' listed for the 'RESIDENTIAL ZONE' of Town Planning Scheme No. 1 Precinct Plan P8 Carlisle Precinct:*

        "Residential R60 zoned area

        A Local Development Plan is required to be adopted by the local government prior to the subdivision or development of the Residential R60 zoned land comprising Lots 1003 (No. 7) and 1004 (No. 6) Raleigh Street, and Lot 1005 (No. 45) Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle, that were formerly partly located within the Robert's Road 'Other Regional Road' reservation under the Perth Metropolitan Region Scheme. The Local Development Plan shall address issues of vehicular access, environmental sustainability, landscaping, building setbacks and the retention and conservation of mature trees on and surrounding the land as part of any future development."

2. The Scheme Amendment Report documents being modified to reflect the decision of the Minister for

Planning dated 2 August 2021 and being forwarded to the Western Australian Commission for final determination by the Minister for Planning.

3. The documents referred to in Part 2 above, being accompanied by a copy of Council's resolution and a letter from the CEO (to be addressed and sent to both the WAPC and Minister for Planning's office) outlining the reasons for the further modification requested in Part 1 above, which seeks to balance the WAPC/Minister's interest in the future residential development of the Miller's Crossing land, with:

   a. the shared desire of the Town and local community for the mature trees within and surrounding the land to be retained and conserved; and

   b. ensuring that future development of the land is of a high-quality design standard, consistent with the WAPC's stated reasoning for the modification that the future development of the sites may serve as a showcase of high-quality medium density housing in accordance with the provisions of the WAPC's Draft Medium Density Codes.

Purpose

For the Council to make a formal resolution in respect of Amendment No. 56 to TPS1 as further modified in accordance with the Minister for Planning's decision dated 2 August 2021.

In brief

- Amendment No. 56 to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS1) relates to the land known as 'Miller's Crossing' in Carlisle. This land is comprised of three lots being Lot 1003 (No. 7) Raleigh Street, Lot 1004 (No. 6) Raleigh Street, and Lot 1005 (No. 45) Bishopsgate Street.
- The amendment also relates to one lot in East Victoria Park adjacent to John Bissett Reserve, which is used by the community and maintained by the Town as part of that reserve, being Lot 1002 (No. 2-8) Beatty Avenue.
- Amendment 56 was initiated by the Town in late 2011 and originally proposed all four of the lots to be reserved 'Park and Recreation'. In 2017 the Minister for Planning required the Town to modify and re-advertise the amendment with the three Miller's Crossing lots to instead be zoned 'Residential' with a density code of R30.
- Amendment 56 has been the subject of protracted considerations by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in its roles both as advisory body to the Minister for Planning and landowner of the lots, as it intends to sell the Millers Crossing lots for residential development in the medium to longer term.
- The Town went through a significant engagement process; prepared a Public Open Space Strategy in late 2019 to understand Public Open Space supply in the Town; and undertook a land purchase evaluation in 2020. All this work was undertaken to assist the Town contemplate a potential purchase of the land from the WAPC.
- Council ultimately determined not to purchase the land and is instead implementing the Public Open Space Strategy which has in recent times included the delivery of a microparks program in Carlisle and advocacy to METRONET for new public open spaces within the rail reserve, all with the aim to address gaps in accessibility to open space that were identified in the Carlisle area. The Public Open Space Strategy revealed that there is sufficient Public Open Space in the immediate surrounds to the Millers Crossing site.
- The further consideration and decision by the Minister for Planning in August 2021 required the Town to re-advertise and further modify Amendment 56 by increasing the proposed residential density of the Miller's Crossing lots from R30 to R60.

- It is recommended that Council resolves to proceed with Amendment 56 as modified by the Minister, subject to requesting that it being further modified to require the adoption of a local development plan for the land, prior to future subdivision or development occurring.

Background

1. The Miller's Crossing open space is in Carlisle adjacent to the Roberts Road boundary with Lathlain, and comprises the following three lots:
   a. Lot 1003 (No. 7) Raleigh Street, Carlisle – 2,081m^2;
   b. Lot 1004 (No. 6) Raleigh Street, Carlisle – 1,343m^2; and
   c. Lot 1005 (No. 45) Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle – 1,157m^2.

2. Amendment 56 was initiated by the Town in late 2011. The amendment was required following the amendment of the Perth Metropolitan Region Scheme which reduced the extent of the Roberts Road 'Other Regional Roads' Reservation, which formerly extended over a portion of the lots, with the balance of the lots being zoned 'Residential R30' under Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS1). The rationalisation of the road reserve resulted in portions of the lots adjoining Roberts Road being neither reserved or zoned, thereby necessitating proposed Amendment 56 to TPS1.

3. The Town initiated Amendment 56 seeking all of the land to be reserved 'Parks and Recreation' given the Town's maintenance of the land and its use by the community as landscaped public open space following the completion of the Robert's Road railway overpass in 2004.

4. Following protracted consideration by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), the Town was advised of the Minister for Planning's decision in 2017 to require the Town to modify and re-advertise the amendment with the Miller's Crossing lots to instead be zoned 'Residential' with a density code of R30.

5. Readvertising of the modified amendment proved controversial and raised significant community concern primarily in relation to the potential loss of this open space and the removal of trees that could arise should the land be developed for residential purposes.

6. The Town was granted a request to defer the Minister's final determination of the amendment in order to consider the outcomes the Town's Public Open Space Strategy (POSS) completed in late 2019, as well as the Town's potential acquisition and options for the use/development of the land in 2020. These matters were the subject of significant community engagement, the outcomes of which reinforced previously raised community concerns and a desire for the Miller's Crossing land to be maintained (and potentially purchased) as public open space, despite the POSS identifying that accessibility to open space was not lacking in the local area.

7. In mid-2020 Council ultimately determined not to purchase the land given its significant cost and high level of investment in nearby open space as part of the Lathlain Park Redevelopment Project. The Council decided to instead focus the Town's efforts on resolving gaps in walkable accessibility to open space identified by the POSS elsewhere in Carlisle, partly and initially through the creation of three microparks in Carlisle as part of the Green Basins Program funded through the Urban Forest Strategy.

8. The Council also approved the commissioning of a site feature survey of the land to identify the trees potentially affected by future development and sought for the Town's administration to advocate to the WAPC for the preparation of a Local Development Plan (LDP) to guide future residential development of the land in order to maximise opportunities for tree retention, should the Minister determine to approve Amendment 56 as was anticipated by the Town.

9. The tree and site feature survey were completed in October 2020 (refer to Attachment 2) and captured the Miller's Crossing lots, their adjacent Council verges and the sloped embankment up to the adjacent Robert's Road pedestrian path. The survey identified a total of 130 trees ranging in canopy diameters from 1 to 16 metres, and heights of 1.5 to 17 metres. Of these trees, 15 were located within Lot 1003, 15 in Lot 1004 and 10 in Lot 1005, representing 31% of the total number of trees surveyed. The survey also confirmed that the significant tree located in very close proximity to the southwest corner of Lot 1003 (identified as T69 with a canopy diameter 10 metres and height of 12 metres) was located outside of the lot, significantly reducing its risk of removal as part of any future development, and avoiding the need for the Town to consider either the potential acquisition of a portion of this lot or requesting a corner lot truncation (transferring the land into the Council verge area) as part of any future subdivision to ensure its ongoing health and protection.

10. The findings of the site feature survey and advocacy efforts were communicated to the WAPC in October 2020. The Town was advised that the amendment was due to be considered by the WAPC in Feb 2021. It was anticipated that the Town's recommended requirement for a LDP would not be supported (this modified version of the amendment then proposed a residential density of R30 for the Miller's Crossing land) based on prior Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) officers advice that the requirement for a LDP was considered unnecessary given:

    a. the WAPC's Local Development Plan Framework states that LDP's are to be used to guide and coordinate development outcomes, and are not generally to be used to inform subdivision layout;

    b. with respect to access, landscaping and building envelope considerations, these matters are controlled via existing state planning policies (including the R-Codes and the WAPC's Development Control Policy 5.1), which would require access from the lower order roads, and specify setback and open space requirements; and

    c. consideration of future subdivision and development applications provides for consideration of site conditions in the context of a subdivision or development plans. Conditions can be applied to future subdivision approvals having regard to the lot layout proposed in the application and comments provided by the Town.

11. Ministerial consideration of Amendment 56 was then delayed until August 2021, following the conclusion of the State Government election caretaker period. Town officers were not advised that DPLH officers or the Minister were considering the imposition of the higher density coding of R60 for the land prior to being informed of the Minister's decision requiring the amendment to be further modified.

Summary of Modified Amendment

4. As a result of the decision of the Minister of Planning dated 2 August 2021, the Town was required to re-advertise further modifications to proposed Amendment No. 56 to the Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1. The requested modifications result in the amendment being modified to the following:
    1. *Classifying No. 2-8 (Lot 1002) Beatty Avenue, East Victoria Park as Town of Victoria Park Scheme Reserve "Parks and Recreation".*
    2. *Modify the Town Planning Scheme No. 1 Precinct Plan P10 Shepperton Precinct accordingly.*
    3. *Nos. 6 & 7 (Lots 1003 & 1004) Raleigh Street and No. 45 (Lot 1005) Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle being transferred to the 'Residential' zone with a density coding of R60.*
    4. *Classifying the portions of the Rutland Avenue, Raleigh Street and Bishopsgate Street road reserves that were formerly part of the Roberts Road Metropolitan Region Scheme "Other Regional Roads" reservation as "Residential R30" zone.*

5. Modify the Town Planning Scheme No. 1 Precinct Plan P8 Carlisle Precinct accordingly.

5. The major change proposed by the Minister's further required modification is the increase in density of the three lots comprising the land known as 'Miller's Crossing' (Lots 1003, 1004 and 1005) from R30 to R60. The Scheme Amendment Report and map of Amendment 56 (as further modified in accordance with the Minister for Planning's decision) are contained in Attachment 1 to this report.

6. The Western Australian Planning Commission has provided the Town with the following reasons for the proposed R60 density coding:

   a. consistency with the urban consolidation principles of the WAPC Central Sub-regional Planning Framework which is broadly supportive of medium density development outcomes at appropriate locations, as part of meeting the dwelling targets of inner and middle-ring metropolitan local governments;

   b. the opportunity to develop the subject land as a demonstration of a high-quality medium-density development, in the context of the Medium Density Codes being progressed by the WAPC as part of its review of State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes – Volume 1;

   c. the subject land's proximity to general amenities, including high-frequency public transport infrastructure and public open space;

   d. densities currently permitted under TPS1 in the surrounding area allow for a range of medium density development. In this regard, it is considered that R60 is broadly consistent with densities permitted in the area; and development of the subject sites at R60 would supplement broader dwelling diversity in the locality;

   (a) the opportunity to make the subject land a demonstration project for medium-density development has arisen in part due to it being under State Government ownership. In this regard, the WAPC's process for the sale of the land can be used to ensure a high-quality development outcome for the area is achieved; and

   (b) it is envisaged that the subject land may be suitable for terraced housing.

7. The timeframe for re-advertising of Amendment 56 was delayed due to the Town awaiting confirmation and clarification of the above rationale from DPLH officers. The Town had additionally sought the following in response to several of the reasons put forward by DPLH officers to assist the local community in making submissions and understanding the intent and purposes of the R60 coding during the readvertising period:
   a. an outline of the intent by the WAPC to potentially make the subject land a 'showcase' for high quality medium density development given the land is owned by the WAPC and the draft Medium Density Codes have been recently released for local government and public consultation;
   b. any aspirational built form concepts that demonstrate the type and quality of built form that is likely to occur on the site; and
   c. any design concepts or subdivision concepts that show tree retention opportunities, path network connections (especially from the Rutland Avenue Principal Shared Path to the emerging Mineral Resources Park Precinct).

8. Unfortunately, DPLH officers were unable to provide this requested detail, with the Town and community members having to rely only on the above general planning rationale.

Strategic alignment

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN01 - Land use planning that puts people first in urban design, allows for different housing options for people	Advocating to the WAPC that any future subdivision of Lots 1003, 1004 and 1005 for residential purposes occurs in accordance with an adopted Local Development Plan to ensure the retention of

with different housing needs and enhances the Town's character.	mature trees that are valued by the community and high quality design outcomes
EN07 - Increased vegetation and tree canopy.	The Millers Crossing open space contains mature trees that contribute to the Town's urban tree canopy and have been indicated through multiple consultation exercises to have a high level of value to the local community. The preparation of a Local Development Plan that seeks the retention of mature trees as part of future residential development of the land will seek to retain and conserve the contribution these make to the local tree canopy.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S02 - An informed and knowledgeable community.	The local community feels well informed that their concerns have been genuinely considered by the Town's administration and Elected Members as part of the decision-making process.

Engagement

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Local residents and land owners
Period of engagement	25 November 2021 to 21 January 2022 (this exceeded the 42 minimum day statutory advertising, exclusive of the holiday period between the Christmas day and New Year's Day public holidays.
Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Invitation to make submissions in writing via the Town's Your Thoughts engagement hub, email, post or in person.
Advertising	• 3 x monthly advertisements in the Southern Gazette • Emails/letters to all prior submitters • Posted letter to all surrounding owners and occupiers previously consulted • Online advertising and submissions on Your Thoughts engagement hub • Public notices at Council's Library and Administration building • Display of 5 signs on site for duration of comment period
Submission summary	Total of 60 submissions: • 6 supporting; • 1 partial support; • 53 objections
Key findings	Summary of information/key messages resulting from engagement. Supporting submissions: • Land is surplus to open space requirements of immediate locality and

	well suited to medium density development. Objections: • The Miller's Crossing open space is highly valued by the local community as an area of passive open space that serves the needs of multiple users (mothers, small children, elderly residents, etc.) • Council should stand up to the State Government and insist that that land remain as public open space for the local community. • The trees contribute to the amenity, sense of place of the locality and serve as local wildlife habitat. • Development of the lots may contribute to increased vehicular traffic on already congested local roads. A schedule of the individual submissions received during the readvertising period is contained in Attachment 3 to this report.

Other engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Main Roads WA	No objections in relation to the proposal.
Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions	No comments to make on the amendment.
DFES	Does not fall into an area designated as bushfire prone pursuant to the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 1998* (as amended) and therefore State Planning Policy 3.7 *Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas* (SPP 3.7) does not apply.
Heritage Council WA	As there are no State Heritage Places within or adjacent to the affected area, there is no objection to the proposed amendment.
Department of Education	The properties fall within the student enrolment intake area of Lathlain Primary School. Based on projections, Lathlain Primary School is anticipated to be under enrolment pressure over the short to medium term. Whilst the proposed density increase is not expected to significantly increase the student enrolment yield, careful planning consideration needs to be given to ensure that accumulative residential growth over time is balanced with the provision of public schools in the locality. The Department would appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with the Town of Victoria Park to forward plans for the public education needs of the Town as development progresses in accordance with the with its Draft Local Planning Strategy.

Department of Communities (Submitted via Your Thoughts)	The Department of Communities owns several sites along Raleigh and Bishopsgate Streets. These assets will be impacted by the proposed zoning changes, in particular the rezoning of lots 1003 and 1004 Raleigh Street. The department wishes to register its support for the R60 coding subject to the following: 1) Mixed housing outcomes: Grouped and single dwellings suitable for families are the predominant land in the area. The proposed R60 coding will provide an opportunity to deliver housing product that could support the needs of a range of households, including singles and aged people who wish to downscale in the area. The Town is encouraged to ensure the delivery of diverse housing outcomes. To this end it is suggested that the town prepare development guidelines that include requirements for mixed housing product. 2) Tree retention: The established local open spaces and trees are valued by the local community and perceived to form part of the open space and pedestrian network in the area. The Town is encouraged to develop planning guidelines for the site that will ensure that trees are retained. It is noted that there are several mature trees at 7 Raleigh Street on the common boundary with the Department's neighbouring development. The department requests that all reasonable steps are taken to retain these trees.

Risk management considerations

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	N/A				Low	
Environmental	N/A				Medium	
Health and safety	N/A				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	N/A				Medium	
Legislative compliance	N/A				Low	
Reputation	Negative public perception if WAPC/Minister for Planning does not support requirement	Likely	Moderate	Medium	Low	Treat - Communication strategy outlining the reason for Council's decision and efforts made to advocate for a LDP and

	for a LDP.	retention of mature trees.
Service delivery	N/A	Medium

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	It is considered that the landowner be responsible for preparation of a LDP for the land prior to subdivision or development occurring. This would then be subject to assessment and approval by the Town.

Analysis

Potential dwelling yields under current R-Codes

9. A comparison between the potential dwelling density yields for the lots under the current provisions of the R-Codes applying a maximum 5% variation that may be permitted with WAPC approval under the R30 and R60 density codes is provided in the below table. This does not take into account future vehicular access and internal driveways that would likely reduce this potential, or that the lots could be developed as a combination of dwelling types and as part of one or a number of development proposals/stages. Dwelling types typically fit within one of three categories as defined by the current R-Codes and summarised below:

   e. Single house – A single dwelling standing wholly on its own lot without any areas of land held in common property, typically served by its own dedicated vehicular access and connections to services (e.g. stand-alone houses and townhouses)

   f. Grouped dwelling – a dwelling in a group of two or more dwellings on the same lot, which may be served by shared vehicular access, connections to utility services and/or includes any dwelling on a survey strata lot with common property (e.g. units, villas, townhouses).

   g. Multiple dwelling – a dwelling in a group of two or more dwellings where one part of a dwelling sits vertically above a part of another dwelling (e.g. residential flats/apartments).

Lots developed for single houses or grouped dwellings	R30 code	R60 code
Lot 1003 (2081m^2)	7	14
Lot 1004 (1343m^2)	4	9
Lot 1005 (1157m^2)	4	8
Total	15 dwellings	31 dwellings
Lots development for multiple dwellings (apartments)	R30 code	R60 code

Lot 1003 (2081m^2)	7	No site area per dwellling restriction – dwelling yields constrained by building height, setbacks and plot ratio requirements.
Lot 1004 (1343m^2)	4	
Lot 1005 (1157m^2)	4	
Total	15 multiple dwellings	Design dependent but anticipated 30+ dwellings

Potential dwelling yields under Draft Medium Density Codes

10. While the timing and extent to which the WAPC's Draft Medium Density Codes will be further refined prior to gazettal is unknown (anticipated to be finalised end of 2022), the current draft provisions introduce a sliding scale (three categories) of density provisions based on parent lot area and whether the proposed development is facilitated through the amalgamation of two or more lots. Based on these draft provisions and the arrangement of the lots, they would potentially be able to be developed to meet the density requirements of all three categories, noting that as per the draft provisions development at *Site Category 3* would first require a local development plan to be adopted by the Town. It should be noted that the proposed introduction of the three site categories is a significant shift in the density controls of the R-Codes that have been formulated to date, and it is unknown if or to what extent they will be introduced or modified by the WAPC in response to submissions received from local governments and the public during the public advertising period.

Lots development for single houses or grouped dwellings - R60 code	*Site Category 1* (no minimum parent lot size with)	*Site Category 2* (1200m^2 or more parent lot area)	*Site Category 3* (1500m^2 or more parent lot area with)
Average site area per dwelling requirement	*150m^2 (same as current R-Codes)*	*120m^2*	*No minimum (*yields constrained by building height, setbacks, deep soil and private garden area requirements)
Lot 1003 (2081m^2)	14	18	18+ (design dependent)
Lot 1004 (1343m^2)	9	21 (achieved through amalgamation or boundary realignment of Lots 1004 and 1005 to achieve minimum parent lot sizes)	21+ across both lots (achieved through amalgamation of Lots 1004 and 1005 to achieve minimum parent lot size)
Lot 1005 (1157m^2)	8		
Total	31 dwellings	39 dwellings	39+ dwellings
Lots developed for multiple	*Site*	*Site Category 2*	*Site Category 3*

dwellings - R60 code	*Category 1* (no minimum parent lot size with)	(1200m^2 or more parent lot area)	(1500m^2 or more parent lot area with)
Average site are per dwelling requirement	*85m^2*	*No minimum (*yields constrained by building height, setbacks, plot ratio, deep soil, private and communal open space area requirements)	
Lot 1003 (2081m^2)	25	25+	
Lot 1004 (1343m^2)	16	30+ across both lots (achieved through amalgamation or boundary realignment of Lots 1004 and 1005 to achieve minimum parent lot sizes)	
Lot 1005 (1157m^2)	14		
Total	55 multiple dwellings	55+ multiple dwellings	

11. The potential dwelling yields increase significantly (potentially double) under the proposed R60 density coding based on raw site area calculations without taking into account other constraints such as setbacks, plot ratio, building height, vehicular access, open space and deep soil area requirements that would reduce the likelihood of this development potential being achieved. Notwithstanding, the transition in scale and density from surrounding lower density R30 development will require careful design consideration and appropriate planning controls to ensure appropriate streetscape and neighbouring property amenity outcomes. Relevant considerations include the transition in and overall building bulk and scale, street setbacks and how they relate to existing neighbouring development, height and location of boundary walls, the location and number of vehicle access points, and overshadowing. Without suitable development controls, future development may also result in the removal of mature trees considered by proponents to restrict development potential due to their size, number or location.

Recommended requirement for Local Development Plan

12. A local development plan (LDP) is considered the most appropriate local planning framework instrument to address these matters and maximise opportunities for the retention of mature trees on the lots. While the number of the trees is less than a third of the total identified under the site feature survey, several are of significant size with the largest tree identified as part of the survey (T37) being located centrally within Lot 1004, which may pose a significant risk to its future retention. Fortunately, many trees located within the lots are located around their periphery so could potentially be retained in light of street and building setback requirements. Notwithstanding a high number of these trees may be at risk of removal due to the potential location of vehicular accessways/internal driveways along the eastern boundary of the lots which neighbour the existing R30 properties on Raleigh and Bishopsgate Streets, and the increased likelihood that the future development will include walls built up to side boundaries.
13. A LDP can set out a range of development standards applying to a specific site or parcels of land to ensure it is carried out in a manner that protects and enhances local amenity, ensures a high standard of and site-response design and addresses issues of vehicular access, tree retention, and building envelopes (setbacks, building height, etc). The requirement for a LDP must be set out in a higher order statutory planning instrument such as the Scheme Text or Precinct Plans, which comprise the Town's

local planning scheme or receive the approval of the WAPC to prepare. The requirements of a LDP supplement and/or vary the requirements of the R-Codes that would otherwise apply to the land. Council officers consider the most timely and likely ability for the requirement of a LDP to be favourably considered is concurrently as part of a further requested modification to Amendment 56, to be considered as part of the Minister for Planning's final determination.

14. The requirement for a LDP would also assist in ensuring that future development of the sites could indeed be a "showcase" for high quality medium density housing as per the stated intention of DPLH officers. Unfortunately, such intentions do not guarantee such an outcome, with the future development being subject to the whims, financial and other motives/constraints of any future developer or landowner in future. A LDP would facilitate a higher quality outcome by requiring a site and context-specific design response that factors in local amenity, and the location and definition and of building envelopes and vehicular access points to ensure retention of mature trees on the site. This approach is also aligned with the provisions of the Draft Medium Density Codes which anticipate the preparation of LDPs for land where 'Site Category 3' (higher density) requirements apply, which could conceivably be applicable to the Miller's crossing lots in future.

15. LDPs have been prepared by the Town for several other areas of the Town including the former Australian Archives site in East Victoria Park, Cohn Street, Carlisle, and Belmont Park.

16. Relevant alternative local planning framework instruments to a LDP that could be developed and adopted by the Town to address the above are listed below with accompanying commentary from Council Officers on the appropriateness and benefits/disbenefits of each approach.

Local planning framework instrument	Officer comments
Local planning scheme amendment	Would require the Town to initiate a further amendment to TPS1 to insert site specific provisions into Precinct Plan P8 – Carlisle Precinct. This would be subject to WAPC and ministerial determination and considered unlikely to be supported.
Precinct Structure Plan	Inappropriate instrument. Time and resource intensive planning process appropriate for far larger areas of land usually within or surrounding activity centres. Requires WAPC approval (not anticipated would be supported) and its implementation would require further amendment(s) or creation of one or more of the other listed local planning framework instruments.
Local Planning Policy	A stand-alone local planning policy (LPP) for the land could be adopted by the Town to supplement the provisions of the R-Codes applying to the future development of the land. LPPs are constrained in the matters they can vary from the R-Codes and require WAPC approval. The limited scope of such an LPP is considered inadequate to address the Town or community's concerns with respect to the future development of the land.

Strategic planning alignment and WAPC/DPLH rationale

17. The Miller's Crossing lots are in Carlisle on the Roberts Road border with Lathlain. On the opposite side of Roberts Road, between Mineral Resources Park and the Armadale rail line/Rutland Avenue is an area of R40/R60 coded land in Lathlain that has been developed with medium density grouped dwellings and single houses. Additionally on the southern side of the railway line lies the R80 coded Sunbury Park Estate. In this respect, the rationale provided by the WAPC/DPLH officers that the R60 coding of

the Miller's Crossing land is broadly consistent with the surrounding area that allows for a range of medium density development is correct. These areas are also located near the Principal Shared Path (PSP) network and Victoria Park and Carlisle railway stations, further supporting the case for medium density development, given their accessibility to high quality public transport and cycling infrastructure.

18. The Town's Local Planning Strategy (LPS) (currently with WAPC for final approval) identifies the Miller's Crossing lots as located within 'Neighbourhood 8 – Carlisle Residential'. The LPS recognises the objectives of the WAPC's Central Sub-Regional Planning Framework for this area as being appropriate for densities of R40 to R60 along local corridors and up to R80 on arterial corridors. However, the LPS notes the already extensive development at R30 densities within this neighbourhood which limits the potential for this to occur. The proposed R60 coding of the Millers Crossing lots along the arterial corridor of Roberts Road represents a rare opportunity where such additional medium density may occur. It is noted however that the LPS did not recommend an increase to existing density codes in the area as a desire for this was not expressed as part of the informing strategic visioning and engagement exercises with the community.
19. While the local community has continually expressed a desire for the land to remain as publicly accessible open space, the analysis as part of the Public Open Space Strategy identified that local accessibility to open space is not lacking in this area of Carlisle, and did not foresee the retention of the Miller's Crossing land as part of the Town's open space network in the longer term, with the immediate locality already well served with access to Mineral Resources Park (limited), Lathlain Park Zone 2, John Bissett Reserve and Koolbardi Park.
20. On balance, having regard to the medium and long term strategic planning objectives of both the State and local planning frameworks, the development of the lots for medium density development is considered the most appropriate strategic planning outcome, if the lots are to be developed for residential purposes. Development of the lots at a R30 density would represent a potential missed opportunity to contribute meaningfully to local housing diversity, potential housing affordability and infill targets, resulting in relatively low dwelling yields and building stock of the same type and format as already exists in the immediate locality. The strategic planning framework has evolved significantly since the original initiation of Amendment 56 in 2011, accompanied by substantial Council investment and delivery of multiple public open space projects within the local vicinity of the Miller's Crossing land.
21. It should be noted that this position does not reduce the value of the existing mature trees on the land that contribute to local ecology, amenity and environmental comfort. As per the provisions of the existing R-Codes, Draft Medium Density Codes, and the Town's Local Planning Policy 39 'Tree Planting and Retention', the retention of mature trees on residential land is a key planning objective for which multiple provisions and incentives exist. Notwithstanding, these planning instruments still permit the removal of mature trees provided they are replaced by one or more trees as part of future development. In this regard it is also noted that if the lots are developed for single houses or grouped dwellings in a terrace housing typology as suggested by DPLH officers, that the total number of trees on the lots would be near to that currently existing on the lots based on tree planting requirements of at least 1 tree per dwelling.
22. In view of the above, it is not recommended that Council oppose Amendment 56 to TPS1 as further modified by the Minister for Planning. Council is advised to instead recommend to the WAPC that the amendment proceed, subject to a further modification requiring a LDP to be adopted by the Town prior to subdivision or development of the land occurring.

Relevant documents

Public Open Space Strategy
Draft Medium Density Codes
Local Planning Policy 39 'Tree Planting and Retention'

Further consideration

23. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.

24. *What is the composition for dwellings if it is zoned R80?*

An R80 zoning is not being proposed by the WAPC and does not form part of the modifications that were required to be made to the Scheme Amendment in accordance with the Minister for Planning's decision dated 2 August 2021. The Town could make a further recommendation supporting an R80 density coding for the lots, however this would constitute a significant change, requiring the further approval of the Minister and likely requirement for a further period of public advertising, assessment/comment from the Town of Victoria Park administration and formal resolution of Council.

Nonetheless, if an R80 zoning designation was to be applied then the built form could include housing types such as apartments, terraces, maisonettes etc (as for the currently proposed R60 coding) but at a potentially greater density/number of dwellings depending on the proposed layout and subject to site-specific access, building height and open space constraints. The composition of dwellings could be considered as part of a Local Development Plan if the Minister were to support its use as outlined in this report, otherwise dwelling location would be subject to the applicable Residential Design Codes and assessed as part of a future development application(s).

In the unlikely event that an R80 site is developed for single or grouped dwelling, the three lots could accommodate up to 38 dwellings.

As there are no minimum lot sizes for the development of multiple dwellings with an R80 zoning, the number of dwellings is determined by the design (e.g. height, setbacks and plot ratio).

Where would the road reserve be within those lots?

In accordance with the Residential Design Codes, vehicular access to any future development on the lots is required to be provided from the lowest order road available. This is very likely to be from the local roads available to the lots, being Bishopsgate Street, Raleigh Street and/or Rutland Avenue. Roberts Road is a higher order road, and its level/topography rises at the approach to the Miller's Crossing bridge so would be inappropriate for vehicular access and contrary to the R-Codes provisions. Notwithstanding, there could potentially be future dwellings with a frontage to Roberts Road (with rear-loaded garages/car parking accessed from an internal common property driveway/communal street) that would be expected to provide suitably articulated elevations to all street frontages, in order to provide visual interest, and legible entry/exit points for residents and visitors, including potential pedestrian access directly to Roberts Road. The exact layout of future vehicular and pedestrian access points/networks is unknown and would be assessed as part of a future Local Development Plan (if supported by the Minister as part of this amendment) or later as part of a future development application(s).

Mayor Karen Vernon tested an alternate before the officer's recommendation.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (77/2022):

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Luana Lisandro

That Council:

1. Continues to support the original intention of Amendment No 56 for Lots 1003 and 1004 Raleigh Street, Carlisle and Lot 1005 Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle (known as Millers Crossing) to be reserved as "Parks and Recreation";
2. Requests the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer to advocate to the Minister for Planning and the Member for Victoria Park for Millers Crossing to be reserved as "Parks and Recreation";
3. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to report to Council by July 2022 as to the progress of that advocacy.
4. Should the Minister for Planning determine to proceed with the Residential R60 zone currently proposed to also support the following modification:

   A Local Development Plan is required to be adopted by the local government prior to the subdivision or development of the Residential R60 zoned land comprising Lots 1003 (No. 7) and 1004 (No. 6) Raleigh Street, and Lot 1005 (No. 45) Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle, that were formerly partly located within the Robert's Road 'Other Regional Road' reservation under the Perth Metropolitan Region Scheme. The Local Development Plan shall address issues of vehicular access, environmental sustainability, landscaping (including replacement of trees lost) , building setbacks and the retention and conservation of mature trees on and surrounding the land as part of any future development.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

Reason:

In March 2022 the City of Melville (with assistance from local MPs) successfully persuaded the Minister for Planning to reverse her decision to require 13 parks within the City to be rezoned as residential, and to agree to their rezoning as public open space in response to strong community support for the parks to remain.

Amendment No 56 was originally intended to result in additional public open green space within Carlisle specifically, and the Town more generally.

The local community has always supported, and continues to support, the retention of Millers Crossing as public open green space.

The Public Open Space Strategy 2019 assessed Carlisle as having the least public open space in the Town. Notwithstanding the opening of Koolbardi Park, Carlisle in December 2019 adjacent to Millers Crossing, the loss of any public open space in Carlisle which has been enjoyed by the community for decades, should be prevented wherever possible through rezoning.

In light of this recent decision for the City of Melville, Council owes it to our community to make a final concerted effort to persuade the Minister for Planning to change her mind about Millers Crossing and agree to its rezoning as Parks and Recreation, without financial impost on the community. We should also engage the new Member for Victoria Park in the fight to rezone Millers Crossing, for its obvious long term environmental and social benefits for our whole community.

PROCEDURAL MOTION

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Vicki Potter

That the meeting be adjourned for 10 minutes at 8.40pm.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

The meeting adjourned at 8.40pm.

12.2 Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Place Leader - Transport
Responsible officer	Manager Place Planning
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Transport Strategy REVISED [**12.2.1** - 44 pages] 2. Parking Management Plan REVISED [**12.2.2** - 58 pages] 3. Transport Strategy on a Page [**12.2.3** - 1 page] 4. Public Comment Summary Attachment [**12.2.4** - 34 pages] 5. Final Consultation Report March 2022 Names Redacted [**12.2.5** - 55 pages] 6. CONFIDENTIAL - State Authority and Local Government Submissions [**12.2.6** - 1 page] 7. Public Comment Survey - Detailed Report [**12.2.7** - 55 pages]

Recommendation

That Council
1. Notes the submissions received and adopts the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan.
2. Repeals the Integrated Movement and Network Strategy 2013 and Parking Management Plan 2012.

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to present the draft Transport Strategy and draft Parking Management Plan to Council for adoption.

In brief

- In October 2020, Council endorsed the scope for an update to the Integrated Movement Network Strategy (2013) and Parking Management Plan (2012).
- In January, the Town engaged WSP and Australian Parking Consultants (APC) to conduct community engagement and develop the documents as per the approved scope. This included changing the name from the "Integrated Movement Network Strategy" to "the Transport Strategy."
- In June 2021 Council endorsed the draft Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan to proceed to a period of public advertising.
- Both documents received over 90% support during the public comment period.
- At the November 2021 OCM Council determined to defer the draft Transport Strategy and Parking Management to a Concept Forum.
- Council and Administration discussed the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan at the February 2022 Concept Forum and several subsequent minor refinements have been made.

Background

1. In October 2020, Council endorsed the scope for an update to the Integrated Movement Network Strategy and Parking Management Plan. The endorsed project scope is as follows:

a) *Create a clear and logical strategy for transport and parking related decision making and business planning via the Town's Place Plans and Corporate Business Plan, which:*

1. *Provides detailed strategic direction for the relevant outcomes in the Town's Strategic Community Plan.*
2. *Is complimentary and consistent with the Town's other relevant Informing Strategies including (but not limited to) the Draft Local Planning Strategy, Town Planning Scheme No.1 and future Local Planning Scheme. No2, Public Open Space Strategy, Urban Forest Strategy and Land Asset Optimisation Strategy*
3. *Encourages highly accessible places, with a pedestrian focus that encourages local populations that sustain local businesses and make use of local amenities.*
4. *Prioritises active transport modes with a focus on achieving public health, economic development and climate change mitigation and adaptation outcomes.*
5. *Adopts a Dynamic Parking Management regime based on user pay, parking bay demand and value.*
6. *Provides a clear plan for investing parking surplus back into the places where it is generated.*
7. *Adopts a movement and place approach to the categorisation of lanes, streets, roads and paths (in line with the State government's proposed Movement and Place Framework) to give clear guidance to the Town to assist with future design and capital works.*
8. *Identifies those major projects that require the Town to advocate to an external body.*
9. *Reviews parking requirements as they relate to the Town's planning framework and recommendations for any necessary changes to these requirements to ensure they are appropriately aligned to the Town's strategic transport direction.*
10. *Explore travel demand management initiatives and plans to guide the Town in managing travel demand and creating a balanced and sustainable transport network by promoting sustainable transport modes.*
11. *Integrate the Town's Joint Bike Plan as a chapter within the document.*
12. *Reviews the Town's parking management practices and compare with other inner-urban local governments in Perth and Australia.*
13. *Develop clear guidelines for parking treatments and practices that provide a matrix of when to intervene and implement these practices in various scenarios.*
14. *Review the Town's pricing model for parking with intent to extend demand based pricing and its impact on the broader transport network and travel behavior.*
15. *Identify methods for promotion and education of the parking management approach and focus on active transport.*
16. *Identification of any land that might be required for future parking needs in collaboration with the Town's Property and Leasing Team.*

2. In January, the Town engaged WSP and Australian Parking Consultants (APC) to conduct community engagement and develop each document as per the approved scope.
3. During the project, the Town agreed with the consultant to change the name of the updated Integrated Movement Network Strategy to be the Transport Strategy to more appropriately align with the documents vision and improve clarity for the community.
4. Throughout February 2021, the Town and WSP conducted community engagement primarily through a community survey and interactive map. These tools were used to help understand the community's aspirations and priorities for how transport and parking should look in the Town and receive location specific information on issues and opportunities in the Town's transport network. Results of the

consultation revealed an emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and improving public transport services. Details of the consultation are provided in Attachments 3 and 4.

5. After conducting rigorous community engagement and analysis, the Town worked with WSP to develop a vision, themes and objectives that would guide the recommendations and actions in both the draft Transport Strategy and draft Parking Management Plan. In April, the Town presented the draft vision, themes, and objectives to Elected Members via the Elected Members Portal before finalising the vision and developing draft recommendations and actions.
6. In June 2021, Council endorsed the draft Transport Strategy and draft Parking Management Plan to proceed to public comment. These documents were publicly advertised for a period of four weeks during July and August 2021.
7. During the public comment period, the Town sought feedback from community members as well as key stakeholders including Town advisory groups, state government agencies and other local governments. Both documents received over 90% support during the public comment period.
8. Both documents received broad support from the community and key stakeholders during the public comment period. However, several changes have been made to the documents due to feedback provided in this process as identified in Attachment 4.
9. At the November 2021 OCM Council determined to defer the draft Transport Strategy and Parking Management to a Concept Forum.
10. Council and Administration discussed the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan at the February 2022 Concept Forum and a number of subsequent minor refinements have been made. The Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan have now been finalised for council consideration and approval.
11. Should Council adopt these documents, the Town will proceed to implementation, which will include design of the Transport Strategy Program of work, and subsequent information in the Town's Long Term Financial Plan.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL02 - A community that is authentically engaged and informed in a timely manner.	The Town has conducted rigorous community engagement, which is summarised in Attachment 3, 4 and 5. These documents have been developed based on community engagement findings and public comment feedback.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	These documents are focused on improving safety and accessibility for all users of the Town's streets, paths and activity centres.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN02 - A safe, interconnected and well maintained transport network that makes it easy for everyone to	The Town's Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan provide the strategic direction that

get around.	determines how to achieve a safe, interconnected, and well-maintained transport network.
EN03 - A place with sustainable, safe and convenient transport options for everyone.	Creating a 'safe, sustainable and balanced network that provides convenient transport options for everyone' is a key pillar of the draft Transport Strategy and draft Parking Management Plan. This is captured in the strategy's vision and key themes.
EN07 - Increased vegetation and tree canopy.	Community engagement on these documents revealed that improving the vegetation and tree canopy on local streets and activity centres is key to improving pedestrian safety and amenity and is 4 of 16 therefore a focus of the Transport Strategy.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	One of the three key themes of the Transport Strategy is "A Healthy Community" and this has been embedded into the document's objectives. This involves facilitating active modes of transport and improving the safety and well-being of all road users.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Place Planning	As the co-coordinator for this project, the Place Planning team has significantly contributed to the content and direction of the draft documents.
Parking & Rangers	As a co-coordinator for this project, the Parking and Rangers team has significantly contributed to the content and direction of the draft documents.
Urban Planning	The Urban Planning team support these documents and value the detailed assessment of private parking regulations.
Street Improvement	Street Improvement has supported the development of the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Residents, Visitors, Business Owners, other key local and state government stakeholders.
Period of engagement	Community Engagement: 5 March 2021 – 21 March 2021 Public Comment: 14 July – 11 August 2021
Level of engagement	3. Involve
Methods of	Community Survey via Your Thoughts Interactive Mapping Tool via Your

engagement	Thoughts Written Submissions Stakeholder Meetings
Advertising	Newspaper Advertisement – Southern Gazette x2 Social Media (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn) - Including several paid Facebook pushes throughout the engagement and public comment periods.
Submission summary	Community Engagement: 66 unique responses. Public Comment: 35 unique responses.
Key findings	Initial Engagement Results in March 2021 revealed a strong emphasis on pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements and public transport services as priorities for improving the transport network. Further information is provided in the Consultation Report in Attachment 3. The Public Comment period revealed significant support from community members and key stakeholders for both documents. Summary results are provided below, however further details are provided in Attachments 3, 4 and 5. Transport Strategy Support: 25 Support with some concerns: 8 Oppose: 2 Parking Management Plan Support: 21 Support with some concerns: 9 Oppose: 3

Other engagement	
Department of Transport	Supports the Strategy and Plan and provides detailed comments in Attachment 5.
Public Transport Authority	Supports the development of these documents and provides detailed points that have been considered in the final version of the Transport Strategy. Details of the response are provided in Attachment 5.
Main Roads WA	Supports the vision, objectives and initiatives of these documents and is particularly supportive of the Town's place-based approach. Details of the response are provided in Attachment 5.
City of South Perth	Supports the actions and objectives of the document. Details of the response are provided in Attachment 5.

Legal compliance

Not applicable

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Failing to adopt the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan may result in actions not being considered in the 2022/23 Council budget.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by Considering alternative project timelines that would reduce likelihood of project delays.
Environmental	Failure to align projects to an endorsed strategy may impact the Town's ability to achieve sustainability goals and targets in the Climate Emergency Action Plan.	Major	Unlikely	Medium	Medium	TREAT risk by aligning projects to the Town's strategic framework.
Health and safety	Failure to deliver a detailed Transport Strategy may impact the Town's ability to improve road safety and overall community health and wellbeing outcomes.	Moderate	Rare	Low	Low	TREAT risk by ensuring strategy is aligned to the Town's Public Health Plan and the State Government's Road Safety Targets.
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not completing the project in the scheduled timeframes may delay planning and delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Medium	TREAT risk by following project and/or program specific planning and where appropriate business case development, update the 5- year capital works program, Place Plans and Long-Term Financial Plan to inform renewal, upgrade and new works.

Legislative compliance	Failure to adopt a Transport Strategy may indirectly impact approvals processes for infrastructure regulations – but will not directly impact legislation.	Insignificant	Rare	Low	Low	TREAT risk by conducting rigorous communicating the strategy rigorously to stakeholders following adoption
Reputation	As the documents received significant community and stakeholder support, failure to adopt the Transport Strategy may be perceived negatively by these parties.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by ensuring stakeholders are updated regularly on the progress of the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan.
Service delivery	Delivery of initiatives and actions may be disruptive to services during implementation.	Minor	Possible	Medium	Medium	TREAT risk by ensuring all stakeholders and the community is engaged meaningfully during planning and implementation of each project

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Passing the recommendation will determine what transport and parking related projects are planned and scoped and then proposed to Council for budget allocation in future years.

Analysis

12. The draft Transport Strategy in Attachment 1 presents the vision, themes and objectives for the Town's future transport network. The Transport Strategy also determines what work should be progressed and prioritised over the next 10 years to help achieve the documents vision and objectives.

13. The draft Transport Strategy vision is:

    '*To provide an integrated, accessible and sustainable transport network which connects people to places and supports the Town as a liveable inner-city community.*'

14. The draft Transport Strategy has used a place-based approach to understand and evaluate how transport can better support the desired place outcomes of the Town. This approach reflects best practice in modern transport planning and includes an assessment of the current and future condition of the Town's places and streets. The document provides guidance on how these streets and places might change to enable the Town to incrementally adapt its transport network to achieve the vision and themes.

15. To help guide the Transport Strategies objectives and recommendations, a user mindset exercise was conducted to evaluate the diverse needs and desires of the Town's existing and future residents, businesses, and visitors. Eight user profiles were developed to reflect a sample of the Town's population and test the Transport Strategy's ability to cater for different customer needs and highlight any gaps in the transport network.

16. WSP assessed the remaining actions of the existing Integrated Movement Network Strategy (2013) and included all actions that remain valid into the draft Transport Strategy. The new recommendations and actions in the draft Transport Strategy are a product of rigorous analysis, community engagement and best-practice transport planning.

17. To help both the Administration and the community comprehend the range of actions proposed, and to assist the implementation of the strategy, the actions have been logically arranged into subprograms within an overall Transport Strategy Program. Individual officers and Service Areas of the Town can be arranged to lead or contribute to the delivery of these sub-programs. This approach is based on the ongoing successful structure of the Urban Forest Strategy Program (Vic Park Leafy Streets, Green Basins, etc). The Transport Strategy Program is made up of the following sub-programs:

    a) Skinny Streets;
    b) Intersections and Vehicle Safety;
    c) Transport Advocacy and Partnership;
    d) Parking Management;
    e) Transport Modelling and Performance;
    f) Travel Demand Management;
    g) Active Transport Education & Promotions;
    h) Bike Network;
    i) Pedestrian Infrastructure;
    j) Streetscape Improvement

18. The Transport Strategy also identifies actions which relate to and are captured in existing programs of the Town. These existing programs deliver outcomes aligned to the themes in the Transport Strategy:
    a) Public Open Space Program (sub-programs include Old Spaces New Places Program, etc.)
    b) Vic Park Planning Reform Program
    c) Urban Forest Strategy Program
    d) Climate Change Mitigation and Action Program.

19. The lifespan of the Transport Strategy is 10 years. However, the Transport Strategy includes actions that may extend beyond the 10-year timeframe before delivery is completed and these are identified as long-term as explained below.

20. An indication of cost, delivery timeframe and level of stakeholder involvement has been noted against each action in the strategy to help guide implementation planning for each program. These indicators are marked next to each action as follows.
    a) Cost:

$	$$	$$$
< $100,000	$100,000 - $500,000	>$500,000

    b) Timeframe:

Short term	Medium term	Long term
< 2 years	2-10 years	> 10 years

    c) Stakeholder Involvement:

Low	Moderate	High
Town Only, potential local engagement	Town, max 2 Stakeholders and/or Community	Various Stakeholders potentially private and public), extensive community engagement

21. The draft Transport Strategy reflects the Town's commitment to achieving an integrated, accessible and sustainable transport network and will help the Town achieve its vision for a dynamic place for everyone.

22. A key plan to deliver this strategy is the draft Parking Management Plan in Attachment 2 which was developed to assess the Town's parking needs and determine its approach to parking management. The draft Parking Management Plan details what measures and direct interventions the Town should take to improve its parking network and management practices to help achieve the vision of the draft Transport Strategy.

23. The draft Parking Management Plan provides an intervention matrix that determines what measures should be taken when responding to various parking issues. The plan also provides detailed recommendations and actions for 10 key precincts within the Town which are listed below:

    a) Oats Street Station Precinct

    b) East Victoria Park Precinct

    c) Victoria Park Precinct

    d) Burswood South Precinct

    e) Raphael Park Precinct

    f) Victoria Park Station Precinct

    g) Technology Park Precinct

24. Recommendations in the draft Parking Management Plan are based on community feedback and rigorous analysis of the Town's parking data and national trends in parking management while comparing the Town's parking management to similar local governments in Perth, Australia and internationally.

25. Developing the draft Transport Strategy and draft Parking Management Plan together has ensured the documents are directly linked. The draft Transport Strategy sets the vision and objectives for the Town's transport network and provides recommendations and actions for the Town. The draft Parking Management Plan responds to the draft Transport Strategy and provides specific recommendations and actions for the Town to improve the provision and management of parking.

26. Should the draft Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan be adopted then the Town will commence with the development of an annual program of work that will be workshopped with Elected Members via the annual budget process and the ongoing review of the Long Term Financial Plan. The Transport Strategy and Parking Management program is likely to include a mix of renewal, upgrade and new projects and in some instances will assist the Town meet asset renewal targets as well as the strategic aims of the draft Strategy and Parking Management Plan and other informing strategies of the Town.

27. Since the November 2021 OCM and February 2022 Concept Forum, the following alterations have been made to the Transport Strategy:

    a) Changes and additions to the images contained within the Strategy, to better represent the Town's current and desired vibrancy and pedestrian orientation.

    b) Reference added to eRideable devices.

    c) A new initiative added under the Active Transport Education & Promotions Sub-Program, relating implementation of cultural and behaviour change strategies.

d) Added description of the Skinny Streets Sub-Program, including a brief history of the development of the Skinny Streets concept, and reference to the "Woonerf" street design practiced in urban planning in many cities in the Netherlands.

e) Minor changes to heading titles and wording of some passages of text, which do not alter the meaning or intent to the Strategy.

f) Correction of typographical errors.

28. The following alterations have been made to the Parking Management Plan:

a) Altered wording of the action relating to parking ratios, to clarify that minimum parking ratios are to be reviewed, as well as maximum parking rations considered.

b) Altered wording of the action relating to cash-in-lieu, to add reference to Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Payment in lieu of parking condition for non-residential development.

c) Correction of typographical errors.

29. It is recommended that Council adopt the draft Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan.

Relevant documents

Existing Integrated Movement Network Strategy – Town of Victoria Park
Existing Parking Management Plan – Town of Victoria Park

Further consideration

30. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.

31. *Can the colours used in 'transport mode shift target pie charts' be reviewed as some look the same?*

The colours in the pie chart can be reviewed following the April 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting and updated if required.

The meeting readjourned at 8.50pm.

AMENDMENT:

Moved: Cr Luana Lisandro **Seconder:** Cr Peter Devereux

That point one be amended as follows:

1. Notes the submissions received and adopts the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan subject to the following amendments:

   a. "The benefits of this project include improving road safety and travel times, enhancing local connectivity and reducing congestion and noise." on page 73 of the Transport Strategy Revised as attachment 12.2.1 under heading *Orrong Road Planning Study,* be removed.

   b. The words "Draft Concept Plan" be added to the notation for figure 5.6 on page 75.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

Reason:

The reason I have proposed this amendment is that this is a value statement and the current concept plan by Main Roads WA is still a draft and is still set to advocated for by Council to the relevant State Authorities. Also, as stated in page 22 of attachment 12.2.1 point 7, it outlines that the Town still needs access issues of the impacts of "any future design " on adjacent community. Also, the concept design has not been finalised and any figure in the report may not reflect any future plans for Orrong Road.

AMENDMENT:

Moved: Cr Peter Devereux **Seconder:** Cr Luana Lisandro

That point one add the following:

c. the Transport Strategy being renamed to the Integrated Transport Strategy.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

Reason:

I note the importance mentioned in point 3 of the officers report on aligning with the documents vision and improving clarity for the community.

The stated vision (pp9) is to "provide an integrated, accessible and sustainable transport network which connects people to places and supports the town as a liveable inner city community".

Given this vision, the transport strategy title should say "integrated" Transport Strategy.

This will better convey the intent of the strategy vision to 'connect people to places' and hence convey the integrating contribution the strategy brings to making the town more liveable, green and socially and economically viable.

This would provide some continuity with the old strategy but also be shorter and clearer than the previous title 'integrated movement network strategy'.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (78/2022):

Moved: Cr Luana Lisandro **Seconded:** Cr Vicki Potter

That Council:

1. Notes the submissions received and adopts the Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan; subject to the following amendments:
   a) "The benefits of this project include improving road safety and travel times, enhancing local connectivity and reducing congestion and noise." on page 73 of the Transport Strategy Revised as attachment 12.2.1 under heading *Orrong Road Planning Study,* be removed.
   b) The words "Draft Concept Plan" be added to the notation for figure 5.6 on page 75.
   c) the Transport Strategy being renamed to the Integrated Transport Strategy.

2. Repeals the Integrated Movement and Network Strategy 2013 and Parking Management Plan 2012.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

12.3 Social Infrastructure Strategy - Request for Final Adoption

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Place Leader Strategic Planning
Responsible officer	Manager Place Planning
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Social Infrastructure Strategy [**12.3.1** - 92 pages] 2. Summary of Public Comments [**12.3.2** - 8 pages]

Recommendation

That Council notes the submissions received and adopts the Social Infrastructure Strategy.

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to present the draft Social Infrastructure Strategy to Council for adoption.

In brief

- The Social Infrastructure Strategy (SIS) provides a strategic approach for the Town to plan, deliver and manage social infrastructure based on forecasted population growth as per the Town's Draft Local Planning Strategy (Draft LPS).
- The SIS builds upon earlier work commenced in the Draft Social Infrastructure Plan 2017 (Draft SIP 2017) and provides a recommended series of actions and work programs to facilitate delivery of high-level social infrastructure planning needs.
- In November 2021, Council endorsed the draft Social Infrastructure Strategy to proceed to a period of public advertising.
- 15 submissions were received during the public comment period of which two thirds indicate support for the draft Social Infrastructure Strategy with the remaining third unsure and/or making recommendations for improvement.

Background

1. A Social Infrastructure Strategy provides a strategic approach for the Town to plan, deliver and manage social infrastructure based on forecasted population growth as per the Town's draft Local Planning Strategy.
2. The Town previously engaged a consultant to prepare a Draft Social Infrastructure Plan in 2017 (Draft SIP 2017). At its meeting of 12 September 2017, Council considered the Draft SIP 2017 and resolved as follows:
    a. The Town of Victoria Park Social Infrastructure Plan attached to and forming part of this report be received.
    b. Strategic Asset Management Plans for the Aqualife Centre, Leisurelife Centre and Library be developed in 2017/18.
    c. Public Open Space Strategy for the Town to be developed in 2017/18.
    d. The Town to work with key stakeholders to identify strategic partnerships and explore setting up a Social Infrastructure Taskforce.

e. Explore the development of an information portal in collaboration with the community to facilitate community group networking, information sharing, event advertising and other information needs identified by the community.

3. Notably, the Council did not resolve to endorse the Draft SIP 2017. Progress on other actions laid out in the resolution has achieved varying degrees of completion.
4. Since the time of the Draft SIP 2017 report, the Town has made considerable progress on progressing its key strategic documents, in particular the Draft Local Planning Strategy and several of the strategic documents identified in the 2017 resolution. Further, the Town has adopted its place-based approach and reviewed several of its processes relating to budget and asset planning. It is an opportune time to return to the Draft SIP 2017 and update the document to reflect the Town's current planning approach and needs.
5. A review of the Draft SIP 2017 assessment of need has been undertaken alongside a desktop study of key strategic developments and several consultation processes with Town of Victoria Park administration, Elected Members, and key facility users.
6. This approach has positioned the SIS to be aligned to the Draft LPS and be formulated to consider both population capacity (that is, the absolute potential population having regard for local planning and development controls) and actual changes in population, growth, need and activity trends over time.
7. In November 2021, Council endorsed the draft Social Infrastructure Strategy to proceed to a period of public advertising. The draft SIS was publicly advertised for a period of five weeks from 2 December 2021 to 7 January 2022.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL02 – A community that is authentically engaged and informed in a timely manner.	The Town has engaged with the community and key stakeholder key stakeholder groups throughout the preparation of the SIS. Comments received during the public comment period are summarized in Attachment

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	The SIS focuses on improving the amenity of and accessibility to the Town's places that provide social infrastructure.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN05 - Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed.	The SIS will assist the Council in facility planning appropriate to the population's needs.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S03 - An empowered community with a sense of pride, safety and belonging.	Social infrastructure opportunities for the community to converge and form relationships, and for community service providers (particularly NFPs) to establish and service the local community.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Community Planning (All service areas)	Participated in two workshops with the consultant and several one-on-one meetings with the project lead. Ideas and feedback have been considered in preparation of the report.
Property and Leasing	Participated in two workshops with the consultant and several one-on-one meetings with the project lead. Ideas and feedback have been considered in preparation of the report.
Asset Management	Participated in two workshops with the consultant and several one-on-one meetings with the project lead. Ideas and feedback have been considered in preparation of the report.
C-Suite	Two updates on the progress of the work, most recently an outline of the proposed works programs (which Elected Members also received)

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Community and key user groups with regular usage arrangements for social infrastructure facilities provided by the Town.
Period of engagement	1. *Community Engagement: 12 April 2021 to 30 April 2021* 2. *Public comment: 2 December 2021 – 7 January 2022*
Level of engagement	Consult
Methods of engagement	1. *April: online survey and on-on-one interviews* 2. *December – January: Community Survey via Your Thoughts and written submissions*
Advertising	1. Community groups were contacted directly by email 2. *Newspaper Advertisement (Southern Gazette) and social media*
Submission summary	*Public Comment: 15 unique responses*
Key findings	Initial engagement results in April 2021 revealed that community groups have strong connections to the Town and that space and funding are key concerns for growing organisations. 15 submissions were received during the public comment period revealing general support for the SIS. A summary of the public comments received are provided at Attachment 2 with levels of support for the SIS 'Vision', 'Principles' and 'Overall' detailed as follows: *SIS Vision* *Support: 13*

	Unsure: 2 *Oppose: 0* *SIS Principles* *Support: 11* *Unsure: 2* *Oppose: 2* *SIS Overall* *Support: 10* *Unsure: 5* *Oppose: 0*

Other engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Department of Education	Acknowledge the need for increased school capacity in Burswood and East Victoria Park if the population of these areas grows in keeping with projections

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Failing to adopt the Social Infrastructure Strategy may result in the Town not setting aside adequate funds to deliver social infrastructure in accordance with the assessed need	Major	Possible	High	Low	TREAT risk by preparing a process for regular review of social infrastructure need and performance and ensuring this is aligned with the budget and service area delivery planning processes
Financial	Failing to align projects to an endorsed strategy may result in the Town providing	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT risk by preparing a process for regular review of social

	unnecessary social infrastructure, resulting in underutilised, low-return facilities					infrastructure need and performance, and ensuring this is aligned with the budget and property management processes
Financial	Failing to adopt the Social Infrastructure Strategy may result in the Town failing to consider long-term social needs when making decisions about the future of its property assets	Major	Possible	High	Low	TREAT risk by preparing a process for regular review of social infrastructure need and performance, and ensuring this is aligned with the budget and property management processes
Environmental	Failing to align projects to an endorsed strategy may result in planned social infrastructure projects conflicting with the preservation of Town managed environmental or heritage assets	Moderate	Unlikely	Medium	Medium	TREAT risk by ensuring that environmental and heritage values are considered at the early stages of all site planning and project delivery
Health and safety	Nil				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Nil				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Nil				Low	
Reputation	As the Social Infrastructure Strategy has received largely supportive feedback, failure to	Minor	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by providing clear information to community on the reasoning behind recommendation,

	adopt the strategy may be perceived negatively by the community.					and proactively and genuinely considering any feedback received during the consultation periods
Service delivery	Failing to adopt the Social Infrastructure Strategy may negatively impact the Town's capacity to facilitate delivery of the social infrastructure	Major	Possible	High	Medium	TREAT risk by preparing a process for regular review of social infrastructure need and performance and ensuring this is aligned with the budget and service area delivery planning processes. Regularly review the Social Infrastructure Strategy alongside the Place Plans to ensure the number of scheduled projects does not exceed organisational capacity.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Should Council adopt the SIS then the proposed programs of work will start to be planned in detail and costs (and their timing) included in the Long-Term Financial Plan where they are known or can be estimated.

Analysis

1. The Social Infrastructure Strategy in Attachment 1 provides a strategic approach for the Town to plan, deliver and manage social infrastructure based on forecasted population growth.
2. The SIS builds upon earlier work commenced in the Draft SIP 2017 and the key strategic principles of the Draft LPS to provide a dynamic, flexible approach to collaborative and growth-responsive social infrastructure planning.

3. A review of the Draft SIP 2017 assessment of need has been undertaken alongside a desktop study of key strategic developments and several consultation processes with Town of Victoria Park administration, elected members, and key facility users.
4. This approach has positioned the SIS to be aligned to the Draft LPS and be formulated to consider both population capacity (that is, the absolute potential population having regard for local planning and development controls) and actual changes in population, growth, need and activity trends over time.
5. The SIS Vision is:

   Residents of the Town of Victoria Park enjoy access to safe, welcoming and diverse social infrastructure spaces that support a diverse range of activities to build a stronger community for everyone.
6. The SIS provides a series of actions and work programs to facilitate delivery of high-level social infrastructure planning needs, based on the principle that continuous refinement is an integral part of the social infrastructure planning process to achieve the vision.
7. Notably, the SIS is not a prescription for facility delivery but rather a framework for future planning and facility management approach. In particular, the SIS outlines a social infrastructure hub hierarchy for the Town, based on the principle that social infrastructure should be agglomerated in community focal points for efficiency and neighbourhood-building purposes, and that all residents of the Town should have access to a community focal point within a 10-minute walk of their home.
8. The SIS recognises the Macmillan Precinct project as the primary social infrastructure hub opportunity for the Town, catering to a range of both district and neighbourhood level needs. The Macmillan Precinct will be complemented by neighbourhood level hubs servicing the Lathlain and Aqualife/Oats Street precinct areas.
9. Additionally, the SIS identifies a series of social infrastructure investigation hubs, which are potential hubs requiring further investigation to determine the appropriate level of provision. These hub investigation areas will cater to the planned future communities in Burswood Peninsula and the Bentley Curtin Specialised Activity Centre, and potentially address gaps in the Burswood South / Victoria Park and Carlisle areas as required.
10. The SIS is also intended to be implemented through a series of work programs, rather than a long list of actions. The benefits of this approach include:
    a. Reflects the Town's current approach with implementation of major strategic plans.
    b. Elevates the key principles for social infrastructure planning by embedding them into work programs that are overseen by the Place Planning team. Social infrastructure planning can therefore be more dynamic, growth responsive and integrated with (and subsequently achieved through) the Town's other key strategic programs.
    c. Responds to the Social Infrastructure Hub Hierarchy and the need to provide place-specific, growth driven solutions through establishing a work program for each hub.
    d. Provides a simpler framework for planning for delivery of the strategy and reporting on progress.
11. The proposed Work Programs are identified below:
    a. **Adapt and Act program:** The program is a cross-functional effort to monitor, understand and adapt the social infrastructure strategy to emerging needs and trends.
    b. **Sharing Spaces program:** The program guides the philosophical and administrative components of transition from the dominant single-use facility approach to the flexible, multi-purpose hub approach.
    c. **Strategic Partnerships program:** To develop positive relationships with other social industry providers, including both government agencies and the private sector, to further develop collaboration and advocacy in social infrastructure projects.

d. **Small Steps, Big Impact program:** To deliver small projects that improve the usage and viability of the social and active recreation infrastructure facilities in the Town.
e. **Macmillan Precinct Hub program:** To create a vibrant and innovative hub for living, learning, culture, wellness, community, and civic opportunities, that forms the social infrastructure 'heart' for the Town of Victoria Park
f. **Aqualife Precinct Neighbourhood Hub program:** To consolidate the Town's aquatic recreation facility with complimentary social infrastructure to create a hub servicing the southern population of the local government area.
g. **Lathlain Neighbourhood Hub program:** To consolidate social infrastructure assets in Lathlain Park and Lathlain Place to create a hub servicing the northern population of the local government area.
h. **Burswood Peninsula Local Hub Investigation Area program:** To proactively identify opportunities for strategic partnerships with major facilities in the Burswood Peninsula, and opportunities to deliver social infrastructure to the Peninsula's future population.
i. **Burswood South Local Hub Investigation Area program:** To proactively plan for local-level social infrastructure facilities to serve the future population.
j. **Bentley – Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Investigation Area program:** To collaborate with stakeholders in the delivery of social infrastructure aligned with the delivery of the Bentley – Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Structure Plan.
k. **Carlisle Centre Local Hub Investigation Area program:** To ensure appropriate provision of localscale social infrastructure as the Carlisle Centre and Carlisle and Oats Street station precincts are redeveloped.

12. The recommendations of the SIS are based on and build upon the extensive engagement and analytical processes undertaken in the preparation of the Draft SIP 2017, the preparation of the Draft LPS and current Strategic Community Plan Review.

13. During the public comment period, the Town sought feedback from community members and community groups with regular usage arrangements for social infrastructure facilities provided by the Town.

14. 15 submissions were received during the public comment period of which two thirds indicate support for the SIS with the remaining third indicating that they were unsure of their level of support. No submissions received oppose the SIS, however, several submissions include queries or made recommendations for minor improvement. A summary of the public comments received are provided at Attachment 2.

15. Should Council adopt the Social Infrastructure Strategy, the Town will proceed to implementation, which will include design of the Social Infrastructure Strategy Program of work, and subsequent information in the Town's Long-Term Financial Plan.

16. It is recommended that Council adopt the Social Infrastructure Strategy.

Relevant documents

Draft Social Infrastructure Plan 2017

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (63/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council notes the submissions received and adopts the Social Infrastructure Strategy.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

12.4 Operating Subsidies 2022-2023 Round One

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Events, Arts and Funding
Responsible officer	Manager Community
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Attachment One Operating Subsidies 2022 2023 Evaluation Summaries ABF [**12.4.1** - 5 pages] 2. CONFIDENTIAL - Attachment Two -Harold Hawthorne Community Centre Theory of Change Model Evaluation Summaries ABF [**12.4.2** - 2 pages]

Recommendation

That Council award three-year operating subsidy, commencing 1 July 2022, to Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizens' Centre and Homes Incorporated for $99,040.00 (cash payment plus Perth CPI applied for years 2 and 3) and In-Kind $960.00 per year

Purpose

To provide Council with oversight of the Town's three-year operating subsidy applications and assessments for Council endorsement.

In brief

- Operating subsidies are made available to support the ongoing operating capacity of the Town's service providers to deliver a range of programs, services, events, and partnerships, that align with the Town's strategic outcomes to enhance the quality of life of the community.
- Applications for the Operating Subsidy applications were open from 17 January 2022 and closed on 25 February 2022.
- The Town received Operating Subsidy applications from two organisations (Harold Hawthorne Seniors Citizens' Centre and Homes Incorporated and Abmusic Aboriginal Corporation) with a combined value of $199,894.00 and $5,000 (In-Kind).
- In review of applications by the assessment panel, Harold Hawthorne Seniors Citizens' Centre and Homes Incorporated sufficiently met the outlined criteria and subsequently have been recommended for Council endorsement with a total funding request of $99,040.00 and $960.00 In-Kind per annum, for the next three years.

Background

1. The Town recognises that community health and wellbeing is influenced by numerous factors, including social connectedness, a sense of belonging, a place where people have meaningful and accessible opportunities to participate in the arts, culture, education and to celebrate heritage.

2. As the tier of government closest to the community, local government plays a significant role in shaping and supporting the overall health and wellbeing of the community. This is achieved through a collective impact approach of working in collaboration with the local community, service providers and stakeholders.

3. Operating subsidies are to support the ongoing operating capacity of the Town's service providers to deliver a range of programs, services, events, and partnerships, which enhance the quality of life of the community.

4. At the 7 December 2021 Concept Forum, elected members provided input into future focus themes for operating subsidies to guide the prioritisation of applications to be more aligned with local government core business.

5. Based on this feedback, the following Primary and Secondary focus areas were integrated into the 2022-23 Operating Subsidy application process:

    a. Primary

        - Youth development / services
        - Seniors / aged
        - Arts and Culture

    b. Secondary

        - LGBTQI+
        - Multicultural

6. Complementing these themes were the addition of the following strengths-based criteria:

    a. Community engagement and social connection,
    b. Capacity building and skill development,
    c. Supporting system identification, alignment, and improvement, and
    d. Seeks collaboration and partnering.

7. The Town currently provides operating subsidies to the following groups:

Organisation	Amount	Timeframe
Harold Hawthorne Community Centre	• Three-year operating subsidy • $132,328 + Perth CPI annually • Financial assistance to contribute to the employment costs of the Centre to deliver programs to community.	Contract ends 30 June 2022
Connect Victoria Park	• Three-year operating subsidy • $75,000 + Perth CPI annually • Contract extension endorsed Nov 2020 • Financial assistance contributing to staffing costs and direct program delivery for the wider community	Contract end 30 June 2024
Victoria Park Centre for the Arts	• Three-year operating subsidy • $104,000 + Perth CPI annually • Financial assistance to contribute to keeping the Centre functioning, and to continue employing a part-time professional team.	Contract end 30 June 2024

Victoria Park Community Centre	• Three-year operating subsidy • $85,000 + Perth CPI annually • Financial assistance to support VPCC to deliver programs, support and services to the local community.	Contract end 30 June 2024

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	Provision of agile appropriately managed funding that provides an opportunity for community organisations to respond to community need.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S02 - An informed and knowledgeable community.	Through provision of funding community organisations will have the capacity to ensure community remains connected and engaged on topics that are of importance to them.
S04 - A place where all people have an awareness and appreciation of arts, culture, education and heritage.	Provision for funding programs that ensure community could remain engaged, with access to arts culture and education.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Operating Subsidy Funding Assessment Panel
Engagement	Consultation and management of grant administration Consultation and Panel review and evaluation

External engagement	
Stakeholders	All Community
Period of engagement	The 2022 Operating Subsidy funding round opened on 17 January 2022 and closed on 25 February 2022.
Level of engagement	1. Inform
Methods of engagement	Town's website Town's social media platforms – Facebook and the Town's e-newsletters Direct email Operating Subsidy Online Information Session
Advertising	Town's website

	Town's social media platforms – Facebook and the Town's e-newsletters Digital Marketing Direct email
Submission summary	Two applications were submitted to the Town for evaluation
Key findings	After detailed panel assessments and discussion had occurred, it was determined that only one operating subsidy application submission met the Town's criteria and is recommended for endorsement, being Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizens' Centre and Homes inc. Abmusic Aboriginal Corporation does not meet Criteria 36b of Policy 114 Community funding - *the applicant does not operate within the Town from a rateable premise or does not primarily deliver services within the Town.*

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Service providers not delivering outlined support to community	Moderate	Likely	High	Low	TREAT by ensuring fair and acquittable application process guided by Policy 114 Community Funding. Continue to work in partnership with service providers in relation to the operating subsidy and social outcomes measurements
Environmental	Not applicable					
Health and safety	Not applicable					
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable					

Legislative compliance	Service providers not meeting agreed legislative requirements	Moderate	Unlikely	High	Low	TREAT – by sighting relevant documentation within the application process and including contractual agreement
Reputation	Negative public perception towards the Town should applications not be funded	Moderate	Unlikely	High	Low	TREAT by transparent approval process. Managed by online funding platform and Council endorsement. Town funding panels. Ensure fair and equitable application process guided by Policy 114 Community Funding
Service delivery	Not applicable					

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Not applicable.
Future budget impact	Endorsement of this recommendation requires a three-year operational subsidy commitment in future budgets, starting 1 July 2022. Hawthorne Community Centre = $99,040 and $960.00 In-Kind per annum x 3 years = $99,040 ex GST and $960 In-Kind x 3 years = $297,120 ex GST and $2,880 In-Kind (2022/23 - 2024/25). To include provision for the addition of Perth CPI annually. Currently Perth CPI is at 3.5%. Current supported operating subsidies with future budget implications include: • Connect Victoria Park = $75,000 per annum x 3 years (ending 30 June 2024) • Victoria Park Centre for the Arts = $104,000 per annum x 3 years (ending

	30 June 2024) • Victoria Park Community Centre = $85,000 per annum x 3 years (ending 30 June 2024) Total estimated commitment for 2022/23 = $363,040 ex GST ($960.00 In-Kind) inclusive of current and recommended operating subsidies.

Analysis

8. Applications for Operating Subsidies were open from 17 January 2022 to 25 February 2022.

9. Additional relevant and reasonable questions were received by the organisations during the application process. These questions were dealt with and answered by the Grants Officer with support from the Manager Community, when needed.

10. The Town delivered a free online Operating Subsidies Information Session to the community on 2 February 2022. The workshop provided the participants with information on what an Operating Subsidy is and the purpose of the subsidy.

11. The Town received two Operating Subsidy application submissions with a total request of $199,894.00 and $5,000 In-Kind excluding GST.

12. The application requires the completion of four parts:
    a) Eligibility
    b) Application Details (organisation, auspice arrangements)
    c) Project details; and
    d) Assessment Criteria as outlined in the table below.

13. The Operating Subsidy application form was aligned with the Town's Strategic Community Plan outcomes and consisted of four questions with a maximum score of five points per question. With four panel members scoring across the four assessment criteria with a maximum score of 80 available per application. The final weighted score for the complete application was out of 100%.

14. The Town's assessment criteria questions are as follows:

Assessment criteria questions	Weighting per question per panel member
Question 1 – Demonstrated evidence-based need (25% weighting) • Which of the primary and or secondary priority themes are you addressing? • Why does your service/offering exist? What is your purpose/vision/mission? • What evidence can you provide that substantiates your focus in delivering services/initiatives in these priority themes(s) within the local area? • Are there secondary data sets to support the need for your service in the local community? https://profile.id.com.au/victoria-park State and Federal Government, AEDC, Health and Wellbeing Indicators; Industry specific	Total score available is five per panel member = 20 points total

research/modelling; • Have you undertaken human centred-design and developmental evaluation (consultation and engagement with stakeholders in program design, monitoring and evaluation) to enhance your focus of approach? If so, what did this tell you? • Is your service a duplication of a service that already exists in the community? If so in what ways? • If it is a duplication, please outline how your service addresses a specific priority theme not being met by others.	
Question 2 – Alignment to the Town's Strategic Community Plan (25% weighting) In this section identify the top three outcomes of the Town's Strategic Community Plan your service will deliver upon. https://www.victoriapark.wa.gov.au/About-Council/Council-documents/Integrated-planning-and-reporting-framework/Strategic-Community-Plan We understand that you will more than likely achieve more than three outcomes. However, to ensure proportionate, consistent, and comparable reporting and acquittals, you will be required to acquit against the three you select, should you be successful. • Considering a strengths-based approach, how will these outcomes be achieved and what evidence do you have to prove that you can achieve these outcomes? • Have you created a Theory of Change and Program Logic to help you demonstrate an alignment to the Town's Strategic Outcomes? If so, please provide as an attachment. • Do you have a monitoring, evaluation, and outcome measurement framework/process in place? If so, provide details as to how you will collect data for the Annual Outcome Report. • Can you provide evidence of past outcomes achieved at an individual and/or community level, and how they were measured? • Can you provide evidence of the skill set, capabilities and capacity of staff to measure outcomes?	Total score available is five per panel member = 20 points total
Question 3 – Value for money (25% weighting) In this section explain how you will deliver value for money. Using a strengths-based approach, what initiatives do you specifically aim to deliver as a result of receiving an operating subsidy? Or what will you have capacity to deliver due to receiving an operating subsidy that you would not normally be able to do?	Total score available is five per panel member = 20 points per total

• How will you address and or integrate one or more of the following elements into your initiative/approach?
  ○ community engagement and social connection,
  ○ capacity building and skill development,
  ○ Supporting system identification, alignment and improvement, and
  ○ seeks out collaboration and partnering
 	
• How many people (approximately) will benefit from your service/initiative within a 12-month period?
• Have you calculated the cost per participant for service (total service cost divided by number of people accessing your offering/services? If so, please provide.
• If you are seeking funds to cover salaries, have you provided examples of similar positions, an average weighted wage for such positions and an explanation of why the role/salary is required?
• Is the initiative/service located within the Town? Yes/No
• Is the initiative/service free for the community? Yes/No
• If you charge a fee, how does this compare to other like services?
• If you are seeking funds for an ongoing program provide examples of similar programs and operational costs.
• You may also like to consider including the number of volunteer hours engaged in your service over the previous 12-month period.	

Question 4 – Governance **(25% weighting)** In this section provide details of the governance structures the organisation has in place. Give consideration to: • Details of the Board of Management structure and core areas of experience. • Staff skills, experience and capabilities in delivering proposed activities outlined within the Operating Subsidy (Consider CV's of critical staff). • Details of risk mitigation strategies. • Attaching Current Strategic Plan. • Attaching financials for previous two years. • Attach any other evidence of relevance to demonstrate a capacity to effectively and safely deliver your service/approach.	Total score available is five per panel member = 20 points per total
Total weighting for four questions = 100%	Total score available = 80 points

15. The Town's internal assessment panel consisted of four Town Officers:
    a) Chief Community Planner
    b) Coordinator – Urban Planning
    c) Communications Advisor – Stakeholders Relations
    d) Manager Community

16. Applications were assessed individually utilising a defined assessment matrix with descriptions and rating scale to guide the assessor with appropriate scoring. Then applications were reviewed within a formal panel meeting in line with Policy 114 Community Funding and the criteria outline for the Town's Operating Subsidy funding program. On average, it took the Community Funding Assessment Panel members between one to two hours per application to assess individually with a one-hour panel meeting.

17. Evaluation summaries related to all Operating Subsidies applications, recommended, and not recommended, are provided in *Attachment One*.

18. The Town recommends the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Operating Subsidy Funding Recommendations:

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizens' Centre and Homes Incorporated	Empowering positive aging in the community	$99,040.00 $960.00 In-Kind
Total		$99.040.00 $960.00 In-Kind

19. The Town does not recommend the following table applications for endorsement by Council:

Operating Subsidy Funding Not Recommended

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Abmusic Aboriginal Corporation	Vic Park Performs Arts	$99,894.00
Total		$99,894.00

Relevant documents

Policy 114 Community Funding

Due to an indirect financial interest, Cr Luana Lisandro left the meeting at 9.04pm.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (79/2022):

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Vicki Potter

That Council award three-year operating subsidy, commencing 1 July 2022, to Harold Hawthorne Senior Citizens' Centre and Homes Incorporated for $99,040.00 (cash payment plus Perth CPI applied for years 2 and 3) and In-Kind $960.00 per year

Carried (7 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

Cr Luana Lisandro returned to the meeting at 9.06pm.

12.5 Vic Park Funding Program - Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Events, Arts and Funding
Responsible officer	Manager Community
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Attachment One Community Grants 2022 [**12.5.1** - 4 pages] 2. Attachment Two Sports Grants 2022 [**12.5.2** - 3 pages] 3. Attachment Three Sports Equipment Grants 2022 [**12.5.3** - 4 pages] 4. Attachment Four Urban Forest Grants [**12.5.4** - 2 pages]

Recommendation

That Council endorse the following Community, Sport, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest grant applications:

1. Community grants
   a. Mackie Street Singers - $2,500
   b. Lathlain Primary School Parents and Citizens Association - $5,065.90 and $650.00 In-Kind

2. Sports grants
   a. Curtin Panthers Netball Club Incorporated - $3,664.30
   b. Victoria Park Squash Club Incorporated - $1,520.00 and $300 In-Kind

3. Sports Equipment grants
   a. Carlisle and Victoria Park AFLW Masters Incorporated - $1,423.75
   b. Curtin Panthers Netball Club Incorporated - $1,451.25
   c. Victoria Park Squash Club Incorporated - $230.00
   d. Dynamic Flame Badminton Club Incorporated - $500.00

4. Sports Equipment grant from 2021/22 Round One
   a. Perth Royals Football Club Incorporated - $500.00

5. Urban Forest grants
   a. East Victoria Park Primary School - $9,415.00

Purpose

To provide Council with oversight of the Town's Community, Sport, Sport Equipment and Urban Forest grant applications and assessments for Council endorsement.

In brief

- The Town's Vic Park Funding program increases opportunities for local collaboration and partnership between the Town, local organisations and community to enhance achievement of the Town's strategic objectives.
- Due to funds remaining for both Community, Sports, Sports Equipment grants programs it was recommended that a second funding round be opened in early 2022.

- Round Two of the Community, Sports, Sports Equipment programs commenced on 17 January 2021 closing 25 February 2022.
- The Urban Forest Grants funding round opened 28 October 2021 closing 25 February 2022. (Noting that there is only one round per year for the Urban Forest grant program).
- The Town received the following applications with a total requested of $63,713.20 and $1,885.00 In-Kind
  - Five Community grants - $30,713.90 and $1,085.00 In-Kind
  - Four Sports Equipment grants - $14,420.00
  - Four Sports grants $9,164.30 and $800.00 In-Kind
  - One Urban Forest grant - $9,415.00
- A review of applications by the Town's Community Fund Assessment Panels (CAFP) concluded the following number of grants sufficiently met the criteria and are recommended for Council endorsement with a *total funding request* of $26,270.20 and $950.00 In-Kind
  - Two Community Grants – totaling $7,565.90 and $650.00 (In-Kind)
  - Two Sports Grants – totaling $5,184.30 and $300.00 (In-Kind)
  - Four Sports Equipment Grants – totaling $3,605.00
  - One Urban Forest Grant – totaling $9,415.00
  - One Sports Equipment Grant from 2021-2022 – Round One - $500.00

Background

1. The Town acknowledges the significant role it plays in supporting the community through the provision of funding opportunities and the impact these opportunities can have within the community.

2. The Town aims to enhance the success and prosperity of the local community while ensuring transparency of funding decisions and accountability of those parties receiving community grant funding.

3. At the December 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting, item 14.5 Policy 114 Community Funding was adopted by Council (with subsequent amendments).

4. To improve efficiency and transparency in December 2019, Town officers reviewed all funding round practices and procedures delivered by the Town. This review initiated a project to procure a funding platform to manage the Town's funding.

5. In March 2020, the Town procured the online grant funding platform SmartyGrants. The implementation of this platform aims to improve the Town's governance, increase transparency, and improve efficiency within Town processes in relation to funding.

6. Further to the adoption of Policy 114 Community Funding at the December 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council resolved that the Chief Executive Officer investigate:
   a. The establishment of a panel for the assessment of applications for community funding to commence in July 2020; and
   b. Future decision on community funding being reported to Council.

7. At the July 2020 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council endorsed the CEO to establish a panel of no less than three members to assess all eligible applications received. The panel will assess applications against the requirements and assessment criteria and present a report to council for endorsement.

8. In making a recommendation to Council the Community Funding Assessment Panel (CFAP) will provide the following information to ensure Council can make accurate timely and transparent decisions:
   a. Details of all applications include title, project scope, amount of assistance applied for (ex GST), evaluation and score.
   b. Information provided will be inclusive of successful, unsuccessful and ineligible applications.

9. To ensure that the CFAP continues to be fit-for-purpose and remains meaningfully engaged, membership for the panel positions were recruited via direct approach to ensure the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience could be applied to the assessment process.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	Funds are managed with full, accurate and timely disclosure of financial information relating to the Council. Town Grant funds are maximised by seeking the greatest possible benefit to the community within the available monetary resources.
CL09 - Appropriate devolution of decision-making and service provision to an empowered community.	The program enables community groups and other organisations to provide services to the local community.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	The Urban Forest Grants encourage community groups and other organisations to contribute to the Town's tree canopy objectives.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	To support organisations that provide programs, services and events that will positively influence the health and wellbeing of the community.
S03 - An empowered community with a sense of pride, safety and belonging.	Empowered local service providers who are supported by the Town to deliver services and initiatives that provide a sense of pride, safety and belonging within the community.

S04 – A place where all people have an awareness and appreciation of arts, culture, education and heritage.	To support local organisations and individuals to deliver services and initiatives that encourage awareness of arts, culture, education and heritage.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Community Grant Funding Assessment Panel Sports and Sports Equipment Funding Assessment Panel Urban Forest Grant Funding Assessment Panel
Engagement	Consultation and management of grant administration Consultation and Panel evaluation

External engagement	
Stakeholders	All Community
Period of engagement	17 January 2022 to 25 February 2022 (Community, Sports and Sport Equipment grants) 28 October 2021 to 25 February 2022 (Urban Forest grants)
Level of engagement	1. Inform
Methods of engagement	Town's website Town's social media platforms – Facebook and the Town's e-newsletters Direct email Grants workshop
Advertising	Town's website Town's social media platforms – Facebook and Town's e-newsletters Digital Marketing Direct email
Submission summary	Five Community grant submissions were received. Four Sport grant submissions were received. Four Sports Equipment grant submissions were received. One Urban Forest grant submission was received.
Key findings	<u>Community grant program:</u> Two Submissions are recommended for Council endorsement. Three Submissions are not recommended for Council endorsement. <u>Sports grant program:</u> Two Submissions are recommended for Council endorsement. Two Submissions are not recommended for Council endorsement <u>Sports Equipment grant program:</u>

	Four Submissions are recommended for Council endorsement. No Submissions are not recommended for Council endorsement. <u>Urban Forest grant program:</u> One Submission is recommended for Council endorsement. No Submissions are not recommended for Council endorsement.

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Loss of funds if successful programs/events are cancelled or do not deliver on intended purpose	Moderate	Unlikely	High	Low	TREAT – Acquittal process to be well organised and communicated to all successful participants.
Environmental	Grant activities are carried out in a way that is detrimental to the local environment	Moderate	Unlikely	Medium	Medium	TREAT – applications reviewed by Urban Forest team and Assessment panel includes environmental expertise.
Health and safety	Not applicable					
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable					
Legislative compliance	Not applicable					
Reputation	Negative public perception towards the Town should applications not be funded	Minor	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT – Transparent approval process. Managed by an online funding platform and council endorsed Town funding panel.

Service delivery	Not applicable

Financial implications

Current budget impact	The budget allocations for 2021/22 were: • Sport and Sports Equipment grants - $40,000 • Community grants – $50,000 • Urban Forest grants - $25,000 In Round One of grant funding the following amounts were approved. • Sport and Sports Equipment grants -$29,779.39 • Community grants - $35,695.00 and $100 (In-Kind) • Urban Forest grants – n/a - single round of funding per year.
Future budget impact	Not applicable – allocated funds will be expended this financial year.

10. Summary of Grants and Available funds – Round 2 (2021/22) as follows:

Summary of Grants and Available funds – Round 2 (2021/22)	
SPORTS GRANTS	
Budget Remaining *Combined budget - Sports and Sports Equipment	$10,220.61*
Total value of applications (including in-kind)	$ 9,964.30
Total recommended for endorsement	$ 5,484.30
SPORTS EQUIPMENT GRANTS	
Budget Remaining *Combined budget - Sports and Sports Equipment	$10,220.61*
Total value of applications	$14,420.00
Total recommended for endorsement *Includes $500 application – Item 44 (from this report)	$ 4105.00*
COMMUNITY GRANTS	

Budget Remaining	$14,305.00
Total value of applications (including in-kind)	$31,798.90
Total recommended for endorsement	$ 8,215.90
URBAN FOREST GRANTS	
Budget Remaining	$25,000.00
Total value of applications	$ 9,415.00
Total recommended for endorsement	$ 9,415.00
TOTAL VALUE OF ALL GRANTS – ROUND 2 (2021/22)	
Budget Remaining	**$49,525.61**
Total value of applications (including in-kind)	**$65,598.20**
Total recommended for endorsement	**$27,202.20**

Analysis

11. The Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants were promoted across various platforms to reach target audiences.

12. The Community, Sports, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest Grants were accessible to the community via the SmartyGrants application platform on the Town's website.

13. The Town delivered a free grant writing workshop to the community on 9 February 2022. The workshop provided the community with information on the following:
    a. An introduction to grants, including what they are, information on where to find them and an explanation of eligibility and assessment criteria
    b. The process of best-practice project planning to prepare for grant success
    c. Information on how to address grant criteria
    d. An explanation of the grant writing approach; what are assessors looking for and how do you give them what they need?
    e. Answers to specific grant writing questions the attendees may have.

Community Grants

14. The Community grants application form was aligned with the Town's Strategic Community Plan outcomes.

15. The Town's internal Community Grants Funding Assessment Panel consisted of Town officers:
    a. Chief Community Planner
    b. Coordinator – Events, Arts and Funding
    c. Coordinator – Project Support
    d. Place Leader – Strategic Planning

16. Applications were assessed individually and then reviewed with a formal panel meeting by the Community Grant panel members in line with Policy 114 Community Funding and the criteria outline for the Vic Park Funding Program.

17. The Town's initial assessment questions are as follows:
    a. Eligibility
    b. Applicant details (organisation, auspice arrangements etc.)
    c. Project details (brief description, risks, locations, dates etc.)
    d. Assessment criteria questions

18. The Town's assessment criteria questions are as follows:

Assessment criteria questions	Weighting per question per panel member
Question 1: The project/initiative aligns with the Town's Strategic Community Plan 2017-32 objectives and priorities (Town's values and Mission)?	(Weighting 25%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 2: Outline how the initiative is suitable and inclusive of all members of the community.	(Weighting 25%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 3: How do you know the project is needed by the community? How many people will benefit?	(Weighting 25%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 4: How does this initiative encourage employment of the Victoria Park community?	(Weighting 25%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
	Total weighting for four questions = 100% Total score available = 80 points

19. The Community funding attracted five applications, with a total requested of $30,713.90 and $1,085.00 (In-Kind).

20. It is recommended Council endorse two of the five applications for a requested funding total of $7,565.90 and $650.00 (In-Kind).

21. Evaluation summaries related to all Community grant applications, recommended and not recommended, are provided in *Attachment One*.

22. The Town recommends the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Community Funding Recommendations

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Mackie Street Singers (Auspiced by Connect Victoria Park Incorporated)	Performance Enhancement Program	$2,500.00

Lathlain Primary School Parents and Citizens Association	Lathlain Community Carols 2022	$5,065.90 $ 650.00 (In-Kind)
Total		$7,565.90 $ 650.00 (In-Kind)

23. The Town does not recommend the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Community Funding Not Recommended

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Curate Arts Incorporated	Voices of Victoria Park	$9,995.00
Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA)	RSPCA WA Community Day	$4,500.00 $ 300.00 (In-Kind)
Chinese Dance Australia Incorporated	Chinese Dance – Moon Cake Festival	$8,653.00 $ 135.00 (In-Kind)
Total		$23,148.00 $ 435.00 (In-Kind)

Sports Grants

24. The Sports grant application form was aligned with the Town's Strategic Community Plan outcomes.

25. The Town's internal Sports Grants Funding Assessment Panel consisted of Town officers:
    a. Manager, Infrastructure Operations
    b. Coordinator, Health and Fitness – Aqualife
    c. Club Development Officer – Clubs, Events and Bookings
    d. Supervisor – Parking and Rangers

26. Applications were assessed individually and then reviewed with a formal panel meeting by the Town's Sports Grants panel members in line with Policy 114 Community Funding and the criteria outline for the Vic Park Funding program.

27. The Town's initial assessment questions are as follows:
    a. Eligibility
    b. Applicant details (organisation, auspice arrangements etc.)
    c. Project details (brief description, risks, locations, dates etc.)
    d. Assessment criteria questions.

28. The Town's assessment criteria questions are as follows:

Assessment criteria questions	Weighting per question per panel member

Question 1: How does the project/initiative align with the Town's Strategic Community Plan 2017-32 objectives?	(Weighting 40%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 2: What measures have you taken to ensure this initiative is suitable and inclusive of all members?	(Weighting 20%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 3: How do you know the project is needed by the community (research, survey, time to upgrade)? How many people will benefit?	(Weighting 30%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
Question 4 Demonstrate the applicant's ability to deliver proposed initiative within a time period.	(Weighting 10%) • Five points per panel member • Total of 20 points available
	Total weighting for four questions = 100% Total score available = 80 points

29. The Sports funding attracted four applications, with total requested of $9,164.30.

30. It is recommended Council endorse two of the four applications for a requested funding total of $5,184.30 and $300 In-Kind.

31. Evaluation summaries related to all Sports grant applications, recommended, and not recommended is provided in *Attachment Two*.

32. The Town recommends the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Sports Funding Recommendations

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Curtin Panthers Netball Club Incorporated	Women's Netball Skills and Fitness Development	$3,664.30
Victoria Park Squash Club Incorporated	Girls Only Squash Program	$1,520.00 $ 300.00 (In-Kind)
Total		$5,184.30 $ 300.00 (In-Kind)

33. The Town does not recommend the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Sports Funding Not Recommended

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Westcycle Incorporated	Girls Riding Program	$1,980.00 $ 500.00 (In-Kind)

Carlisle and Victoria Park AFLW Masters Incorporated (Not Eligible)	Equipment	$2,000.00
Total		$3,980.00

Sports Equipment Grants

34. The Sports Equipment grants application form was aligned with the Town's Strategic Community Plan outcomes.

35. The Town's internal Sports Equipment Grants Funding Assessment Panel consisted of Town officers:
    a. Manager, Infrastructure Operations
    b. Coordinator Health and Fitness - Aqualife
    c. Club Development Officer – Clubs, Events and Bookings
    d. Supervisor – Parking and Rangers.

36. Applications were assessed individually and then reviewed at a formal panel meeting by the Town's Sports Equipment Grants panel members in line with Policy 114 Community Funding and the criteria outline for the Vic Park Funding Program.

37. The Town's initial assessment questions are as follows:
    a. Eligibility
    b. Applicant details (organisation, auspice arrangements etc.)
    c. Project details (brief description, risks, locations, dates etc.)
    d. Assessment criteria questions.

38. The Town's assessment criteria questions are as follows:

Assessment criteria questions	**Weighting per question per panel member**
Question 1: What are you planning to purchase from the grant funding?	Weighting 20% • Five points per panel member • Total 20 points available
Question 2: Why is the uniforms and equipment necessary? Please explain the needs for the items.	Weighting 30% • Five points per panel member • Total 20 points available
Question 3: How does the purchasing of uniforms or equipment align with the Town's Strategic Community Plan? 2017-32 objectives?	Weighting 40% • Five points per panel member • Total 20 points available
Question 4 Is the sporting club located in the Town? If not, does the sports club service the Town of Victoria	Weighting 10% • Five points per panel member • Total 20 points available

Park community?	
	Total weighting for four questions = 100% Total score available = 80 points

39. The Sports equipment funding attracted four applications, with total requested of $14,420.00.

40. It is recommended Council endorse all four applications for a requested funding total of $3,605.00 (25% of cost).

41. Evaluation summaries related to all Sports equipment grant applications, recommended, and not recommended, are provided in *Attachment Three*.

42. The Town recommends the following tabled applications for endorsement by Council:

Sports Equipment Funding Recommendations

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Carlisle and Vic Park AFLW Masters Incorporated	AFLW Masters Sporting Equipment	$1,423.75
Curtin Panthers Netball Incorporated	Encouraging club culture through winter squad jackets and new equipment	$1,451.25
Victoria Park Squash Incorporated	Equipment	$ 230.00
Dynamic Flame Badminton Club Incorporated	Badminton equipment	$ 500.00
Total		$3,605.00

43. No Sports Equipment applications are not recommended for endorsement.

Sports Equipment Funding Recommendation from 2021/22 Sport Equipment (Round One)

Applicants:	Project	Amount
Perth Royals Football Club Incorporated	Perth Royals Football Club Sustainable Project	$500.00
Total		$500.00

44. At the 16 November 2021, Ordinary Council Meeting, the Town recommended the above Perth Royals Football Club Sports Equipment Grant to be endorsed for $500.00 (for sports equipment) and another $487.50, for the fridge component (transferred from a Sports Grant to a Sports Equipment grant).

    An amendment was endorsed at the 16 November 2021, Ordinary Council Meeting, that Point 5c of the Officer's recommendation be deleted. Point 5c included two components of the grant applications from Perth Football Club. Amendment as follows:

    That point 5c of the officer's recommendation be deleted.

    Reason: *A fridge is not sporting equipment, as it is not necessary for, or related to, the playing of football, nor is it needed for maintaining the club's equipment. It is related to the recreational and revenue raising activities of the club, and it sets a precedent to encourage other sporting clubs to consider grant funding for similar items.*

    The Perth Football Club grants were as follows:
    a. $500.00 - for the purchase of sports equipment
    b. $487.50 - for the purchase of a fridge (application transferred from Sport Grants program)

    This amendment only took into consideration the fridge component of the Sports Equipment grant, with the reason being that the fridge is not sporting equipment.

    As a result of this review, Officers recommend the second component of the $500.00 grant for the Perth Royals Football Club for the purchase of new sports equipment be reviewed and endorsed in this round of funding.

Urban Forest Grants

45. The Urban Forest grants application form was aligned with the Town's Strategic Community Plan outcomes.

46. The Town's internal Urban Forest Grants Funding Assessment Panel consisted of Town officers:
    a. Manager Infrastructure Operations
    b. Manager Place Planning
    c. Coordinator Urban Planning

47. Applications were assessed individually and then reviewed at a formal panel meeting by the Town's Urban Forest Grants panel members in line with Policy 114 Community Funding and the criteria outline for the Community funding program.

48. The Town's initial assessment questions are as follows:

a. Eligibility
b. Applicant details (organisation, auspice arrangements etc.)
c. Project details (brief description, risks, locations, dates etc.)
d. Assessment criteria questions

49. The Town's assessment criteria questions are as follows:

Assessment criteria questions	Weighting per question per panel member
Question 1- Urban Forest Targets Which actions from the Urban Forest Strategy Implementation Action Plan does the project progress and how?	Weighting 25% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
Question 2- Place Impact How does the project positively influence the experience of the place?	Weighting 15% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
Question 3 - Environmental services Provide details on how the project will positively contribute to environmental services (e.g., Improvements in water management, soil health, biodiversity, and ecology).	Weighting 15% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
Question 4 - Project costs How does the project represent "good value for money"? (e.g., Project costs incurred in both implementation and ongoing maintenance).	Weighting 15% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
Question 5 - Community Support Explain how the project is supported by community and encourages community member involvement to achieve social outcomes whilst communicating the benefits of the Urban Forest?	Weighting 15% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
Question 6 - Health Outcomes How does the project contribute to positive health outcomes?	Weighting 15% • Five points per panel member • Total 15 points available
	Total weighting for six questions = 100 % Total score available = 90 points

50. The Urban Forest funding attracted one completed application, with a total requested of $9,415.00.

51. It is recommended Council endorse the Application for a requested funding total of $9,415.00.

52. Evaluation summaries related to all Urban Forest grant applications, recommended and not recommended, is provided in *Attachment Four*.

53. The Town recommends the following tabled application for endorsement by Council:

Urban Forest Funding Recommendations

Applicants:	Project	Amount
East Victoria Park Primary School	Nature Play Canopy Project	$9,415.00
Total		$9,415.00

Relevant documents

Policy 114 Community Funding

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (64/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council endorse the following Community, Sport, Sports Equipment and Urban Forest grant applications:

1. Community grants
   a. Mackie Street Singers - $2,500
   b. Lathlain Primary School Parents and Citizens Association - $5,065.90 and $650.00 In-Kind

2. Sports grants
   a. Curtin Panthers Netball Club Incorporated - $3,664.30
   b. Victoria Park Squash Club Incorporated - $1,520.00 and $300 In-Kind

3. Sports Equipment grants
   a. Carlisle and Victoria Park AFLW Masters Incorporated - $1,423.75
   b. Curtin Panthers Netball Club Incorporated - $1,451.25
   c. Victoria Park Squash Club Incorporated - $230.00
   d. Dynamic Flame Badminton Club Incorporated - $500.00

4. Sports Equipment grant from 2021/22 Round One
   a. Perth Royals Football Club Incorporated - $500.00

5. Urban Forest grants
   a. East Victoria Park Primary School - $9,415.00

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13 Chief Operations Officer reports

13.1 TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Manager Infrastructure Operations
Responsible officer	Chief Operations Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Recommendation

That Council does not accept any tender associated with TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment, with the terms and conditions as outlined in the contract.

Purpose

For the Council to accept the recommendation relating to TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment, as this has gone to public tender, the acceptance of the offer and subsequent award of any such contract is to be determined by Council.

In brief

- TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment was advertised on 29 January 2022 through the West Australian newspaper, Tenderlink, the Town's website, and Council Administration Centre and Library public notice boards. The tenders to be received on or before 2pm (WST) 22 February 2022.
- Suppliers were requested to provide a schedule of rates for the supply of materials used for the maintenance of the Towns irrigation assets.
- The Town estimates $35,000 - $40,000 per annum for this tender, booked to individual work orders.
- Only one tender submission was received from TOTAL EDEN PTY LTD T/AS NUTRIEN WATER, which was assessed against the prescribed criteria. It is recommended that Council accepts no submission.

Background

1. The Town of Victoria Park has approximately 100 Hectares of irrigated Public Open Space it maintains.
2. Repair and replacement of sprinklers, pipework and other irrigation parts and equipment due to wear and tear and damage is a normal function of parks maintenance.
3. The Town has previously spent up to $35,000 per annum average over three years of the contract.
4. The tender allows for the supply of parts and equipment required for the maintenance and repair of the Towns irrigation assets.

Compliance criteria

5. Tender submissions must comply with the advice provided under the compliance criteria, as indicated in section 4.1.2of the tender documents.

6. The Town's Contracts and Procurement Officer assessed all submissions for compliance against the compliance criteria set out in section 4.1.2 of the tender documents.
7. The submission received was deemed compliant.

Evaluation process

Relevant experience Describe your experience in completing/supplying similar Requirements. Respondents must, as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label it "Relevant Experience": i) Provide details of similar work; ii) Provide scope of the Respondent's involvement including details of outcomes; iii) Provide details of issues that arose during the project and how these were managed; iv) Demonstrate competency and proven track record of achieving outcomes; and v) Demonstrate sound judgement and discretion.	Weighting 20%
Organisation Capacity, Key Personnel experience, stock availability and expertise i) Organisation's capacity and capability ii) Organisation's stock availability iii) Organisation's structure, vision and mission alignment iv) Plant, equipment and materials; and v) Any contingency measures or back up of resources including personnel (where applicable). Tenderers must address the enquired information in an attachment and label it "Current Capacity."	Weighting 20%
Economic Sustainability Tenderers should provide evidence of sustainability in the delivery of the goods, and in the general day-to-day operation of their organisation. Tenderers should also demonstrate the benefits and contribution to the Town of Victoria Park local economy and community. Areas you may wish to cover include: i) How will a contract with your organisation provide economic benefits to the geographical region of the Town of Victoria Park? ii) What benefits are you providing to the local community apart from employment or the payment of business rates? E.g. sponsorship of local community organisations or sporting clubs, culture initiatives, training opportunities for apprentices etc. iii) Please provide a Community Benefit Method Statement. iv) Are all your employees paid in accordance with minimum award rates for the goods or services you are providing? YES / NO, if yes, please provide details. Tenderers must address the enquired information in an attachment and label it "Economic Sustainability".	Weighting 5%
Methodology Tenderers should detail the process they intend to use to achieve the Requirements of the Specification. Areas that you may wish to cover include: i) A project schedule/timeline (where applicable);	Weighting 5%

ii) The process for the delivery of the goods; iii) Training processes (if required); and iv) A demonstrated understanding of the scope of work Supply details and provide an outline of your proposed methodology in an attachment labelled "Demonstrated Understanding".	
Tender fees and Price/s The price to supply the goods in accordance with the Request Rates or prices for variations. Tenderers are required to fill in the Price Schedules in the format requested by the Principal in this Request.	Weighting 50%

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	A public tender process ensures integrity in the appointment of contracts for supplying materials to maintain Town assets.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN06 - Appropriate, inviting and sustainable green spaces for everyone that are well maintained and well managed.	Regular maintenance of the reticulation asset in the Towns Public open Space ensures the turf and gardens are kept to an acceptable standard for passive recreation and community sport

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	Providing high-quality recreation areas encourages public participation in passive recreation, exercise and sport, promoting a healthy community.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Procurement	Provided advice and acted as a probity advisor throughout the process.
Irrigation staff	Provided technical advice on specifications

Legal compliance

Section 3.57 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Part 4 Division 2 of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Failure to have a credible process for engaging a supplier.	Moderate	Almost certain	High	Low	TREAT risk by selecting a supplier through appropriate procurement process
Environmental	Failure to maintain irrigation assets resulting in poor quality POS	Moderate	Likely	High	Medium	TREAT risk by carrying out regular reticulation maintenance
Health and safety	Failure to maintain playing surfaces to standard resulting in sporting injuries	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by adopting appropriate reticulation maintenance
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable				Low	
Reputation	Not applicable				Low	
Service delivery	Failure to maintain reticulation due to lack of parts	Moderate	Likely	High	Medium	TREAT risk by selecting a suitable supplier

Financial implications

Current budget impact	As this has gone to public tender, the acceptance of the offer/tender and subsequent award of any such contract is to be determined by Council. Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Funds relating to irrigation maintenance will be included in future Parks Maintenance budgets.

Relevant documents

Policy 301 – Purchasing

Analysis

8. The assessment of the submissions was to be formally undertaken by a panel that included:
    a. Reserves and Capital Works Supervisor
    b. Streetscapes Supervisor
    c. Building Assets Officer
9. The Town received one submission. It was compliant.
10. As there was only one submission, TOTAL EDEN PTY LTD T/AS NUTRIEN WATER, were ranked number 1.
11. The panel did not go through a further formal ranking of the submission against the selection criteria, on the advice of the Contracts and Procurement Officer, as they were the only submission and held the previous supply contract.
12. The price schedule contained within the documents indicates an increase in estimated costs from the current $35,000 - $40,000 per annum up to $70,000 - $80,000 representing a potential 100% increase. Due to the large increase, concerns regarding value and the lack of alternative submissions it is recommended the Town not accept any tender.
13. The Town is well stocked for reticulation spares, having updated stock levels prior to the current contract expiring. Staff have researched the supply market and are confident there are sufficient options for quoting in accordance with the Town's purchasing policy.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (65/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council does not accept any tender associated with TVP/22/01 Supply and Delivery of Sprinklers, UPVC Pressure Pipe and Ancillary Equipment, with the terms and conditions as outlined in the contract.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13.2 Investigation of a verge bond system

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Principal Design and Traffic Coordinator
Responsible officer	Manager Technical Services
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the findings associated with the potential introduction of a verge bond system.
2. Endorses the Town's preference that no verge bond system be introduced.
3. Endorses the Chief Executive Officer to put in place a more formal mechanism to detail and report on damage to infrastructure which may have occurred due to building or demolition activity for future consideration.

Purpose

To consider the issues involved with the potential introduction of a verge (infrastructure) bond system to protect Council assets, encompassing points that support or detract from its introduction.

In brief

- To date, the Town has not implemented a verge bond system to protect infrastructure assets and has accepted damage that may have occurred to adjacent infrastructure assets from building and demolition activities. A motion to introduce a verge bond system was put forward at the 2021 Annual Meeting of Electors, and a resolution was passed to consider introducing a suitable system.
- Following the review, the Town officers do not recommend introducing a verge bond system. The introduction of such a system potentially provides the Town with some leverage over building and demolition companies to take better care of infrastructure assets. However, it is felt that this is outweighed by the difficulty in establishing the liability for damages and the administrative burden placed on the Town, exacerbated by the lack of dedicated internal staffing and resources, which leads to the need to introduce fees; supported by a review of other local government operations which provide results which are inconsistent in terms of effectiveness. It is also not recommended on the basis that it adds a further administrative burden on building and demolition companies which are currently facing significant difficulties in resourcing their activities (and is likely to add cost imposts on property owners)
- It is, however, proposed to adopt a more formal mechanism to monitor potential damage incurred from building and demolition activity and reconsider its stance if deemed necessary. This may include separate consideration of a verge bond specifically for high-value trees.
- Council's endorsement for the Town's recommended approach is sought in this item.

Background

1. The option to introduce a verge bond system has recently been put forward in the annual meeting of electors, and a resolution was passed to consider the introduction of a suitable system.

2. The resolution from the 28 July 2021 annual electors meeting was "*That the Town seriously consider imposing a levy on builders when they put an application in to build a building in the Town for the remuneration to be paid to the Town for the damage they do to Town infrastructure whilst the building is going on, and for the Town to inspect construction sites during construction periodically.*".
3. At the ordinary Council meeting of 21 September 2021, the resolutions from the Annual Meeting of Electors were considered further. Resolution 6 from the Annual Meeting of Electors (relating to the potential levy) resulted in the following proposed Council action: "*That Council approves the Chief Executive Officer to investigate administrative compliance improvement opportunities such as the potential realignment of certain positions within the organisational structure and report back on findings to the February 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting*". Both the initial Annual Meeting of Electors resolution and the proposed Council action have been incorporated into the final Council Resolution 219/2021.
4. The Town officers initially considered the matter, and a preliminary report on findings was made at the February Agenda Briefing Forum (ABF). The final review is now presented for consideration by Council. The elected members raised several issues at the ABF, and these have been noted in the analysis section of this report.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL10 - Legislative responsibilities are resourced and managed appropriately, diligently and equitably.	For Council to be seen to be considering perceived lack of recovery of costs for damaged infrastructure resulting from private property building and demolition activities.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN02 - A safe, interconnected and well maintained transport network that makes it easy for everyone to get around.	To consider a system to provide protection for infrastructure assets from private property building and demolition activities.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Technical Services	Previous dealings with builders requiring a bond had resulted in contractors simply increasing their construction charges payable by lot owners who have no direct control over their activities.
Street Operations	Considerable asset damage may have been caused by utility service providers and building contractors.
Street Improvement	Many of the damaged footpaths and kerbs are aged and not designed to handle the load of maintenance trucks for activities such as tree pruning, pipe repairs, cabling repairs.
Place Planning (UFS)	Tree protection bonds will require further investigation.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Compliance Officers of various local governments including Cities of Bayswater, Gosnells, Wanneroo, Joondalup, Canning, South Perth and the Town of Bassendean.
Period of engagement	Between 1 June 2020 and 24 December 2021
Level of engagement	Consult
Method	Face to face and phone conversations.
Advertising	N/A
Submission summary	N/A
Key findings	A number of these local governments do not have a verge bond system in place and the compliance officers provided mixed messages regarding the effectiveness of such a system.

Other engagement	
WALGA	Refer to the 2020 version of Code of Practice for Utility Service Providers-Restoration. The Town's staff were co-authors of this document.

Legal compliance

Fees in accordance with *Local Government Act 1995*, section 6.16

Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not adopting a verge bond system for building and demolition activity may result in lack of recovery of infrastructure damage costs from contractors.	Minor	Possible	Moderate	Low	Accept risk by not adopting a verge bond system, noting the significant drawbacks to its introduction; and the added comfort offered through existing bonding arrangements on subdivisions, and

						controls over practices by utilities.
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Damaged Council assets in the public realm may cause serious injury to members of the public	Major	Possible	High	Low	Treat risk through routine asset condition reviews.
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	The verge bond system may be seen to add to existing permit requirements as unnecessary.	Minor	Likely	Moderate	Low	Treat risk by not adopting a verge bond system.
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Unless a bonding system is introduced there will be no future budget impacts. If this is to be considered for implementation in the future, the budget impact will need to be identified at that time.

Analysis

5. Before introducing a verge bond system, it is worthwhile to briefly review the existing Town practices regarding works impacting the public thoroughfare.
6. The current practice allows for bonds to be taken concerning the deferral of subdivision requirements (so that clearances can be issued), and major development where the verge is impacted, or the developer is modifying the verge to incorporate significant changes such as parking embayments or major landscaping works. It is considered that the level of non-compliance for requirements in these situations is minimal, given rectification works are required for statutory development approvals. For utilities working in the public thoroughfare, no bonds are taken at the time of work activity. However, the utilities (and their contractors) are required to comply with the Code of Practice for utilities, and this is generally sufficient to ensure that any damages are properly reinstated to the satisfaction of the Town.

7. The potential introduction of a verge bond system raises several issues that should be addressed. These are canvassed in the following paragraphs.
8. The main purpose of a verge bonding system is to provide an opportunity for the Town to have some leverage over building and demolition companies to take better care of the infrastructure (particularly footpaths) surrounding any private development. Without any leverage, there may be little incentive for less reputable companies to avoid damage to the Town's assets, although it is noted that many companies will want to maintain a good working relationship with the Town and keep their reputation within the building industry.
9. It follows those damages to infrastructure assets from building and demolition activities may be minimised if a higher degree of care is taken. Consequential risks in relation to public liability etc. from damaged assets resulting from these works may therefore be diminished, although it is noted that such risks may also be reduced by the normal asset condition reviews undertaken by the Town.
10. However, there are significant drawbacks against introducing a verge bond system. Two main issues relate to the determination of liability for damages and the administrative burden that is placed on the Town.
11. The determination of liability is a vexed issue, mainly due to the length of time or potential breaks in building or demolition works and the inability of the Town to be present for all significant activities that may affect the infrastructure assets. This liability determination may be helped through such things as pre and post-construction demolition inspections and reports on infrastructure assets, and acknowledgement of site control periods for on-site works. However, there will always be room for argument on the liability for damage unless direct evidence of damage is witnessed.
12. The extent of the damage may also not be assisted when consideration is made of the condition of the Town's infrastructure assets – with some of the Town's concrete kerb and footpaths being aged and having underlying foundational issues such as rotting tree/grass roots, growing tree/grass roots and ant nests. Such assets may be argued to not be designed to handle unpredictable site challenges in building and demolition activity, and the likelihood of damage will be compounded by the dynamic loading of heavy construction or work vehicles.
13. It should be noted that the Town has considered the level of damage from building and demolition activities proven to have been caused by such works within the municipality. Over the past 5 years no contractor working on private properties were successfully proven by the Town to have damaged the Town's assets, these damages were mainly sustained by aged assets and were repaired by the Town at its cost.
14. Based on this review, there has been no successfully recent proven liability for costs of damage against building or demolition contractors for repair works undertaken on adjacent infrastructure assets. While this conclusion is not based on a specific review mechanism that may be envisaged through a verge bond system, the difficulty of liability determination remains as noted above. Such disputes regarding liability may also escalate beyond the officer level of the Town.
15. The second significant issue relates to the administrative burden placed on the Town by introducing a verge bond system. The most obvious resulting costs for this arise through the engagement of operations personnel to monitor, inspect, report and act on the building and demolition activity within the Town. After considering the matter, there is insufficient internal capacity to provide the dedicated resources required to undertake the anticipated role. The extra staffing would therefore need to be engaged externally (and while not unachievable, the current market conditions for external personnel indicate that suitable candidates may not necessarily be attracted to the role).
16. It is estimated that funding in the order of $120,000 per year will be required to maintain a verge bond system. This covers the cost of a dedicated officer for direct monitoring etc. and other associated indirect finance, records and customer service staffing costs for the administration involved with the system and collection of fees etc.
17. The potential source of funding for these costs can be sought through the imposition of new fees which can be applied for verge infrastructure protection permits to be granted to building and demolition companies for private works (such fees can be levied under section 6.16 of the *Local*

Government Act 1995 and through the *Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000*). Based on approximately 707 permits issued for building and demolition works in 2020/21 (619 building permits and 88 demolition permits), the fees to be set maybe around $170 for each verge infrastructure protection permit. Such a fee level is comparable to other local government fees being set for similar works.

18. At the same time as setting the fees applicable to fund the extra costs for the verge bond system the actual verge bond amounts would need to be set and approved. The levels of bonds need to be applied so that the Town has sufficient funding to use in the event of damage occurring to the verge infrastructure assets, and these may vary for individual or grouped dwellings and the dimensions of the verge area likely to be affected. Other local governments have indicated verge bond amounts of $1,400 to $4,000 depending on verge size etc.
19. To give some perspective on the verge bond system, it is also noted what additional information was gained in discussions with other local governments on their operation of such a system. This is documented in the final two paragraphs of this Analysis section. In essence, the feedback received indicated that there were inconsistent results with the verge bond system, and its effectiveness may be marginal.
20. In addition, it is noted that from the point of view of the builders and demolition contractors and property owners, the introduction of a verge bond system will place further administration and added costs to the process. While these should be able to be accommodated, this does add to the current difficulties that the building industry faces.
21. In summary, the introduction of a verge bond system may provide some opportunity for the Town to improve its controls over damage occurring to infrastructure assets occurring through private building and demolition activities. However, there are significant drawbacks to the operation of a verge bond system in the difficulty of proof of damage and the extra administrative burden placed on the Town, which can only be funded through additional fees (and bonds). The difficulty of running successful verge bond operations is also highlighted by the results indicated by other local governments on their systems. Combined with the extra administration and costs for building and demolition companies and property owners for verge bond requirements; together with the added comfort of the existing bonding arrangements in place for subdivisions and major developments, as well as the practices of utility providers; the Town does not recommend the introduction of such a system.
22. An alternative system may be available to the Town where verge bonds themselves are not taken and only a formal inspection and reporting system for building and demolition activity is introduced. While this may marginally reduce the administration and costs under the system, this would still require additional resources and extra fees to fund the roles. It is also subject to the same drawbacks as already noted and is not recommended for introduction.
23. While the introduction of a verge bond system is not recommended, it is acknowledged that the levels of damage to the infrastructure assets from building and demolition activity is likely to be higher than indicated from the review of costs proven to be involved. Therefore, it is also recommended that potential damage costs arising from private building and demolition activity be documented on a more formal basis, for consideration if necessary. The documentation should also consider high value assets, such as significant trees, which have not been specifically addressed in this report, but can be considered as a separate aspect.
24. Officers investigated what compliance officers have done in other Local Governments in respect of the effectiveness of a verge bonds systems and have received mixed messages from the various Councils contacted. In summary, the two main opposing conclusions are:
    a. The verge bond system seems to have encouraged contractors to be more careful when undertaking works affecting the road and verge. It is thought that if the bond system is not in place, there may have been more damage done by contractors. So, the staff time spent on managing the verge bond system is worth it. Unfortunately, there is no evidence made available to the Town to verify this claim.

b. The verge bond system takes up a lot of officer time to manage. The bond administration fee received was only enough to cover the cost of administration and not the cost associated with site inspections and meetings with contractors. Hence the verge bond system does not seem to be worthwhile

c. Note that most of the damage caused to the Town's assets were due to works undertaken by public utility service providers (Western Power, Water Corporations, etc) and these organisations and their contractors have generally been quite professional in undertaking reinstatement works associated with council assets especially if prompted by compliance officers.

25. There does not seem to be any major difference between the processes of the various councils. However, the way that each council interacted with contractors seems to have produced different outcomes. The councils that seem to find it easy to manage the verge bond system would basically stop pursuing with penalising the suspected contractors who dared to continue to challenge the findings of the compliance officers. These councils would generally treat these cases as either being inclusive or lacking key evidence. It is noted that there is a higher chance of owner builders challenging the compliance officers while contractors were keener to part with the bond money or charge the lot owners to undertake the repairs. There is also a tendency that those compliance officers with lesser experience are more likely to perceive the system effective while those officers with many years of experience tend to be less enthusiastic about the system.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

Further consideration

26. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.

27. Information on cost of installing cameras at building sites for an extended period of time and storing data.

Officers have received a preliminary cost indication of $32/day for the hire of CCTV (Site Sentry) cameras for site observation. This is based upon a minimum three-month hire period. Setup costs of approximately $1,000 will also need to be factored in for each installation. Costs for damage will be covered in the daily rate, however, substantial extra costs will be incurred for officer time in reviewing footage etc. At this stage the costs of storing data have not been determined. For a six-month hire period at a single location, this equates to approximately $7,000, excluding data retrieval and review. Note that if the home construction works continued for a period of 18 months to 3 years, the total hiring cost has been estimated to be between $17,500 and $35,000.

Other considerations also come into play. Cameras may not be able to capture the verge area on the far side of vehicles crossing the verge; night vision may be impacted by low resolution; and the formation of cracks on footpaths and kerbs as heavy vehicles mount over them are not always possible to be captured due to the distance and angle of the camera mounting.

Without the relevant local laws enacted, the Town's current building application processes do not have the ability to impose conditions to charge the abovementioned non-refundable costs to the affected lead builder or contractor. From experience, it is likely that any such charge incurred by the builder/contractor would be passed on to the lot owner or developer even though this charge is intended to mitigate the builder's/contractor's actions.

Based on the costs of operation and monitoring, together with the other factors as noted, it is not considered worthwhile to engage CCTV cameras to monitor building construction and demolition activities.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (80/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Mayor Karen Vernon

That Council:

1. Notes the findings associated with the potential introduction of a verge bond system.
2. Endorses the Town's preference that no verge bond system be introduced.
3. Endorses the Chief Executive Officer to put in place a more formal mechanism to detail and report on damage to infrastructure which may have occurred due to building or demolition activity for future consideration.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13.3 Proposed disposal of office space at Aqualife by way of lease

Location	East Victoria Park
Reporting officer	Senior Property Development and Leasing Officer
Responsible officer	Chief Operations Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice to invite expressions of interest for the disposal of a 25m² suite for a period of up to five years within the Aqualife Aquatic Centre at 42 Somerset Street, East Victoria Park by way of a lease, with criteria to include that the Town seeks a service provider, community or sporting organisation that would compliment the services provided by the Town at the Aqualife Aquatic Centre.
2. Notes that in the event that a preferred proponent is selected by the Council, it will then be necessary for the proposed lease to be advertised and to comply with the requirements of section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider advertising an invitation for expressions of interest for the disposition of a suite within the Aqualife Aquatic Centre by way of a lease.

In brief

- The Town is the freehold owner of 42 Somerset Street, East Victoria Park on which the Aqualife Aquatic Centre is located.
- A 25m² suite within the Aqualife Aquatic Centre has become available for lease.
- Policy 310 Leasing provides standard tenure guidelines for lease agreements.
- A local government may dispose of a property by way of a lease in accordance with section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- This item recommends Council approve the advertising to invite expressions of interest from the public and subsequently enable officers to present submissions and make a recommendation to Council for the lease disposition of the 25m² office space within the Aqualife Aquatic Centre.

Background

1. The legal description of the land that the Aqualife Aquatic Centre is situated on is Lot 331 on Plan 63589 Certificate of Title Volume 2798 Folio 118. The land is reserved Parks and Recreation under the local Town Planning Scheme No. 1.
2. The Aqualife Aquatic Centre provides a range of recreational spaces and related services. The space available for lease disposal is a 25m² suite located near the entrance of the Centre.
3. The suite was previously used as an office for the Centre's swim school staff. However, it is no longer required for this purpose. There was no previous generation of income from this space.

4. The Town has received enquiries from members of the community interested in operating a business from the subject suite.
5. Policy 310 Leasing aims to balance appropriate management and responsible use of the Town's facilities for the benefit of the community and ensures managed properties are appropriately maintained. Well maintained and managed property assets present a significant benefit to the Council and the community. Any new lease, either for a commercial operator or community group, will be subject to the standard tenure guidelines contained within this policy.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	A lease will deliver a financially sustainable ongoing outcome for the Town's ratepayers.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC01 - A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment, and entrepreneurship.	The objective of a lease will be to deliver a space for commerce, employment, and entrepreneurship.
EC02 - A clean, safe, and accessible place to visit.	Community services will be available within a clean, safe and accessible environment.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN05 - Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed.	Vacant properties within the Town can attract anti-social activities and may accelerate the deterioration of the asset. The Town will assess the suite for possible maintenance defects and ensure that the asset will be able to continue to provide sustainable benefits to the Town.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	A lease will deliver potential to engage with service providers able to increase individual and community well-being.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Property Development and Leasing Manager	Comments included in report.

Manager Community	The Town's recently completed Social Needs Analysis Study identified gaps in local service provision for a number of areas that could potentially be filled by organisations aligning with this location / service delivery outcome / allowable uses of the land. Consideration to include these focus areas into the EOI process would be of benefit, once assessed and determined as appropriate.
Leisure Facilities Program Manager	Consideration given to the lease of the space to a service provider, community or sporting organisation that would complement and enhance the experience of customers at the Aqualife Aquatic Centre.
Manager Development Services	The Parks and Recreation reservation applying to the land is limiting in terms of the allowable uses of the land. Uses considered to be complementary to the services provided by the Town at Aqualife, would be favourably considered.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Businesses, Residents, Community Groups and Not-for-profit associations
Period of engagement	2 weeks estimated at this stage to be from 20 April 2022 to 6 May 2022 (inclusive)
Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Written Submissions
Advertising	Newspaper advertisement, Town website, Public Notice Boards.
Submission summary	N/A - Not yet advertised
Key findings	N/A - Not yet advertised

Legal compliance

Section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Failure of Lessee to meet rent payment obligation.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	Treat risk by taking debt recovery action to recover outstanding rent.
Environmental	Not applicable.					

Health and safety	Not applicable.					
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.					
Legislative compliance	Failure to comply with s3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	Treat risk by following the disposal of property process in accordance with s3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
Reputation	Not applicable.					
Service Delivery	Failure to secure a suitable Lessee to meet community expectations.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	Treat risk by securing a suitable Lessee to ensure service provision for the community.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Income – An annual rental will be sought of between $4,160.00 to $5,200.00 per annum, including outgoings, excluding utility charges plus GST. The rent will increase on a yearly basis in accordance with the rate of CPI (All Groups).

Analysis

6. The suite is located within the main lobby of the Aqualife Aquatic Centre adjacent to the main entry and reception area. The room gains entry off the lobby via an aluminium framed and glazed entry and has a full-height aluminium shop front gaining exposure to patrons visiting the Aquatic Centre.
7. The suite is irregular in shape (rhomboid) with a total area of approximately 25m^2. It has a tiled floor with plastered walls and suspended acoustic ceiling on T-bar flanges fitted with fluorescent light fittings and fitted with a split air conditioning unit. The suite offers a good standard of accommodation.
8. The Leasing Management Practice notes this premises is being held by the Town for community purposes and may be considered for utilisation by not-for-profit associations, community groups, sporting clubs and commercial operators in accordance with Policy 310 Leasing.
9. Policy 310 Leasing sets guidelines for leasing of exclusive use of a property subject to a redevelopment clause which reserves the Town's right to terminate the lease at any time on 6 months' notice. The setting of rent will be based on a market rental valuation assessment determined by a licensed Valuer. A lessee is responsible for preventive maintenance costs and the payment of any rates, fees, utility costs and outgoings (if applicable).

10. A market rental valuation assessment undertaken on the 22 February 2022 determined a fair market rental of between $4,160.00 to $5,200.00 per annum, including outgoings, excluding utility charges, plus GST.
11. The valuation analysis recognises the quality and size of the amenity provided, the location within a community leisure complex and the location away from a commercial hub. The valuation noted the nature of the premises, which is a community Aquatic Centre without the tenancies having any individual identity and generally not being able to attract normal commercial tenants who require a commercial image to appeal to their particular customer base.
12. The Town is bound by specific conditions under the *Local Government Act 1995* with regard to the disposal of property. Section 3.58 of the Act enables a local government to dispose of a property to the highest bidder at a public auction, by way of a public tender process or by giving local public notice of the proposed disposition and following the public consultation process as prescribed by sub-section section 3.58(3) of the Act. In this context, disposing of property means to 'sell, lease or otherwise dispose of, whether absolutely or not'.
13. The recommendation proposes advertising to invite expressions of interest from the public for the disposal of the suite by way of a lease. This process may result in a number of expressions of interest and an opportunity for the Council to select a preferred proponent that will provide services that will enhance or compliment the services provided within the Centre.
14. Should Council support the officer recommendation, expressions of interest will be invited by advertisement. The selection of a preferred proponent would require a further report, and a recommendation will be presented to Council for consideration. Following a Council approval, a lease disposal under section 3.58(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* may be progressed by way of local public notice.
15. Local public notice will require a description of the property concerned, details of the proposed disposition and an invitation for expressions of interest to be made before a date to be specified in the notice, being not less than 2 weeks after the notice is first given. Submissions received during the notice period must be considered by Council and the resulting decision recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the decision is made.

Relevant documents

Policy 310 - Leasing

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (66/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice to invite expressions of interest for the disposal of a 25m² suite for a period of up to five years within the Aqualife Aquatic Centre at 42 Somerset Street, East Victoria Park by way of a lease, with criteria to include that the Town seeks a service provider, community or sporting organisation that would compliment the services provided by the Town at the Aqualife Aquatic Centre.
2. Notes that in the event that a preferred proponent is selected by the Council, it will then be necessary for the proposed lease to be advertised and to comply with the requirements of section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13.4 Proposed disposal of cafe spaces at Leisurelife and Aqualife by way of lease

Location	East Victoria Park
Reporting officer	Senior Property Development and Leasing Officer
Responsible officer	Chief Operations Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. CONFIDENTIAL REDACTED - Submitter 1 [**13.4.1** - 1 page] 2. CONFIDENTIAL REDACTED - Submitter 2 [**13.4.2** - 2 pages]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the outcomes of the notice to invite public submissions on the proposal to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease for a social enterprise to operate from the premises under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy, subsection Operating subsidy.
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to readvertise by public notice of the intention to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease to the public at large pursuant to section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995,* with criteria to include that the Town seeks a service provider, community or sporting organisation that would complement the services provided by the Town at the Leisurelife Recreation Centre and Aqualife Aquatic Centre.
3. Authorises the Council to consider all submissions and select the preferred proponent/s for the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café.

Purpose

To present all submissions to Council following the public notice period of the intention to dispose of the Leisurelife and Aqualife Café by lease to a social enterprise to allow Council to consider and select the preferred proponent.

In brief

- Historically the Town operated the cafes at Aqualife and Leisurelife. The café services operated at an annual loss of approximately $50,000. This led to a Council endorsed decision to test the market for interest in leasing the café facilities, resulting in the appointment of Hospitality Industry Service Providers Pty Ltd (HISP). Notwithstanding continuous efforts, HISP were not able to meet projected sales targets from both Café locations and subsequently rendered their business operations at these locations unviable after operating at a loss.
- Council, at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 21 April 2020 accepted the surrender of lease effective 31 March 2020 for both the Leisurelife Café lease and Aqualife Café lease.
- At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 21 April 2020, the Council also resolved to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice within the next 12-24 months of the intention to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease for a social enterprise to operate from the premises under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy, subsection Operating subsidy.

- Policy 114 Community Funding Policy defines a social enterprise (also referred to as business) as:
  a. A small business that is led by an economic, social, cultural or environmental mission consistent with a public or community benefit.
  b. Derive a substantial portion of their income from trade.
  c. Reinvest the majority of their profits/surplus in the fulfilment of their mission.
- The Town advertised by public notice pursuant to section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995* to invite expressions of interest for the disposal of the Aqualife Café and Leisurelife Café to a social enterprise by way of a lease.
- Two submissions were received during the public submission period which closed on 4 March 2022. Both submissions do not evidence qualification as a social enterprise under the definition of a social enterprise within Policy 114 Community Funding Policy.
- This item recommends Council approve readvertising both Café spaces to the open market and invite submissions from the public at large in accordance with section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Background

1. The Aqualife and Leisurelife facilities provide a range of community recreational spaces and related services. The facilities include two cafe spaces:
   a. Aqualife Café - Fully equipped 60m^2 café facility with all kitchen facilities and a servery onto the public seating area adjacent to the indoor pool area.
   b. Leisurelife Café - Fully equipped 24m^2 café facility with kitchen facilities and a servery onto the public seating area adjacent to the basketball arena.
   c. Until 31 March 2020 the Aqualife Café and Leisurelife Café were both leased to HISP, a commercial operator who requested a surrender of lease to effect the premature termination of their lease contracts due to the inability to operate at a profit.
2. Council, at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 21 April 2020 accepted the surrender of lease effective 31 March 2020 for both the Leisurelife Café lease and Aqualife Café lease and authorised the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice within the next 12-24 months of the intention to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease for a social enterprise to operate from the premises under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy, subsection Operating subsidy.
3. A social enterprise is a hybrid business model which joins the social purpose traditionally associated with the not-for-profit sector, with the economic rationality and market based approach traditionally associated with for-profit firms to drive social and/or environmental change. In addition to raising revenue through product sales, social enterprises have the capacity to leverage a range of funding sources, including philanthropic funding, grant funding, donations etc, which can help ensure financial viability and sustainability.
4. Prior to HISP leasing the café spaces, the Town was approached by the Perth Basketball Association Inc (Perth Redbacks). To ensure a service could continue to be provided after the café spaces were vacated, the Town approached the Perth Redbacks to see if they were still interested in a casual hire arrangement until the café spaces were advertised for a social enterprise. The Perth Redbacks initially tried both café spaces however ceased to operate the Aqualife Café soon after due to it not being a viable business option for them.
5. To test the market in the lease opportunities within the facilities, the Town advertised by public notice pursuant to section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995 to invite expressions of interest for the disposal of the Aqualife Café and Leisurelife Café to a social enterprise by way of a lease.

Strategic alignment

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	Café facilities will be available within a clean, safe and accessible environment.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN05 - Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed.	The café spaces are in compliance with EN05 and any new tenant will be required to maintain the cafes at a high standard to the benefit of community members who visit the facilities.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S03 - An empowered community with a sense of pride, safety and belonging.	Empower people facing barriers to inclusion and upwards social mobility through meaningful employment opportunities which provide hands on experience and training within the hospitality industry.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Property Development and Leasing Manager	Comments are incorporated in the report.
Leisure Facilities Program Manager	The café space at Leisurelife is currently operating under a casual hire arrangement with the Perth Redbacks Basketball Association. This arrangement is working reasonably well for both parties predominantly due to alignment of core programs. The Redbacks briefly operated the Aqualife Café space under the same arrangement without success. The provision of food and beverage is an important part of the Leisure facilities experience and we feel that a longer-term arrangement would be beneficial for the Town. Selection criteria must stipulate that any proponent would align to our core values, programs and services.
Manager Community	Support the rationale that the applicants for the EOI do not meet the definition of a social enterprise, as per Policy 114. Due to the nature and general funding model of social enterprises, it can be difficult to succeed in such an enterprise / location without substantial start up assistance and or resources. Opening a future EOI to the wider market will likely increase the range of businesses suitable for the locations in question, with social enterprises still able to submit an EOI.

Manager Development Services	The continued use of the spaces as a café is acceptable from a planning perspective. The Parks and Recreation reservation applying to the land is limiting in terms of the allowable uses of the land. Uses considered to be complimentary to the services provided by the Town at the centres, would be favorably considered.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Social Enterprises
Period of engagement	12 February 2022 to 4 March 2022
Level of engagement	Consult
Methods of engagement	Written submissions accepted.
Advertising	Notification on public notice boards, Town website and the West Australian newspaper notice.
Submission summary	Two submissions received.
Key findings	Two submissions do not qualify as an eligible social enterprise.

Legal compliance

Section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Leaving the café spaces vacant would result in revenue loss for the Town.	Moderate	Almost Certain	High	Low	TREAT risk by making the café spaces available for ongoing hire.
Environmental	Not applicable.					
Health and safety	Not applicable.					
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.					
Legislative	Not applicable.					

compliance						
Reputation	Not applicable.					
Service delivery	Failure to secure a suitable operator to meet community expectations.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by securing a suitable operator to ensure service provision for the community.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	• The Town currently does not receive any revenue from the Aqualife café as this space has remained vacant. • The Town currently receives approximately $3,500 per annum in revenue from the Perth Redbacks via hire fees for the Leisurelife cafe. • Should Council accept the recommendation, the revenue for this financial year will be adjusted as required.
Future budget impact	• Given the limited permissible land uses, lack of exposure to passing trade and history of unviable business operations and the current rental demand and supply situation in the market, we are limiting revenue forecast to the $3,500 per annum which we are currently receiving.

Analysis

6. Advertising the proposal to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease for a social enterprise to operate from the premises under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy, subsection Operating subsidy has been undertaken in accordance with section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995. Notice of the proposed disposition was published in the West Australian newspaper, on the Towns website and at the Town of Victoria Park Library and Administration Centre notice boards on the 12 February 2022. The expression of interest submission period was open for 21 days.
7. Two submissions were received during the submission period. Both submissions have expressed an interest in leasing the Leisurelife Café space however, for the reasons set out below, they do not evidence compliance with social enterprise criteria under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy.

Submission	Summary	Officer Response
1. Submitter 1	Submitter is a commercial operator who asserts extensive experience within the hospitality industry. Proposes a quality service focusing on: • house made products; • tailored products to suit the demographic and individual needs e.g. gluten free;	Submitter 1 does not evidence compliance with social enterprise criteria and therefore does not meet the requirements contained within Policy 114 Community Funding Policy.

	• classic lines; • coffee and beverages; • a retail vibe through the sale of coffee beans and to-go cups; • a catering service; and • local suppliers	
2. Submitter 2	Submitter is a not-for-profit sporting association who currently occupy the Leisurelife café under a casual hire arrangement, submission offers to provide a café service managed by a dedicated and experienced canteen manager for specific days, these being Saturday, Sunday and Special event days. They would like to continue to operate the café based on their current arrangement or a comparable arrangement that meets the objectives of the Town.	Submitter 2's offering is a limited one based on their current (Leisurelife only) casual hire arrangement or a comparable arrangement. The Town's Leisure Facilities assess that the provision of food and beverage is an important part of the Leisure facilities experience and a longer-term arrangement would be beneficial for the Town. Submitter 2 is a not for profit and displays some characteristics of a social enterprise but hasn't evidenced all of the characteristics contained within the definition of a social enterprise under the terms of the Policy 114 Community Funding Policy.

8. Submitter 1 and Submitter 2 do not qualify as a social enterprise under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy due to lack of evidence and insufficient evidence, respectively. The Policy definition states:

   "A social enterprise (also referred to as business) means;

   a. A small business that is led by an economic, social, cultural or environmental mission consistent with a public or community benefit

   b. Derive a substantial portion of their income from trade

   c. Reinvest the majority of their profits/surplus in the fulfilment of their mission."

9. The cafés predominantly offer a community facility as a service to users of the leisure centre. Historically, they have not been able to function as a viable commercial operation due to the lack of a continuous flow of patrons other than perhaps weekends and evenings when the facilities are being utilised. Considering the cafes are located within community leisure centres without the tenancies having any individual identity, it is generally difficult to attract tenants who require a commercial or other trading image to appeal to their particular customer base.

10. The Leasing Management Practice notes these cafes are held for community purposes and may be considered for utilisation by not-for-profit associations, community groups, sporting clubs and commercial operators subject to either a lease, licence or facility hire agreement. Generally, tenure is granted on the basis of a lease where the intention is to grant exclusive possession of the property or part of the property.

11. The officer recommendation supports readvertising the café spaces in the open market to the public at large in order to invite submissions from commercial operators, sporting clubs, not-for-profit associations, community groups and individuals under a lease arrangement with a view to providing the Council with an opportunity to select the best proponent for the community. In the meantime, it is envisaged that the existing casual hire arrangement for the Leisurelife café will continue.
12. A local government may dispose of property by way of a lease provided it gives local public notice, and it considers any submissions made to it before the date specified in the notice in accordance with section 3.58(3) of the Local Government Act 1995.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (67/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Notes the outcomes of the notice to invite public submissions on the proposal to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease for a social enterprise to operate from the premises under Policy 114 Community Funding Policy, subsection Operating subsidy.
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to readvertise by public notice of the intention to dispose of the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café by lease to the public at large pursuant to section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995,* with criteria to include that the Town seeks a service provider, community or sporting organisation that would complement the services provided by the Town at the Leisurelife Recreation Centre and Aqualife Aquatic Centre.
3. Authorises the Council to consider all submissions and select the preferred proponent/s for the Leisurelife Café and Aqualife Café.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13.5 Proposed disposal of 10 Kent Street by way of lease or licence

Location	East Victoria Park
Reporting officer	Senior Property Development and Leasing Officer
Responsible officer	Manager Property Development and Leasing
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. CONFIDENTIAL - VPCA Proposal to occupy 10 Kent Street under a co-share arrangement [**13.5.1** - 1 page]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice to invite expressions of interest for the disposal to 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park for a period up to five years by way of a lease, or for a period up to 3 years by way of a licence.
2. That the selection criteria include a requirement for a use that the Council is satisfied is within the definition of "community purpose" under Town Planning Scheme No. 1.
3. Notes that in the event a preferred proponent is selected by Council to lease the property, it will then be necessary for the proposed lease to be advertised and comply with the requirements of section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider adverting an invitation for expressions of interest for the disposition of 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park by way of a lease or licence.

In brief

- The Town is the freehold owner of 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park.
- 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park, has recently been renovated and is now available for lease or licence.
- Policy 310 Leasing provides standard tenure guidelines for lease and licence agreements.
- A local government may dispose of a property by way of a lease in accordance with section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- This item recommends Council approve the advertising to invite expressions of interest from the public and enable officers to present submissions and make a recommendation to Council for the lease or licence of 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park.

Background

0. The legal description of the land for 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park is Lot 10 on Plan 1954 Certificate of Title Volume 46 Folio 394A. The land is reserved Parks and Recreation under the local Planning Scheme 1.
1. 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park comprises of land and a recently refurbished brick and iron residence located in between the Town of Victoria Park Rangers and Parking Office and Victoria Park Centre for the Arts. Parking for two vehicles can be accommodated onsite, with timed street parking available along Kent Street.

2. The property was previously used as an office by Communicare, a not-for-profit organisation who were paying market rental of $28,325 per annum excluding GST and outgoings. Communicare was along standing tenant that vacated the premises on 15 March 2019 due to the government contract to provide Jobactive and Work for the Dole programs having been terminated early. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 16 July 2019, the Council resolved to approve an early surrender of lease effective 30 June 2019.
3. Since being vacated, the property has been refurbished, including disability access and building code compliance works. The rear of the property which includes a large storage building at the rear of the property has been excised and retained for use by the Town.
4. The Town has recently received a proposal from Victoria Park Centre for the Arts (VPCA) who are seeking Council consideration and approval for a shared licence arrangement at 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park, as a short term measure to address issues of administrational overcrowding at 12 Kent Street, East Victoria Park. Their preferred term is until 30 June 2024, with view to securing a more permanent arrangement nearby.
5. VPCA are a well established local community arts and culture centre who encourage, stimulate and promote local arts and cultural activities for a variety of established and emerging artists of all persuasions. Their mission is to improve the quality of community life through increased participation in the arts and celebrate cultural diversity. Their vision is to be a vibrant and energetic art centre, fostering a community that embraces the arts as part of daily life.
6. VPCA has also advised they have a memorandum of understanding and formal interest in co-sharing with another local community group who are looking for meeting, storage and office space, the local community group being United in Diversity (UID).
7. UID is a Western Australian not-for-profit organisation. Their vision is to ensure Western Australian residents from all backgrounds and ability levels have the information, skills and networks to integrate, contribute and find belonging in their local community.
8. Policy 310 Leasing aims to balance appropriate management and responsible use of the Town's facilities for the benefit of the community and ensures managed properties are appropriately maintained. Well maintained and managed property assets present a significant benefit to the Council and the community. Any new lease, either for a commercial operator or community group, will be subject to the standard tenure guidelines contained within this Policy.
9. 10 Kent Street is within a Local Scheme Reserve for Parks and Recreation purposes. A use that is within the definition of "community purpose" under Town Planning Scheme No. 1 can be considered.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	A lease will deliver a financially sustainable ongoing outcome for the Towns ratepayers.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC01 - A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment and entrepreneurship.	The objective for a lease or licence will deliver a space for commerce, employment and entrepreneurship.
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	Community services will be available within a clean,

	safe and accessible environment.

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN05 - Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed.	Vacant properties within the Town can attract anti-social activities and may accelerate the deterioration of the asset. The Asset Management Plan for the building will ensure that the asset will be able to continue to provide sustainable benefits to the Town.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	A lease or licence will deliver potential to engage with service providers able to increase individual and community well being.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Property Development and Leasing Manager	Comments are within the body of the report.
Manager Community	The use of 10 Kent Street / the surrounding precinct for arts and cultural related activities is consistent with several of the Town's strategic documents, including the Macmillan Precinct Plan, Arts and Culture Plan, Social Infrastructure Plan, draft Social Infrastructure Strategy, Social Needs Analysis Study, and Maker Space report. The Victoria Park Centre for the Arts currently receives an Operating Subsidy from the Town ($104,000 p.a. plus CPI) to provide arts and cultural activities from 12 Kent Street. Conversations have been held with the group regarding the request to secure additional premises to enable their endeavours to be further enhanced. There may be limited capacity for this group to contribute market rent for the use of 10 Kent Street. Application via an open EOI with a focus on arts and culture would enable the most suitable use to be considered that aligns with the intent of the precinct as identified in the above plans / strategies.
Manager Development Services	Notwithstanding the land being reserved 'Parks and Recreation, historically, the building has been allowed to be used for activities that benefit the community. Accordingly, it is considered that a use that falls within the definition of "community purpose" under Town Planning Scheme No. 1 is an acceptable use for the site.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Businesses, Residents, Community Groups and Not-for-profit associations.
Period of engagement	2 weeks estimated at this stage to be from 20 April 2022 to 6 May (inclusive)
Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Written Submissions
Advertising	Newspaper advertisement, Town website, Public Notice Boards.
Submission summary	N/A - Not yet advertised
Key findings	N/A - Not yet advertised

Legal compliance

Section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Failure of Lessee to meet rent payment obligation.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	Treat risk by taking debt recovery action to recover outstanding rent.
Environmental	Not Applicable					
Health and safety	Not Applicable					
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not Applicable					
Legislative compliance	Failure to comply with s3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	Treat risk by following the disposal of property process in accordance with s3.58 of the Local Government Act.

Reputation	Not Applicable					
Service delivery	Failure to secure a suitable Tenant to meet community expectations.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	Treat risk by securing a suitable Lessee to ensure service provision for the community.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Income – expressions of interest may attract an offer from a tenant willing to pay a market related rental. The market related rental has been assessed as $18,000 per annum. If the Town accepts such an offer then an annual rental will be realised.

Analysis

10. 10 Kent Street is located within the locality of East Victoria Park, which is situated approximately 4kms east of the Perth CBD, with Albany Highway being the major thoroughfare serving the area connecting through to the city via Graham Farmer Freeway. The property is located within close proximity to the Albany Hiway commercial strip and benefits from the ability to access all major services and the retail commercial facilities, including the Park Shopping Centre and well as recreational facilities, including Leisurelife Recreation Centre.
11. The improvements comprise a 110m^2 character style, rendered brick and iron residence that has been converted to an office with a side carport and has undergone renovation.
12. 10 Kent Street is a Local Scheme Reserve for Parks and Recreation purposes. Noting the historical use of the site by organisations that provides services that benefit the community, it is considered that a use that is within the definition of "community purpose" under TPS 1 can continue to operate on the site. TPS 1 defines "community purpose" as "means premises designed or adapted primarily for the provision of educational, social or recreational facilities or services by organisations involved in activities for community benefit".
13. The Leasing Management Practice notes this premises is being held by the Town for community purposes and may be considered for utilisation by not-for-profit associations, community groups, sporting clubs and commercial operators in accordance with Policy 310 Leasing.
14. Policy 310 Leasing sets guidelines for leasing of exclusive use of a property and licensing of non-exclusive use of a property subject to a redevelopment clause which reserves the Town's rights to terminate the lease at any time on 6 months' notice. The setting of rent for a lease will be based on a market rental valuation assessment determined by a licensed Valuer. A lessee is responsible for non-structural maintenance, preventative maintenance and the payment of rates, fees, utility costs and outgoings (if applicable), whilst a licensee is responsible for the payment of an annual licence fee and utility costs (if applicable).
15. A market rental valuation assessment was undertaken on 23 November 2021 determined a fair market rental of $18,000 per annum, excluding outgoings and GST.

16. The valuation analysis considered the current Parks and Recreation reservation and was based on the following comparable evidence:
    a. the asking rentals of homes converted to general office space for commercial or community use;
    b. the levels of rental being achieved for converted homes in similar comparable locations throughout the metropolitan area;
    c. the current market conditions and economic climate; and
    d. The overall size, location and quality of the premises when achieving an achievable rental.
17. The Town is bound by specific conditions under the *Local Government Act 1995* with regard to the disposal of property. Section 3.58 of the Act enables a local government to dispose of a property to the highest bidder at a public auction, by way of a public tender process or by giving local public notice of the proposed disposition and following the public consultation process as prescribed by sub-section section 3.58 (3) of the Act. In this context, disposing of property means to 'sell, lease or otherwise dispose of, whether absolutely or not'.
18. The recommendation proposes advertising to invite expressions of interest from the public for the disposal of 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park by way of a lease or licence. This proposal may result in a number of expressions of interest and an opportunity for the Council to select a preferred proponent that will provide services for the benefit of the community.
19. Should Council support the officer recommendation, expressions of interest will be invited by advertisement. The selection of a preferred proponent would require a further report, and a recommendation will be presented to Council for consideration. Following a Council approval, a lease disposal under section 3.58(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995* may be progressed by way of local public notice.
20. Local public notice will require a description of the property concerned, details of the proposed disposition and an invitation for expressions of interest to be made before a date to be specified in the notice, being not less than 2 weeks after the notice is first given. Submissions received during the notice period must be considered by Council and the resulting decision recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the decision is made.

Relevant documents

Policy 310 - Leasing

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (68/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to advertise by public notice to invite expressions of interest for the disposal to 10 Kent Street, East Victoria Park for a period up to five years by way of a lease, or for a period up to 3 years by way of a licence.
2. That the selection criteria include a requirement for a use that the Council is satisfied is within the definition of "community purpose" under Town Planning Scheme No. 1.
3. Notes that in the event a preferred proponent is selected by Council to lease the property, it will then be necessary for the proposed lease to be advertised and comply with the requirements of section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

13.6 Teague Street Traffic Safety Investigation

Location	Burswood
Reporting officer	Design Engineer
Responsible officer	Chief Operations Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the outcome of the initial traffic data evaluation undertaken which does not support the provision of traffic calming treatments.
2. Does not recommend Teague Street (between Harper St and Harvey St) be prioritised for physical traffic calming treatments.

Purpose

To present the Town's response to Resolution 13, which was passed at the Annual Meeting of Electors on 28 July 2021. Resolution 13 states the following:

> *That Council investigate and implement a traffic calming treatment on Teague St, between Harper St and Harvey St, Burswood.*

In brief

- The Council-endorsed Traffic Warrant System has denoted this section of Teague St as a site with low safety and amenity concerns.
- This is mainly due to the recently surveyed average speed and recorded crash history.
- The Town prioritises streets and intersections with higher crash rates and speeding issues.
- The Town will continue to monitor traffic speed at this location. However, at this stage, there are no plans to implement traffic calming at this location.

Background

1. This section of Teague St is classified as an "Access Road". The predominant purpose of an Access Road is to provide access to abutting properties with amenity, safety and aesthetic aspects having priority over the vehicle movement function. These roads are bicycle and pedestrian friendly.
2. This section of Teague St carries approximately 986 vehicles per day. The carriageway is 7.5m wide and contains a vertical crest curve. On-street parking is predominately restricted on the northside of Teague St. Available on-street parking for approximately 6 cars is located mid-block between Harvey St and Hampton St. These parking bays are not time restricted.
3. A study of the recent crash history has been conducted between Harvey St and Harper St. This showed that there were four reported crashes within the extracted data for the five-year period to the end of December 2021. This is summarised below:
   - One property damage minor crash related to maneuvering out of parking;
   - One property damage minor crash related to maneuvering out of a driveway;

- One property damage major “thru right” crash at the intersection of Teague St and Clydesdale St;
- One medical “thru thru” crash at the intersection of Teague St and Harper St.

4. A summary of speed and volume data is provided in the table below. The posted speed limit for this section of Teague St is 50km/h. There is also a 40km school zone that begins/ ends just south of Clydesdale St.

Teague St	2013	2016	2022
Harvey St & Hampton St	45.0 (85th) 1334.6 (AWT)	49.3 (85th) 1053 (AWT)	43.0 (85th) 879.8 (AWT)
Hampton St & Clydesdale St	NA	NA	43.7 (85th) 985.8 (AWT)

*AWT (Average Weekday Traffic)

Strategic alignment

Environment	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EN02 - A safe, interconnected and well-maintained transport network that makes it easy for everyone to get around.	Monitor traffic speeds and intervene when it is warranted.
EN03 - A place with sustainable, safe and convenient transport options for everyone.	Target high crash locations through state funded road safety programs.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Street Improvement	Provided technical support.
Place Planning	Comments.

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council’s risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	NA				Low	
Environmental	NA				Medium	
Health and	NA				Low	

safety						
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	NA				Medium	
Legislative compliance	NA				Low	
Reputation	Negative reputation due to the Town not undertaking works at this location.	Minor	Unlikely	Low	Low	Refer to priority projects that have far greater speed issues and verifiable crash trends.
Service delivery	NA				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	As no physical road works are proposed, there is no current impact on the capital works budget.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

5. The existing layout of the street is quite narrow, especially where on-street parking is available. The street is also restricted in terms of vision due to the crest curve. These two factors require drivers to be more alert, perceptive, and prudent. This results in cars driving more slowly and carefully because the rules of the road are ambiguous.
6. From a comparative review of traffic volumes from 2013 to 2022. The data indicates that traffic volumes have reduced. This is considered unusual for typical urban growth rates. However, it could be correlated to intersection changes along Great Eastern Hwy. It should be noted that this section of Teague St is impacted by school peak time traffic generated by Ursula Frayne Catholic College.
7. A review of crash data along this section of Teague St does not indicate any crash trends that require priority.
8. The traffic data indicates traffic speed has fluctuated from a low of 43.0 to 49.3km/h. Hence, traffic speed is not currently considered an issue along this section of Teague St. It is not to say that illegal driving does not occur. However, most drivers are travelling below the posted speed limit.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (69/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Notes the outcome of the initial traffic data evaluation undertaken which does not support the provision of traffic calming treatments.
2. Does not recommend Teague Street (between Harper St and Harvey St) be prioritised for physical traffic calming treatments.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

14 Chief Financial Officer reports

14.1 Financial Statements - February 2022

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Finance Manager
Responsible officer	Chief Financial Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Financial Statements - February 2022 [**14.1.1** - 43 pages]

Recommendation

That Council accepts the Financial Statements – February 2022, as attached.

Purpose

To present the statement of financial activity reporting on the revenue and expenditure for the period ended 28 February 2022.

In brief

- The financial activity statement report is presented for the month ending 28 February 2022.
- The report complies with the requirements of Regulation 34 (financial activity statement report) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.
- The financial information as shown in this report does not include a number of end-of-financial year adjustments that are still yet to occur, as well as the final approval by the Auditor. The figures stated should therefore not be taken as the Town's final financial position for the period ended [date].

Background

1. Regulation 34 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* states that each month, officers are required to prepare monthly financial reports covering prescribed information, and present these to Council for acceptance. Number all paragraphs from here on, not including tables.
2. As part of the monthly financial reports, material variances are reported. Thresholds are set by Council and are as follows:

   Revenue
   Operating revenue and non-operating revenue – material variances are identified where, for the period being reported, the actual varies to the budget by an amount of (+) or (-) $25,000 and, in these instances, an explanatory comment has been provided.

   Expense
   Operating expense, capital expense and non-operating expense – material variances are identified where, for the period being reported, the actual varies to the budget by an amount of (+) or (-) $25,000 and in these instances, an explanatory comment has been provided.

3. For the purposes of explaining each material variance, a three-part approach has been applied. The parts are:

Period variation
Relates specifically to the value of the variance between the budget and actual figures for the period of the report.

Primary reason(s)
Explains the primary reason(s) for the period variance. Minor contributing factors are not reported.

End-of-year budget impact
Forecasts the likely financial impact on the end-of-year financial position. It is important to note that figures in this part are 'indicative only' at the time of reporting and may subsequently change prior to the end of the financial year.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	To make available timely and relevant information on the financial position and performance of the Town so that Council and public can make informed decisions for the future.
CL10 - Legislative responsibilities are resourced and managed appropriately, diligently and equitably.	Ensure the Town meets its legislative responsibility in accordance with Regulation 34 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Service Area Leaders	All Service Area Leaders have reviewed the monthly management reports and provided commentary on any identified material variance relevant to their service area.

Legal compliance

Regulation 34 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Misstatement or significant error in financial statements	Moderate	Unlikely	Medium	Low	Treat risk by ensuring daily and monthly reconciliations are completed. Internal and

						external audits.
Financial	Fraud or illegal transaction	Severe	Unlikely	High	Low	Treat risk by ensuring stringent internal controls, and segregation of duties to maintain control and conduct internal and external audits.
Environmental	Not applicable.					
Health and safety	Not applicable.					
Infrastructure/ICT systems/utilities	Not applicable.					
Legislative compliance	Council not accepting financial statements will lead to non-compliance	Major	Unlikely	Medium	Low	Treat risk by providing reasoning and detailed explanations to Council to enable informed decision making. Also provide the Payment summary listing prior to preparation of this report for comments.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Commentary around the current budget impact is outlined in the Statement of Financial Activity, forming part of the attached financial activity statement report.
Future budget impact	Commentary around the future budget impact is outlined in the Statement of Financial Activity, forming part of the attached financial activity statement report.

Analysis

4. The Financial Statements – February 2022 complies with the requirements of Regulation 34 (Financial activity statement report) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*. It is therefore recommended that the Financial Statements – February 2022 be accepted.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (70/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council accepts the Financial Statements – February 2022, as attached.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

14.2 Schedule of Accounts - February 2022

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Finance Manager
Responsible officer	Chief Financial Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. Payment Summary - February 2022 [**14.2.1** - 8 pages]

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Confirms the accounts for February 2022, as included in the attachment, pursuant to Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.
2. Confirms the direct lodgement of payroll payments to the personal bank accounts of employees, pursuant to Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Purpose

To present the payments made from the municipal fund and the trust fund for the month ended February 2022.

In brief

- Council is required to confirm payments made from the municipal fund and the trust fund each month, under Section 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.
- The information required for Council to confirm the payments made is included in the attachment.

Background

1. Council has delegated the Chief Executive Officer the authority to make payments from the municipal and trust funds in accordance with the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.
2. Under Regulation 13(1) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, where a local government has delegated to the Chief Executive Officer the exercise of its power to make payments from the municipal fund or the trust fund, each payment is to be noted on a list compiled for each month showing:
   a) the payee's name
   b) the amount of the payment
   c) the date of the payment
   d) sufficient information to identify the transaction.
3. That payment list should then be presented at the next ordinary meeting of the Council, following the preparation of the list, and recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which it is presented.
4. The payment list and the associated report was previously presented to the Finance and Audit Committee. Given this Committee's scope has changed to focus more on the audit function, the payment listings will be forwarded to the Elected Members ahead of time. Any questions received prior to the finalisation of the report will be included along with the responses within the Schedule of Accounts report for that month.
3. The list of accounts paid in accordance with Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* is contained within the attachment and is summarised below.

Fund	Reference	Amounts
Municipal Account		
Creditors – EFT Payments		$4,010,907.79
Payroll		$1,165,193.29
Bank Fees		$12,285.85
Corporate MasterCard		$10,317.61
Total		$5,198,704.54

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL06 - Finances are managed appropriately, sustainably and transparently for the benefit of the community.	The monthly payment summary listing of all payments made by the Town during the reporting month from its municipal fund and trust fund provides transparency into the financial operations of the Town.
CL10 - Legislative responsibilities are resourced and managed appropriately, diligently and equitably.	The presentation of the payment listing to Council is a requirement of Regulation 13 of *Local Government (Finance Management) Regulation 1996*.

Legal compliance

Section 6.10(d) of the *Local Government Act 1995*
Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulation 1996*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Misstatement or significant error in Schedule of accounts.	Moderate	Unlikely	Medium	Low	Treat risk by ensuring daily and monthly reconciliations are completed. Internal and external audits.
Financial	Fraud or illegal transactions	Severe	Unlikely	High	Low	Treat risk by ensuring stringent internal controls, and segregation of duties to

						maintain control and conduct internal and external audits.
Environmental	Not applicable.					
Health and safety	Not applicable.					
Infrastructure/ICT systems/utilities	Not applicable.					
Legislative compliance	Not accepting schedule of accounts will lead to non-compliance.	Major	Unlikely	Medium	Low	Treat risk by providing reasoning and detailed explanations to Council to enable informed decision making. Also provide the Payment summary listing prior to preparation of this report for comments.
Reputation	Not applicable.					
Service Delivery	Not applicable.					

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

4. All accounts paid have been duly incurred and authorised for payment as per approved purchasing and payment procedures. It is therefore requested that Council confirm the payments, as included in the attachments.

Relevant documents

Procurement Policy

Further consideration

5. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.
6. *Clarification on the line item for $16,274.50 for the Australian Institute of Management.*

   The payment relates to training and leadership development for Town Staff.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (81/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson

That Council:

1. Confirms the accounts for February 2022, as included in the attachment, pursuant to Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.
2. Confirms the direct lodgement of payroll payments to the personal bank accounts of employees, pursuant to Regulation 13 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15 Committee Reports

15.1 Amendment to Policy 117 - Business Grants

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Place Leader (Economic Development)
Responsible officer	Manager Place Planning
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee

The motion was lost at the Policy Committee and therefore was no Committee recommendation.

Officer's recommendation

That Council:
1. Amends Policy 117 Business Grants to allow for emergency relief funding as per Attachment 1.
2. Declares emergency relief is required for the purpose of the business grants program.

Purpose

For Council to amend Policy 117 Business Grants to allow for emergency relief funding when required.

In brief

- At its meeting of 18 August 2020, Council adopted Policy 117 Business Grants (the Policy). This Policy requires Council to make the final decision on whether a grant application is to be approved or rejected following a recommendation from the assessment panel.
- As community transmission of the COVID-19 Omicron variant continues to increase, there is an increasing need to support the business community. Businesses have stated that grants are one way the Town could do this.
- To be able to issue grant funding to businesses in a timely and responsive manner, amendments to the Policy are required. This will allow for the delegation of decision making to administration when it comes to emergency relief funding.

Background

0. At its meeting of 18 August 2020, Council adopted the Policy which provides an overarching policy to establish a business grants program, with project objectives and grant categories being reviewed on an annual basis in response to current trends and needs.
1. This Policy requires Council to make the final decision on whether a grant application is to be approved or rejected following a recommendation from the assessment panel.
2. COVID-19 has been an ongoing pandemic since 2020. In late 2021, a new variant of COVID-19 called Omicron was detected. The World Health Organisation has declared Omicron to be a COVID-19 variant of concern.
3. On 2 January 2022, the Omicron variant was first detected in the WA community. This variant spreads quickly in the community.

4. On 21 February 2022, level 1 public health and social measures were implemented to slow the transmission of Omicron. These included indoor mask requirements, proof of vaccination, contact registration and capacity limits for businesses.
5. On 3 March 2022, level 2 public health and social measures were implemented, which included level 1 measures, as well as capacity limits and seated service only to businesses deemed high risk.
6. Based on these restrictions and evidence of the impact of the Omicron variant on businesses across Australia, business support is required. At a business breakfast on 8 February 2022, the attendees were asked 'Is there anything more you think the Town could do to support small business during the COVID pandemic?'. The most replied answer was 'grants'.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL09 - Appropriate devolution of decision-making and service provision to an empowered community.	Administration has decision making powers when it comes to awarding grants for emergency relief purposes, allowing businesses to receive financial support to deliver resilience projects.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC01 - A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment and entrepreneurship.	The amendments to the Policy allow the provision of financial support to businesses, allowing them to build resilience during emergency periods, including the COVID-19 pandemic.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Governance	Provided strategic advice on how to prepare the amended Policy.
Place Planning	Provided feedback on the proposed amendments to the Policy.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	**Risk event description**	**Consequence rating**	**Likelihood rating**	**Overall risk level score**	**Council's risk appetite**	**Risk treatment option and rationale for actions**
Financial	Demand for business grants exceeds funding	Minor	Possible	Medium	Low	ACCEPT risk and openly communicate

	available due to emergency relief amendments to Policy.					funding availability and the process by which this funding will be allocated.
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	The perception that the Town is not supporting businesses during COVID-19.	Moderate	Likely	High	Low	TREAT risk by endorsing the amendments to the Policy.
	Businesses don't understand the process under which grants are approved by administration.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by assessing applications on a first come, first serve basis. TREAT risk by making sure reasons for grants being endorsed/not endorsed are documented and communicated when necessary.
Service delivery	Administration of business grants exceeds staff capacity.	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Medium	TREAT the risk through considering resourcing at all stages of program planning and budget planning. ACCEPT the risk if administration needs exceed staff capacity.

Financial implications

Current budget	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.

impact	
Future budget impact	Budget for future business grants rounds will be proposed as part of the annual budget process.

Analysis

7. In 2020/21, COVID-19 related business grants were launched. There were two categories:
    . COVID-19 Small Business Resilience Grants
        0. Aim: To support small businesses that were actively engaged in the Town of Victoria Park local economy to adapt, build resilience and grow during COVID-19 recovery.
        1. Assessment Criteria:
            . Initiative is intended to directly assist local business/es in recovery from COVID-19 and building ongoing resilience.
            a. Applicant can demonstrate an ongoing commitment to the Town of Victoria Park local economy including:
                . Commercial lease agreement with 12 months remaining or own principal place of trading.
                i. Demonstrating genuine, visible engagement with the local economy.
        2. Demonstrate the feasibility of the initiative and their capability to deliver it.
    a. COVID-19 Economic Development Grants
        . Aim: To support initiatives developed by the local business community that will benefit the Town of Victoria Park local economy.
        i. Assessment Criteria:
            0. Initiative will assist the local economy in recovery from COVID-19.
            1. Initiative will deliver at least one of the following target benefits:
                . Substantial improvements to the amenity of the public realm that will attract visitors to the area;
                a. Substantial activation of underutilised of vacant spaces that will attract visitors or investment to the area;
                b. Provide a unique and visible retail or service offering that will attract visitors to the Town;
                c. Foster networking and collaboration between local businesses to support COVID-19 recovery;
                d. Provide unique, regionally significant promotion, development or investment for the Town's local economy; or
                e. Foster innovation industries or innovative business practices.
            2. Feasibility of the initiative and their capability to deliver it.
8. There were 42 applicants across both categories in 2020/21. Twenty grants were awarded at a value of $61,626.
9. It is proposed amendments be made to the Policy to allow for the quick provision of funding to the business community for emergency relief purposes, including COVID-19. These amendments are also designed to provide flexibility for any other emergencies that may arise.

10. A summary of the proposed amendments can be found below:
    . The definition of emergency relief.
    a. The assessment criteria for emergency relief funding.
    b. The maximum amount of grant funding per applicant for emergency relief purposes is $4,999.
    c. Decision making on who is awarded emergency relief funding is delegated to administration.
11. Delegation to administration is required for emergency relief funding due to the length of time it takes to seek Council approval. Emergency relief funding is not possible if Council endorsement is required.
12. In addition, clause 9 and the Related documents section have been updated to reflect include reference to the Town's codes of conduct and conflict of interest provisions.
13. It is recommended that Council endorse the amendments to the Policy, which will allow the administration to provide grant funding to support businesses through the COVID-19 pandemic.

Relevant documents

Policy 117- Business Grants

Further consideration

14. As the motion was lost at the Policy Committee, Council are required to move the officer's recommendation to allow for the item to be debated and voted on.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (82/2022):

Moved: Cr Peter Devereux **Seconded:** Cr Jesse Hamer

That Council:

1. Amends Policy 117 Business Grants to allow for emergency relief funding as per Attachment 1.
2. Declares emergency relief is required for the purpose of the business grants program.

Lost (0 - 8)

For: Nil

Against: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

15.2 Review of Policy 225 - Hire and use of Town banner and flag sites

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Manager Stakeholder Relations
Responsible officer	Chief Executive Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council revokes Policy 225 Hire and use of Town banner Flag sites.

Purpose

The November Ordinary Meeting of Council referred the review of Policy 225 Hire and use of Town Banner and Flag sites to the future Policy Committee in March 2022 with regards to the continued inclusion of the banner display sites.

In brief

- Policy 225 was identified for review as part of the Council adopted policy work plan.
- The policy sets out the option to hire Town-owned banner and flag sites for promotion and recognition purposes.
- The policy review was completed in November 2021 and was recommended to be repealed by the administration.
- The Policy Committee supported to retain Policy 225 Hire and use of Town banner and flag sites without modification.
- At November 2021 OCM Council requested that administration bring back the policy to March 2022 policy committee to reconsider inclusion of the banner poles.

Background

1. At its meeting on 20 April 2021, Council adopted a work plan to complete the review of a number of policies. Policy 225 was one of the policies identified for review.
2. Policy 225 was last reviewed by Council on 20 April 2021 as part of the minor review of policies. The only amendment made at this time was a change to the responsible officer.
3. Administration recommended repeal of the policy as the use of flag poles should align to Australia Flag laws as set by the Federal Government.
4. Administration recommend to repeal the hiring of the banner poles due to the policy never being enacted and the banner poles not hired in the past five years.
5. Council rejected the changes to flag pole requests, but did note that banner pole hire may not be feasible, it was requested on this basis for administration to review the policy again and reconsider an approach to flags.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL01 – Everyone receives appropriate information in the most efficient and effective way for them	The public would be supported in requests for use of flag poles for commemoration, acknowledgment or celebration in the community.
CL07 - People have positive exchanges with the Town that inspires confidence in the information and the timely service provided.	Community members and groups feel supported in the commemoration, acknowledgement or celebration.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Community Development	Banner poles will be utilised for periods of significance that aligns to Council decisions (NADIOC, Reconciliation week). Flag raising ceremonies can be requested by the Council for particular days of significance or recognition, as a civic ceremony hosted by the Mayor.
Place Planning	The Town would support the delivery of campaigns to support destination marketing, where an external organisation wishes to partner with the Town in the use of banners it would be part of a broader agreement.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Australian Flags (pmc.gov.au)

Flags Act 1953 (legislation.gov.au)

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Have fees and charges that aren't used	Insignificant	Almost Certain	Medium	Low	ACCEPT The banner poles have not been hired in the last financial year.
Environmental	The banner poles used on Albany Hwy are single use	Moderate	Almost Certain	High	Medium	TREAT Future review of the poles to offer a

	vinyl plastic.					more sustainable option.
Health and safety	Banners left on the poles after bad weather can cause a hazard.	Major	Likely	High	Low	AVOID The Town manages banner poles and removes them as soon as any damage is sustained.
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	N/A					
Legislative compliance	Flag poles cannot be hired for commercial use as they are aligned to Australian Flag Protocol.	Moderate	Almost Certain	High	Low	SHARE fly flags as per the requirements for a government building.
Reputation	Incorrect flying of flags.	Moderate	Almost Certain	High	Low	SHARE fly flags as per requirements for a government building.
Service delivery	High administration requirement to manage the hire of banner poles.	Minor	Almost Certain	Med	Med	TREAT partner with organisations, include as part of sponsorship support if requested and receive acknowledgement

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Not applicable.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

Clause	Proposed	Reason
Policy Objective	1. To provide guidance on the use and hire of	*Remove reference to banner poles* *Remove reference to promotion on flag poles and not recognition but remove promotion*

	Town flag sites for recognition purposes.	
Policy Objective	*2. Remove objective*	*Remove need to pay for flags to be raised for recognition purposes*
Policy Scope	This policy applies to community use of flag poles.	*Remove reference to hire and remove reference to banner poles*
Policy Statement	1. , The Town may permit requests to fly flags on Town flag poles by community groups or members. In accordance with Australian flag laws.	*Reference to banners removed, Inclusion of Australian flag laws, removal of fees and charges*
Policy Statement	2. For requests to be accepted they must be either: a. Align to a day of significance that is supported by the Council b. Recognition aligned to social advocacy that is supported by Council c. To celebrate or acknowledge achievements of an individual or group	*Clarify types of flags that can be considers for the Towns flag poles. Removes reference to banners.*
Policy Statement	3. Removed	*Priority statement becomes void as banners have been removed and framework for flags is updated as per above.*
Policy Statement	4. Removed	*Void as framework for inclusion noted in item 2*
Policy Statement	5. The Town has discretion to approve or reject requests for the use of flag poles .	*Removed reference to banner poles*

Relevant documents

Policy 225 Hire and Use of Town Banner and Flag sites - Victoria Park

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (71/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council revokes Policy 225 Hire and use of Town banner Flag sites.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.3 Review of Policy 404 - Fireworks management - results of public consultation

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Principal Environmental Health Officer
Responsible officer	Manager Development Services
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council adopt the amended Policy 404 – Fireworks Management as shown in Attachment 5; subject to the following amendments:

1. Amend the Policy title to 'Fireworks events' instead of 'Fireworks management';

2. Amend the Policy objective by replacing the words "applications for fireworks display" with "Fireworks Event Notices";

3. Amend the Policy scope:
   i. In paragraph 2, replace the words "Fireworks Event Notice application" with "Fireworks Event Notices"
   ii. In paragraph 3, replace the words "fireworks applications" with "fireworks events".

4. Amend clause 4 of the Policy statement by rewording the last sentence to read "A Fireworks Event Notice will not be supported by the Town without the submission of an application under Regulation 18, and the issuing of an approval.

5. In clauses 8 and 12a, replace "Victoria Park" with "the Town".

Purpose

For Council to consider the draft revised Council Policy 404 - Fireworks Management (Policy 404) following public consultation.

In brief

- Policy 404 has been identified for review as part of Council's adopted policy work plan.
- Applications for fireworks displays are assessed having regard to Policy 404.
- Several amendments are proposed to the policy to provide greater clarity in the assessment of applications, to clarify the Town's role in the process and to address issues that have arisen in relation to the current policy.
- The draft revised policy was advertised for public comment. It is recommended that the policy be adopted with modification from that which was advertised.

Background

1. Background to the review of the Policy is outlined in the previous report presented to Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 September 2021 (see Attachment 3). At this meeting, Council resolved as follows:

   "That Council:

1. *Endorse the draft revised policy 404- Fireworks Management (as shown in Attachment 2) for public consultation; subject to the following amendments:*

    1. *Amend point 1 of the policy to read as follows:*

        "When considering a Fireworks Events Notice, the Town's principal considerations will include:

        a. *The Environmental Health impact of the fireworks event upon the community and surrounding environment (including birds and animal life); including but not limited to the noise impact.*

        b. *Ensuring the community is reasonably informed of the fireworks event.*

    2. *Give local public notice for a period of 28 days that comprises a notice in the local newspaper for three consecutive weeks and via the Town of Victoria Park's social media channels and Your Thoughts. "*

2. It is worth noting that the above resolution amended the draft policy prepared by Officers by including the words "*and surrounding environment (including birds and animal life)"*.

3. It should also be noted that the following additional comments were provided by Officers in the report presented to the September 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting around advice received from an ornithologist about the impact of fireworks on birdlife:

    "In view of the above advice, it is considered necessary to liaise with the DBCA before proceeding further with the policy review, and that further consideration be given to the resourcing and other implications of the ornithologist advice. Accordingly, Officers recommend that further consideration of the item be deferred to the November 2021 Policy Committee."

4. Council however, resolved to advertise the draft Policy for public comments.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL01 – Everyone receives appropriate information in the most efficient and effective way for them	Public notification of all fireworks activities that may cause a noise nuisance within the Town.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC01 - A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment, and entrepreneurship.	Streamline the Fireworks Event approval process for anyone that wants to do business in the Town and increase tourism within the Town and ensure that the Town's residents are reasonably informed of the Fireworks Event.
EC02 - A clean, safe, and accessible place to visit.	Improved management of noise nuisances relating to fireworks displays.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Environmental Health	The Town's Environmental Health Officers provided input into the revised draft policy.
Place Planning	No comments to make.
Community Development	No comments as they have not had any request for fireworks as part of a booking.
Ranger Services	Requested that in assessing an application for a fireworks event, consideration should be given to parking and traffic management. This is not considered necessary, as fireworks are normally associated with an event, already the subject of traffic management, rather than being the primary purpose of an event. i.e., traffic and parking are generated by an event, not fireworks at the event. Also requested that in relation to the public notification provisions for a fireworks event, this includes advice to residents to secure their dogs during events. While the sentiment is understood, in advising residents of an event the resident can already make an informed decision as to whether to secure their dogs.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Town wide residents
Period of engagement	21 October 2021 until 21 November 2021
Level of engagement	Consult
Methods of engagement	Public Notice on a local community newspaper, Your Thoughts Engagement Hub on the Town's website, and the Town's Social Media page
Advertising	Newspaper advertisement, Town website and the Town's Social Media page
Submission summary	The following number of responses were received: • Your Thoughts Engagement Hub - 3 responses. Two were unsure and one supported. • Social Media - 3 responses. Two objected and one said once a year suits them. • Letter response - 1 objection
Key findings	The matters raised through the submissions included: • The Town has a policy banning balloons and should adopt a similar policy to ban fireworks. • Toxic pollution from fireworks causing further pollution of the river and riverbeds.

	• The policy is hard to understand and looks like it is allowing more fireworks to happen. • The impact of noise and light disruption on domestic animals. • The impact on birdlife. • The number of fireworks is fine. • There are too many fireworks events currently in the Town.

Other engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS)	DMIRS advised the Town to refer to the Fireworks Code of Practice. The Code of Practice focuses on the Fireworks Event Operators and indicates the minimum separation distances to specific facilities and environmentally sensitive areas for any type of firework. The above applies to the contractors and operators of the fireworks events and has no implication on the Town's amended policy. As part of the assessment and approval process, the Town is not required to check the requirements under DMIRS Code of Practice.
Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)	Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) advised that if the fireworks are short one-off events, then a scare licence would not be required as the aim of the activity is not to scare/disturb birds, so this effect would be incidental. Their advice is that a fireworks display is unlikely to constitute disturbance, given that it is not repetitive or often enough to alter the behaviour of resident birds to their detriment.

Legal compliance

Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997
Local Government Act 1995
Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004
Dangerous Goods Safety (Explosives) Regulations 2007

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Noise nuisances disrupting residents and wildlife.	Moderate	Likely	High	Medium	TREAT risk by ensuring that the areas likely to be impacted by fireworks noise are notified.
Health and	Noise complaints.	Moderate	Likely	High	Low	TREAT risk by

safety						ensuring that affected area is notified.
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Noise complaints.	Moderate	Likely	High	Low	TREAT risk by approving fireworks events in accordance with Regulation 18 of the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997* and ensure that the area likely to be impacted by the fireworks noise is notified.
Reputation	Town's brand damage due to unhappy ratepayers impacted by fireworks noise.	Moderate	Likely	High	Low	Ensure that all approvals are conditioned to comply with the terms.
Service delivery	Additional resources to resolve fireworks related complaints	Moderate	Likely	High	Medium	Improved approval process to ensure that residents are well informed of a fireworks event.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

5. A review of Policy 404 was completed by Council Officers in mid 2021 with it being recommended that the Policy be amended. The report to the Ordinary Council Meeting of September 2021 outlines the issues around the current policy and the improvements proposed in the draft policy (see Attachment 3).

6. A copy of the proposed draft amended policy, as advertised, is contained at Attachment 2.

7. As per the Council resolution of September 2021, the proposed draft amended policy was advertised for public comments for 28 days between 21 October and 21 November 2021. The consultation was in the local newspaper (PerthNow), the Town's consultation hub (Your Thoughts) and the Town's social media pages.

8. The below table contains a summary of the submissions received and the Officers response. A copy of the submissions in full is provided at Attachment 4.

Comments from submitters (summarised)	**Officer comments**
The number of fireworks is fine.	Noted.
It looks like the Policy is allowing more firework events to happen by rolling the venue into a single event that can have multiple shows on consecutive days. I object to the number of fireworks that currently happen in the Town.	The amended policy does not intend to allow for additional fireworks event. A change to the policy is recommended to clarify that where an event has fireworks over consecutive nights, that is considered to be one event. This situation is already occurring, with Curtin University graduation ceremonies being an example. The amendment to the policy just provides clarity around this. The concern regarding the number of fireworks already occurring is noted.
The impact of the noise and light disruption on domestic animals.	Any impact on domestic animals is short-lived and is able to be managed by the pet owner.
The Town already has a policy banning balloons at Council approved functions due to the pollution they cause. Can we please have the same criteria applied to Fireworks?	It is open to Council to consider such a policy position. However, such a position would not balance the competing desire for events to bring entertainment and activity to the Town. Furthermore, while Council could adopt such a policy position, DMIRS have the power to issue an approval for a fireworks event regardless of the Town's position.
The Town should suggest more environmentally and socially friendly solutions.	Noted.
Once a year would suit me.	Noted.
Adverse impact on wildlife.	This issue is discussed further below.
Toxic pollution from fireworks causing further pollution of the river and riverbeds.	There is no evidence of this. Additionally, DBCA did not raise any concerns in relation to pollution of the river and riverbeds associated with fireworks events.
The policy is hard to understand.	The policy has been structured into a number of sub-headings for ease of reading and uses clear

	language.

9. Noting the recommendations from the ornithologist, the Town's officers considered it necessary to seek expert advice from DBCA. Consequently, the DBCA, having reviewed the advice from the ornithologist, advised the Town as follows:

   "The Department's position remains that if the fireworks are reasonably short one-off events, then a licence would not be required. The aim of activity is not to scare/disturb, so this effect would be incidental. It is also unlikely to constitute disturb, given that it is not repetitive or often enough to alter the behaviour of resident birds to their detriment."

10. At the Policy Committee meeting held on 23 August 2021, questions were raised in relation to the impact of fireworks events on birdlife which resulted in the Policy Committee recommending to amending part 1 of the policy by including the words "*and surrounding environment (including birds and animal life)"* such that part 1 of the policy read in full as follows:

    "When considering a Fireworks Events Notice, the Town's principal considerations will include:

    a. The Environmental Health impact of the fireworks event upon the community and surrounding environment (including birds and animal life); including but not limited to the noise impact.

    b. Ensuring the community is reasonably informed of the fireworks event."

11. In response to the questions raised at the August 2021 Policy Committee meeting, a Technical Advice Note was received from an ornithologist, which was referred to in the report considered at the Ordinary Council Meeting in September 2021. In summary the ornithologist advised that fireworks events can negatively impact on birdlife, and a number of recommendations were provided as shown in the below table.

12. Officers have further considered the advice from the ornithologist and the DBCA, and make the following comments in relation to the ornithologist's recommendations:

Ornithologist Advice	**Officer's Comment**
ToVP begin communications with relevant DBCA section to determine if a scare/disturbance license is required.	The DBCA was contacted, and they have advised that the Town that a scare/disturbance licence is not required (see comments at paragraph 9 above).
ToVP apply for the license to scare birds under the DBCA *Biodiversity Conservation 2016*.	Not applicable.
ToVP engage with stake holders (BirdLife Australia, DBCA & WA Museum), to determine the presence of birds and the species in question using the environs of the proposed pyrotechnic display areas.	The recommendation would require considerable additional work to be undertaken by the Town. Any potential impact of fireworks on birdlife is not unique to the Town, and if considered to be an issue that requires attention, should be led by relevant State agencies to ensure consistency.

ToVP to maintain a 'current' map of all known roost sites for EPBC Act listed species, within the ToVP governance area, allowing for compliance appraisal of future requests from private entities who wish to engage in pyrotechnic display events.	The recommendation would require considerable additional work to be undertaken by the Town. Any potential impact of fireworks on birdlife is not unique to the Town, and if considered to be an issue that requires attention, should be led by relevant State agencies to ensure consistency.
ToVP to check for presence of birds, of all species, and particularly roost sites at proposed public pyrotechnic display areas.	The recommendation would require additional work to be undertaken by the Town, in relation to a specific event.
ToVP post event to check for the presence of birds, or other wildlife that may have been negatively impact, (died), in the immediate vicinity of a pyrotechnic event.	The recommendation would require additional work to be undertaken by the Town, following an event. Additionally, the presence of any dead birds may not necessarily be due to the fireworks.
ToVP to establish a data capture system within the environment section of ToVP relating to pyrotechnic displays and possible negative impacts of birds and other wildlife.	The recommendation would require considerable additional work to be undertaken by the Town.
ToVP may wish to include wildlife safety issues in their application form relating to private pyrotechnic events.	Noted.

13. It should also be noted that verbal advice from Officers of the DBCA was that they considered the recommendations of the ornithologist to be onerous and unnecessary.

14. While it is accepted that fireworks events can have an impact upon birdlife, and that any negative impact on birdlife is not desirable, a reasonable balance needs to be struck between this and the desire from some members of the community to use fireworks as part of a celebration or event, as well as noting that many members of the community enjoy fireworks. This should be considered in the context that fireworks events occur over short, irregular periods, and accordingly any impact on birdlife is likely to be short-lived. With respect, the advice from the ornithologist prioritises the consideration of the impact on birdlife and does not take into account the other matters that Council should consider in determining a position on the acceptance of fireworks displays within the Town.

15. As outlined at paragraph 10 above, Council previously amended the draft Policy to include that a principal consideration in the Town's consideration of a fireworks application will be the impact upon the environment including birds and other animals. The Officer's view is that this should not be a principal consideration. Elevating this matter to a principal consideration could mean that no fireworks displays are supported under the Policy, accepting that fireworks display can have an impact on birdlife. Additionally, the policy contains no criteria to assess the impact on birdlife as part of an application.

16. In view of the above, it is recommended that part 1 of the policy be amended to delete those words indicated with a strikethrough as follows:

"When considering a Fireworks Events Notice, the Town's principal considerations will include:

a. The Environmental Health impact of the fireworks event upon the community ~~and surrounding environment (including birds and animal life);~~ including but not limited to the noise impact.

b. Ensuring the community is reasonably informed of the fireworks event.

17. It is therefore recommended that the Policy Committee recommend to Council that the draft amended policy, as modified and contained at Attachment 5, be adopted.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

Further consideration

18. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.

19. *Can environmental and fauna considerations be included in the policy but be targeted specifically for larger scale, reoccurring fireworks events?*

    Yes, that could occur if Council considers there is merit to do so. However, this would likely require some criteria or definitions in the policy around what is a larger scale event, and what is a reoccurring event (occurs every year? occurs on consecutive nights? etc).

    Furthermore, at paragraphs 14 and 15 of this report, Officers express concern that being required to consider the impact of fireworks on birdlife and wildlife as a primary consideration both (a) prioritises this as a consideration ahead of other matters that the Town should also consider; and (b) could potentially result in no fireworks events being approved in the Town, accepting that fireworks can have some impact on birdlife and wildlife. These concerns remain even if these matters are to only be considered for larger scale, reoccurring events, however these terms are defined. Additionally, the comments from DBCA should be noted relating to the short-term impact of a fireworks event on birdlife.

20. *Is there a way for environmental and animal and wildlife impacts to be taken into consideration when assessing a fireworks event notice that will not incur demands and constraints on the Town's administration?*

    No, not to the Officers knowledge. Officers are of the view that consideration of environmental and wildlife impacts will have an impact on Town staff assessing fireworks events notices, principally by requiring a greater level of time and more detailed assessments. Based upon the advice of the ornithologist, it is likely that additional steps would be required to be undertaken by Officers in assessing a fireworks event notice, most notably assessing the area surrounding the site of a proposed event for evidence of birdlife and determining whether the impact is acceptable. It is estimated that this would add up to 2 hours to the assessment process per application, inclusive of an inspection post the event.

    Importantly, while a view of the area may determine the existence of birdlife, Officers do not have the knowledge or experience to assess the extent to which the fireworks event would have a negative impact on birdlife, and whether this warrants objection to the event.

It should also be noted that it is DMIRS who approve applications for fireworks events, not the local government. Therefore, there is concern that the additional work required to be undertaken by Officers may have little value, when DMIRS have the ability to approve an application regardless of the local government's comments.

21. *Are there other Councils in WA or interstate that do take into account the environmental and wildlife/fauna impact from fireworks as part of their policy?*

    At the time of writing this report, Officers are not aware of any. However, further research can be undertaken before the Ordinary Council Meeting.

22. *With reference to the City of Cockburn 2021 review and impact assessment of fireworks, which suggests alternatives to fireworks and comments on the changing community perception towards fireworks, are Officers aware of the suggestion of alternatives and can this be considered?*

    Officers have now reviewed the cited report, and note the suggestion that alternatives be trialed with a goal to potentially phasing out fireworks in the future. Suggested alternatives include light shows and projections; water shows; drone shows; or other musical acts and performances. It is open to the Council to consider such alternatives.

AMENDMENT:

Moved: Cr Luana Lisandro **Seconder:** Cr Peter Devereux

That the recommendation be amended as follows:

"That Council:

1. Adopt the amended Policy 404 – Fireworks Management as shown in Attachment 5; subject to the following amendments:

a) Amend the Policy title to 'Fireworks events' instead of 'Fireworks management';
b) Amend the Policy objective by replacing the words "applications for fireworks display" with "Fireworks Event Notices";
c) Amend the Policy scope: i. In paragraph 2, replace the words "Fireworks Event Notice application" with "Fireworks Event Notices" ii. In paragraph 3, replace the words "fireworks applications" with "fireworks events".
d) Amend clause 4 of the Policy statement by rewording the last sentence to read "A Fireworks Event Notice will not be supported by the Town without the submission of an application under Regulation 18, and the issuing of an approval.
e) In clauses 8 and 12a, replace "Victoria Park" with "the Town".

2. Requests the CEO to provide a report on alternatives to fireworks displays, such as but not limited to light and drone shows, to a future Council Concept Forum on or prior to March 2023."

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

Reason:

The reason I have proposed this amendment is that the officers report has not fully explored and investigated other options to fireworks such as light and drone shows, and it is unclear if the current fireworks policy can cover these types of shows or would require a separate policy. This is especially timely as the City of Perth and City of Cockburn are both indicated that there is a move away from these due to cost as well as community attitudes to new forms of celebration events.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (83/2022):

Moved: Cr Luana Lisandro **Seconded:** Cr Vicki Potter

That Council:

1. Adopt the amended Policy 404 – Fireworks Management as shown in Attachment 5; subject to the following amendments:

a) Amend the Policy title to 'Fireworks events' instead of 'Fireworks management';
b) Amend the Policy objective by replacing the words "applications for fireworks display" with "Fireworks Event Notices";
c) Amend the Policy scope: i. In paragraph 2, replace the words "Fireworks Event Notice application" with "Fireworks Event Notices" ii. In paragraph 3, replace the words "fireworks applications" with "fireworks events".
d) Amend clause 4 of the Policy statement by rewording the last sentence to read "A Fireworks Event Notice will not be supported by the Town without the submission of an application under Regulation 18, and the issuing of an approval.
e) In clauses 8 and 12a, replace "Victoria Park" with "the Town".

2. Requests the CEO to provide a report on alternatives to fireworks displays, such as but not limited to light and drone shows, to a future Council Concept Forum on or prior to March 2023.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.4 Review of Policy 001 - Policy management and development

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Governance and Strategy
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:
That Council adopts the amended Policy 001 – Policy management and development as attached.

Purpose

To review Policy 001 – Policy management and development (Policy 001).

In brief

- Policy 001 was identified for review as part of the Council adopted policy work plan.
- Policy 001 was adopted by Council on 21 May 2019 and was last reviewed on 20 April 2021.
- Minor changes are proposed that do not alter the intent of the policy.

Background

1. At its meeting on 20 April 2021, Council adopted a work plan to complete the review of a number of policies. Policy 001 was one of the policies identified for review.
2. Policy 001 was adopted by Council on 21 May 2019. It was last reviewed by Council on 20 April 2021 as part of the minor review of policies. Minor administrative amendments were made at this time however, a full review of the policy has not been undertaken since its implementation.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL08 - Visionary civic leadership with sound and accountable governance that reflects objective decision-making.	Policy 001 sets out the processes for the making, evaluation and management of policies and management practices. Policies guide the Town's decision-making.

Engagement

Not applicable.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact	Risk event	Consequence	Likelihoo	Overall risk	Council's	Risk treatment

category	description	rating	d rating	level score	risk appetite	option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	Not applicable.				Low	
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

3. The following amendments are proposed to Policy 001.

Clause	Proposed	Reason
Policy evaluation definition	Included 'content' in the definition.	Policy evaluation should consist of examination of the policy's content, implementation and/or impact.

4. Other minor amendments are proposed and are marked up in the attached policy.
5. The proposed amendments are minor in nature and do not alter the intent of the policy.
6. It is recommended that the amended policy be adopted.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (72/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council adopts the amended Policy 001 – Policy management and development as attached.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.5 2022 Minor review of Council policies

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Governance and Strategy
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council endorses minor amendments to the following policies, in line with Policy 001 – Policy management and development, as attached:

a. Policy 002 – Review of decisions
b. Policy 003 – Legal advice
c. Policy 007 – Long service leave
d. Policy 011 – Elections
e. Policy 021 – Elected member fees, expenses and allowances
f. Policy 022 – Elected member professional development
g. Policy 023 – Provision of information and services – elected members
h. Policy 024 – Event attendance
i. Policy 025 – Independent committee members
j. Policy 026 – Complaints relating to Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates
k. Policy 051 – Agenda Briefing Forum, Concept Forum and workshops
l. Policy 053 – Meeting of electors
m. Policy 101 – Governance of Council Advisory and Working Groups
n. Policy 103 – Communication and engagement
o. Policy 104 – Customer service delivery
p. Policy 105 – Advocacy
q. Policy 112 – Visual arts
r. Policy 114 – Community funding
s. Policy 116 – Sponsorship
t. Policy 208 – Street verges – reinstatement of lawns following works
u. Policy 221 – Strategic management of land and building assets
v. Policy 222 – Asset management
w. Policy 223 – Fleet management light vehicles
x. Policy 224 – Fences between property owned by the Town and adjoining property
y. Policy 253 – Water conservation
z. Policy 310 – Leasing
aa. Policy 351 – Parking permits
bb. Policy 352 – Parking work zones at building sites.

Purpose

To conduct a minor review of the policies of Council.

In brief

- Policy 001 – Policy management requires the Town to complete a minor review of all policies of Council each year.

- There are 28 policies with minor changes being presented to Council for consideration. Changes mainly relate to updating responsible officers, updating references to policies and local laws and improving language.

Background

1. At its meeting in May 2019, Council resolved to adopt Policy 001 – Policy management and development. This policy requires the Town to complete a minor review of all policies of Council each year.
2. A minor review of the policies of Council has taken place each year, as required by the policy.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL08 - Visionary civic leadership with sound and accountable governance that reflects objective decision-making.	The annual review of policies ensures that policies set by Council set clear, consistent and effective direction for both the community and the Town.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Managers	Managers completed minor reviews of policies that they are responsible for.
Service Area Leaders	Service Area Leaders completed minor reviews of policies that they are responsible for.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	**Risk event description**	**Consequence rating**	**Likelihood rating**	**Overall risk level score**	**Council's risk appetite**	**Risk treatment option and rationale for actions**
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative	Policies become	Minor	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by

compliance	out of date/inconsistent with relevant legislation.					continuing to conduct an annual minor review of policies.
Reputation	Policies are not regularly updated/reviewed causing complaints from the community when content doesn't reflect current processes.	Insignificant	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT risk by continuing to conduct an annual minor review of policies.
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

3. All policy managers were asked to complete a minor review of their policies. The review resulted in minor changes to 28 policies. A summary of the key changes has been provided below and amended policies with tracked changes have been attached to this report.

Policy	Proposed change	Reason
Policy 002 – Review of decisions	Grammatical and spelling errors corrected.	Not applicable.
Policy 003 – Legal advice	1. Introduced acronyms following the first use of Chief Executive Officer and Western Australian Local Government Association. 2. Replaced 'Programs and Sections' in clause 21 to 'responsibility'.	Simplified the content for increased ease of reading.
Policy 007 – Long service leave	Included responsible officer.	Responsible officer not identified in the current policy.
Policy 011 – Elections	Included additional related document.	The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates is relevant to this

		policy.
Policy 021 – Elected member fees, expenses and allowances	1. Included two additional related documents. 2. Included additional responsible officer.	1. Policy 022 – Elected member professional development and the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates are both relevant to this policy. 2. The Mayoral and Governance Support Officer is responsible for processes relating to this policy.
Policy 022 – Elected member professional development	1. Clause 28 updated to reference Cabcharge digital passes. 2. Included additional related document.	1. To reflect the Town's current process. 2. The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates is relevant to this policy.
Policy 023 – Provision of information and services – elected members	Included additional related document.	The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates is relevant to this policy.
Policy 024 – Event attendance	Included three additional related documents.	Policy 022 – Elected member professional development, the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates and Code of Conduct for employees (in relation to the Chief Executive Officer) are relevant to this policy.
Policy 025 – Independent committee members	Included additional related document.	The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates is relevant to this policy.
Policy 026 – Complaints Policy for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates	1. Amended title to Policy 026 – Complaints relating to Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates. 2. Included additional related document.	1. Removing 'Policy' from the title will make this policy consistent with the naming convention of all other Council policies. 2. The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates is relevant to this policy.
Policy 051 – Agenda Briefing Forum, Concept Forum and	1. Clause 11 amended deputation request deadline	1. Clause 11 is amended to be consistent with clause 34 of

workshops	to 6.30pm. 2. Clause 15 amended and new clause 16 included. 3. Included additional responsible officer.	the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019* which states that deputations must be received at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. 2. Clause 15 is amended and a new clause 16 included to enact Council's decision on 15 March 2022 to retain the second public participation time at Agenda Briefing Forums. 3. The Governance Officer is responsible for processes relating to this policy.
Policy 053 – Meeting of electors	1. Policy reference in clause 18 and related documents updated. 2. Included additional responsible officer.	1. Reference to Policy 052 corrected to current title and link updated. 2. The Governance Officer is responsible for processes relating to this policy.
Policy 101 – Governance of Council Advisory and Working Groups	Policy references updated.	Reference to Policy 103 and 021 corrected to current title.
Policy 103 – Communication and engagement	Included responsible officer.	Responsible officer not identified in the current policy.
Policy 104 – Customer service delivery	Updated responsible officer.	Responsible officer amended to correct position title.
Policy 105 – Advocacy	Policy reference in Council workshop definition and related documents updated.	Reference to Policy 051 corrected to current title and link under relevant documents included for ease of reference.
Policy 112 – Visual arts	1. Policy reference in clause 4 and related documents updated. 2. Updated responsible officer.	1. Reference to Policy 301 corrected to current title and link updated. 2. The Coordinator Events, Arts and Funding is now responsible for this policy.
Policy 114 – Community funding	1. Reference to *Local Government (Rules of Conduct) Regulations 2007 and Local Government (Administration) Regulations*	1. Removed incorrect references and included references to the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee

	1996 removed from clause 9. 2. Included two additional related documents. 3. Updated responsible officer.	Members and Candidates and Code of Conduct for employees as they are both relevant to this policy. 2. Codes of conduct and links included under relevant documents for ease of reference. 3. The Coordinator Events, Arts and Funding is now responsible for this policy.
Policy 116 – Sponsorship	1. Clause 2d amended and clause 2e deleted. 2. Clause 3ci amended and clause 3e deleted. 3. Reference to *Local Government (Rules of Conduct) Regulations 2007 and Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* removed from clause 7. 4. Included two additional related documents. 5. Updated policy manager and responsible officer.	1. Sponsorship should deliver a product outcome for the Town, not marketing outcomes, we are aiming to supplement events programming, the marketing objectives are secondary to this outcome. 2. Clause 3e duplicated the provisions of clause 3ci. To ensure the intent of clause 3e was not lost, 3ci was amended. 3. Removed incorrect references and included references to the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates and Code of Conduct for employees as they are both relevant to this policy. 4. Codes of conduct and links included under relevant documents for ease of reference. 5. The Manager Stakeholder Relations manages this policy and the Coordinator Communications and Engagement is responsible for processes relating to this policy.
Policy 208 – Street verges – reinstatement of lawns following works	Local law reference in clause 4 and related documents updated.	Reference to the Verge Local Law corrected to *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares*

		Local Law 2000 and included under relevant documents included for ease of reference.
Policy 221 – Strategic management of land and building assets	1. Included links for relevant documents. 2. Updated policy manager.	1. Included links for the documents listed under relevant documents for ease of reference. 2. Updated policy manager to correct position title.
Policy 222 – Asset management	Updated policy manager.	Manager Technical Services manages this policy.
Policy 223 – Fleet management light vehicles	Included additional related document.	The Code of Conduct for employees is relevant to this policy.
Policy 224 – Fences between property owned by the Town and adjoining property	1. Local law reference in clauses 3, 4, 7 and related documents updated. 2. Clause 7 amended to include a timeframe for the Town to reimburse the owner of a property where they have arranged the fence erection.	1. Reference to the Fencing Local Law corrected to *Town of Victoria Park Fencing Local Law 2021*. 2. Clause 7 has been amended to ensure the policy is fair and equitable for both parties.
Policy 253 – Water conservation	Updated policy manager.	Manager Technical Services manages this policy.
Policy 310 - Leasing	Updated policy manager.	Updated policy manager to correct position title.
Policy 351 – Parking permits	1. New clause 6 included, allowing for up to three vehicle registrations to be listed on a permit with a limitation that the permit may only be used by one vehicle at a time. 2. Clause 74 and 81 deleted and new clause 82 included. 3. Local law reference in policy objective and related documents updated. 4. Updated responsible officer.	1. This will provide greater flexibility for residents with multiple vehicles. This change is based on common customer feedback received by the Town. 2. The Town has introduced a digital permit system which permit holders can update their details for event permits. This removes the requirement for physical event permits therefore, clauses 74 and 81 are no longer required. 3. Reference to the Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law corrected to *Town of Victoria Park Vehicle Management*

		Local Law 2021. 4. Updated responsible officer to correct position title.
Policy 352 – Parking work zones at building sites	Clause 6g amended.	Requests for work zone permits are often for short periods of one day or less. It is impractical to have a sign erected prior to the commencement of work and removal following. The Town will take a practical approach to the installation of work zone signage depending on the length of the permit.

4. Other minor amendments are proposed and are marked up in the attached policies.
5. No changes are proposed to the remainder of the Council's policies.
6. Following Council adoption, the policies will be updated on the website and changes will be implemented by the relevant officers.
7. The next minor policy review will be scheduled for May 2023.

Relevant documents

Policy 001 – Policy management and development

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (73/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council endorses minor amendments to the following policies, in line with Policy 001 – Policy management and development, as attached:

a. Policy 002 – Review of decisions
b. Policy 003 – Legal advice
c. Policy 007 – Long service leave
d. Policy 011 – Elections
e. Policy 021 – Elected member fees, expenses and allowances
f. Policy 022 – Elected member professional development
g. Policy 023 – Provision of information and services – elected members
h. Policy 024 – Event attendance
i. Policy 025 – Independent committee members
j. Policy 026 – Complaints relating to Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates
k. Policy 051 – Agenda Briefing Forum, Concept Forum and workshops
l. Policy 053 – Meeting of electors
m. Policy 101 – Governance of Council Advisory and Working Groups
n. Policy 103 – Communication and engagement
o. Policy 104 – Customer service delivery
p. Policy 105 – Advocacy
q. Policy 112 – Visual arts
r. Policy 114 – Community funding
s. Policy 116 – Sponsorship
t. Policy 208 – Street verges – reinstatement of lawns following works
u. Policy 221 – Strategic management of land and building assets
v. Policy 222 – Asset management
w. Policy 223 – Fleet management light vehicles
x. Policy 224 – Fences between property owned by the Town and adjoining property
y. Policy 253 – Water conservation
z. Policy 310 – Leasing
aa. Policy 351 – Parking permits
bb. Policy 352 – Parking work zones at building sites.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.6 Policy Committee - Terms of Reference review and future meeting dates

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Governance and Strategy
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council:

1. Adopts the amended Policy Committee Terms of Reference as shown in attachment 1.
2. Endorses the Policy Evaluation Schedule as shown in attachment 2.
3. Requests that the Chief Executive Officer conduct policy evaluations for 2022/2023 as follows:
   a. By August 2022
      Policy 023 – Provision of information services – elected members
      Policy 252 – Nuclear free zone
      Policy 112 – Visual arts
   b. By November 2022
      Policy 004 – Risk management
      Policy 251 – Rainforest timbers – use in Town construction
      Policy 303 – Debt collection
   c. By February 2023
      Policy 007 – Long service leave
      Policy 011 – Elections
      Policy 305 – Loan borrowing limitations
   d. By May 2023
      Policy 052 – Recording and live streaming
      Policy 312 – Transaction card
      Policy 402 – Extended trading permit applications – licenced premises.
4. Receives the Policy Evaluation Framework as shown in attachment 3.
5. Schedules its future Policy Committee meetings to be held on:
   a. 23 May 2022
   b. 22 August 2022
   c. 28 November 2022
   d. 27 February 2023
   e. 22 May 2023.

Purpose

To review the current Policy Committee Terms of Reference, set a policy evaluation schedule for the next four financial years, commencing in 2022/2023, and schedule meeting dates for the remainder of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023.

In brief

- The Policy Committee Terms of Reference have been reviewed and minor changes are proposed.
- Clause 10 of Policy 001 – Policy development and management states "A policy evaluation is to occur for each policy at least once every four years.".
- A policy evaluation schedule has been prepared which proposes 12 policies for evaluation in 2022/2023.
- Meeting dates have been proposed to ensure the proposed policy evaluation deadlines can be met.

Background

1. The Policy Committee Terms of Reference were adopted on 29 October 2019 and were last reviewed on 16 June 2020.
2. Over recent years, Council has conducted major reviews of its policies.
3. Policy 001 – Policy development and management states "A policy evaluation is to occur for each policy at least once every four years.".

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL08 - Visionary civic leadership with sound and accountable governance that reflects objective decision-making.	Clear Terms of Reference assist in allowing the committee to run efficiently and effectively, which in turn helps the community to understand the purpose, structure and function of the committee.
CL10 - Legislative responsibilities are resourced and managed appropriately, diligently and equitably.	Planning policy evaluations over the next four financial years allows the Town to ensure the resourcing required to undertake the evaluations can be planned and managed appropriately.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
C-Suite	C-Suite reviewed the list of proposed Policy Evaluation Schedule and had no issues.
Managers	Managers reviewed the list of proposed policy reviews and suggested minor changes to scheduling.
Development Services	Development Services were consulted on the review of the Policy Committee Terms of Reference.

Legal compliance

Section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Funds not available to undertake community consultation for applicable policy evaluations.	Insignificant	Possible	Low	Low	TREAT risk by Council adopting the Policy Evaluation Schedule which will assist officer's with forward planning and budgeting.
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Policies become out of date/inconsistent with relevant legislation.	Minor	Possible	Medium	Low	TREAT risk by continuing to conduct an annual minor review of policies in addition to policy evaluations.
Reputation	Policies are not regularly updated/reviewed causing complaints from the community when content doesn't reflect current processes.	Insignificant	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT risk by continuing to conduct an annual minor review of policies in addition to policy evaluations.
Service delivery	High workload of policy evaluations scheduled for service areas within one financial year resulting in a reduction in service levels.	Minor	Possible	Medium	Medium	TREAT risk by Council adopting the Policy Evaluation Schedule which seeks to spread the evaluations over four financial years to reduce

		workload for the Policy Committee and officers.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Some policy evaluations may involve consultation with the community. The relevant service area will be responsible for considering the financial implications of the evaluation and providing for it in the Annual Budget.

Analysis

Terms of reference

4. The Policy Committee Terms of Reference have been reviewed and proposed amendments are as follows.

Clause	Proposed amendment	Reason
2(1)	Removed annual and included Policy Evaluation Schedule.	As detailed in this report, a Policy Evalution Schedule has been developed which sets a four yearly evaluation rotation for all Council policies. This has been reflected in the amended Terms of Reference.

5. Other minor amendments are proposed and are marked up in Attachment 1.
6. These changes are to provide further clarity in relation to the Policy Committee process.
7. It is recommended that the amended Policy Committee Terms of Reference be adopted.
8. In the future, the Policy Committee Terms of Reference are proposed to be reviewed in line with the appointment of elected members to the committee following each ordinary local government election.

Policy evaluation

9. In accordance with Policy 001 – Policy development and management, an evaluation schedule (attachment 2) has been developed for all 73 Council policies. This schedule spans over the next four financial years.
10. Policies have been scheduled for evaluation taking into consideration when their last major review was completed, feedback from managers, identified need and creating a balanced workload for the Policy Committee and Town officers.
11. In 2022/2023, 12 policies are scheduled to be evaluated as follows.

Policy	Policy adopted/last reviewed	To be presented to Policy Committee
Policy 023 – Provision of information and services – elected members	A major review of Policy 023 was completed in August 2020. With new elected members on board, it is proposed to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy.	August 2022

Policy 112 – Visual arts	Policy 112 was adopted in June 2014 and has not had a major review/evaluation since its commencement.	August 2022
Policy 252 – Nuclear free zone	A major review of Policy 252 was presented to Council in March 2022 and was referred to a future Policy Committee. It is intended that this policy will undergo an evaluation in line with the new Policy Evaluation Framework and be represented to the Policy Committee in August 2022.	August 2022
Policy 004 – Risk management	Policy 004 had a major review in February 2020. The Town will be conducting a review of the Risk Management Framework in 2022/2023. It is good practice to review related documents at the same time to ensure the documents align.	November 2022
Policy 251 – Rainforest timbers – use in Town construction	A major review of Policy 251 was presented to Council in March 2022 and was referred to a future Policy Committee. It is intended that this policy will undergo an evaluation in line with the new Policy Evaluation Framework and be represented to the Policy Committee in November 2022.	November 2022
Policy 303 - Debt collection	Policy 303 was adopted in May 2019 and has not had a major review/evaluation since its commencement.	November 2022
Policy 007 – Long service leave	Policy 007 had a major review in March 2020. An evaluation is due in 2023/2024 however, it has been brought forward to balance the Policy Committee's workload.	February 2023
Policy 011 - Elections	Policy 011 was adopted in July 2021. An evaluation is proposed prior to the next ordinary local government elections in November 2023 to ensure its effectiveness.	February 2023
Policy 305 – Loan borrowing limitations	Policy 306 had a major review in February 2020. An evaluation is due in 2023/2024 however, it has been brought forward to balance the Policy Committee's workload.	February 2023
Policy 052 - Recording and live streaming	Policy 052 was adopted in April 2019 and has not had a major review/evaluation since its commencement.	May 2023
Policy 312 - Transaction card	Policy 312 was adopted in March 2019 and has not had a major review/evaluation since its	May 2023

	commencement.	
Policy 402 – Extended trading permit applications – licenced premises	Policy 402 had a major review in April 2020. An evaluation is due in 2023/2024 however, it has been brought forward to balance the Policy Committee's workload.	May 2023

12. The number of policies scheduled for evaluation in the following three financial years are as follows:
    f. 2023/2024 - 21 policies
    g. 2024/2025 - 20 policies
    h. 2025/2026 - 21 policies
13. To assist staff to conduct evaluations and to ensure there is consistency in the process, a Policy Evaluation Framework has been developed as shown in attachment 3.

Meeting dates

14. In 2021, Council resolved for the following policies to be evaluated and presented to Council by June 2022:
    a. Policy 223 – Fleet management light vehicles
    b. Policy 113 – Homeless – The Town's role.
15. To ensure the Policy Committee has an opportunity to consider these evaluations, a meeting is proposed to be scheduled for 23 May 2022.
16. Meeting dates for the 2022/2023 financial year have been proposed on a quarterly basis to accommodate the 12 policy evaluations to be presented.
17. Meeting dates and the timing of policy evaluations for the 2023/2024 financial year, will be presented to the May 2023 Policy Committee meeting for consideration.

Relevant documents

Policy 001 – Policy development and management

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (74/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council:

1. Adopts the amended Policy Committee Terms of Reference as shown in attachment 1.
2. Endorses the Policy Evaluation Schedule as shown in attachment 2.
3. Requests that the Chief Executive Officer conduct policy evaluations for 2022/2023 as follows:
   a. By August 2022
      (i) Policy 023 – Provision of information services – elected members
      (ii) Policy 252 – Nuclear free zone
      (iii) Policy 112 – Visual arts
   b. By November 2022
      (iv) Policy 004 – Risk management
      (v) Policy 251 – Rainforest timbers – use in Town construction
      (vi) Policy 303 – Debt collection
   c. By February 2023
      (vii) Policy 007 – Long service leave
      (viii) Policy 011 – Elections
      (ix) Policy 305 – Loan borrowing limitations
   d. By May 2023
      (x) Policy 052 – Recording and live streaming
      (xi) Policy 312 – Transaction card
      (xii) Policy 402 – Extended trading permit applications – licenced premises.
4. Receives the Policy Evaluation Framework as shown in attachment 3.
5. Schedules its future Policy Committee meetings to be held on:
   a. 23 May 2022
   b. 22 August 2022
   c. 28 November 2022
   d. 27 February 2023
   e. 22 May 2023.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.7 Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022 - results of public consultation

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Technical Services
Voting requirement	Absolute majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council:

1. Considers the submissions received in relation to the proposed Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022.
2. Makes the Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022 as shown in attachment 1, in accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Purpose and effect
The purpose of this local law is to amend the Schedule 1 of the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000* to reflect the correct clause numbers for items 32-44 and move to the penalty units system, in accordance with the *Town of Victoria Park Penalty Units Local Law 2021*.

The effect of this local law is to amend Clause 9.4 and Schedule 1 of the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000*.

Purpose

To consider submissions received and make the proposed Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022.

In brief

- At the December 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council resolved to advertise the proposed local law for public consultation.
- Consultation commenced on 17 January 2022 and closed on 4 March 2022.
- One submission was received.
- It is recommended the proposed Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022 be made with the inclusion of the minor administrative amendments as shown in attachment 2.

Background

1. The Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) requested the Town to give undertakings to amend the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000* due to drafting errors in Schedule 1 of the local law.
2. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 16 November 2021, Council resolved as follows:

That Council resolves to undertake to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation that:

a. Within the next six months, correct the reference errors in Schedule 1 to clause 3.6 (items 32 to 44).

b. Ensure all consequential amendments arising from undertaking 1 will be made.

c. All copies of the Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Signs on Thoroughfares) Local Law 2021 and consolidated Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading on Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000, publicly available whether in hard copy or electronic form, will be accompanied by a copy of the undertaking above.

3. To correct the drafting errors, an amendment local law was required to be drafted.
4. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 14 December 2021, Council resolved as follows:
   That Council gives notice that it intends to make the Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2021, as shown at attachment 1, which will amend the Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000, in accordance with section 3.12 of the Local Government Act 1995.
5. The making of a local law must follow the process prescribed in Section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL10 - Legislative responsibilities are resourced and managed appropriately, diligently and equitably.	The proposed local law will correct drafting errors and reflect the new penalty units system for local law offences, ensuring the public has up to date information relating to the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading on Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000*.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Technical Services	Supportive of the proposed local law and suggested amendments.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	All community members
Period of engagement	17 January 2022 to 4 March 2022
Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Your Thoughts and written submissions

Advertising	Perth Now Social Media Website Public noticeboards Your Thoughts
Submission summary	No public submissions were received.
Key findings	Not applicable.

Other engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries	The Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries provided a submission with minor administrative amendments requested.

Legal compliance

Section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	The Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022 is not made within the agreed timeframe.				Low	TREAT risk by amending the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000* within six months as resolved by Council on 16

		November 2021.
Reputation	Not applicable.	Low
Service delivery	Not applicable.	Medium

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Analysis

6. In accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, prior to making any local law, the Town was required to give local public notice of the draft law and receive submissions from the public for at least six weeks.
7. The public consultation period commenced on 17 January 2022 and closed on 4 March 2022.
8. In that period, no submissions from the public were received. A submission was received from the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries (DLGSC).
9. The DLGSC submission proposed minor administrative amendments which have been made and are shown in attachment 2.
10. The proposed local law will rectify the drafting errors in Schedule 1 – Prescribed Offences that were enacted by the *Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Signs on Thoroughfares) Local Law 2021* by amending Items 32-44 to reflect the introduction of sub-clauses (1) and (2) to clause 3.6 of the local law.
11. In addition, it will convert the prescribed offences to the penalty units system in accordance with the *Town of Victoria Park Penalty Units Local Law 2021*, which came into effect on 1 July 2021. No changes to the amount for any offence under the local law are proposed.
12. With no objections received it is recommended that the Council make the proposed Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022.

Relevant documents

Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (84/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson

That Council:

1. Considers the submissions received in relation to the proposed Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022.
2. Makes the Town of Victoria Park Amendment (Prescribed Offences) Local Law 2022 as shown in attachment 1, in accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Purpose and effect

The purpose of this local law is to amend the Schedule 1 of the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000* to reflect the correct clause numbers for items 32-44 and move to the penalty units system, in accordance with the *Town of Victoria Park Penalty Units Local Law 2021*.

The effect of this local law is to amend Clause 9.4 and Schedule 1 of the *Town of Victoria Park Activities on Thoroughfares and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000.*

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

15.8 Review of Local Government Property Local Law 2000

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Coordinator Governance and Strategy
Responsible officer	Manager Governance and Strategy
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	{attachment-list-do-not-remove}

Recommendation from the Policy Committee:

That Council gives local public notice of its intent to review the *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* in accordance with section 3.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Purpose

To commence the statutory review of the *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000*.

In brief

- Section 3.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires that a local law must be reviewed within a period of eight years from its commencement.
- The *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* has not been reviewed since its commencement on 14 June 2000.
- It is proposed that the process for reviewing this local law commences.

Background

1. The *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* was published in the Government Gazette on 31 May 2000 and came into effect on 14 June 2000.
2. An amendment to this local law was published in the Government Gazette on 21 June 2005 and came into effect on 5 July 2005.
3. The *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* provides for the regulation, control and management of activities and facilities on local government property within the district.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL02 - A community that is authentically engaged and informed in a timely manner.	Publicly advertising the review of this local laws will ensure the community is consulted on laws affecting them.
CL08 - Visionary civic leadership with sound and accountable governance that reflects objective decision-making.	Reviewing local laws ensures that they remain relevant and can be enforced.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	The *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* ensures that the Town remains a clean, safe and accessible place.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	Comments
Business Services	Business Services were consulted on commencing the statutory review.
Place Planning	Place Planning were consulted on commencing the statutory review.
Property Development and Leasing	Property Development and Leasing support a review of the local law.
Technical Services	Technical Services support a review of the local law.

Legal compliance

Section 3.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	The Town fails to comply with the *Local Government Act 1995* and receives a direction from the Department of Local Government,	Insignificant	Possible	Low	Low	TREAT the risk by commencing the necessary review of the *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000*.

	Sport and Cultural Industries to comply.					
Reputation	The *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* being out of date causes complaints when the Town is unable to address an issue in the community.	Insignificant	Unlikely	Low	Low	TREAT the risk by reviewing the local law to ensure it remains relevant, enforceable and protects the Town and its community.
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	If the findings of the review recommend amendment of the local law, funds will be required in the 2022/23 to make this amended local law. Provision for this has been included in the draft 2022/23 Annual Budget.

Analysis

4. Although the local law has been amended since its commencement, a statutory review has not been conducted.
5. A review of this local law is now overdue and required to be undertaken.
6. In accordance with section 3.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Town is required to give local public notice of the review and receive submissions from the public for a period of at least six weeks.
7. During the public consultation period, Town officers will also review the provisions of the local law.
8. Following the public consultation period, Council will be presented with any submissions received and a recommendation on whether the local law requires amendment.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (75/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council gives local public notice of its intent to review the *Town of Victoria Park Local Government Property Local Law 2000* in accordance with section 3.16 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Carried by exception resolution (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

16 Applications for leave of absence

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (85/2022):

Moved: Cr Vicki Potter **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council approve a leave of absence for:

1. Cr Jesse Hamer for the date of 2 August 2022.
2. Mayor Karen Vernon for the dates of 3 May to 5 May 2022 (inclusive).

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

17 Motion of which previous notice has been given

17.1 Cr Jesse Hamer - Covid Response

In accordance with clause 4.3 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*, Cr Jesse Hamer has submitted the following notice of motion.

Motion
That Council: 1. Survey community input and feedback on how they are coping with covid and how the council can most appropriately support community groups, businesses, residents, ratepayers and electors so they can best support and encourage each other to be a resilient, caring and inclusive community in the face of covid and the many pressures and stresses it has caused. 2. Seeks to learn and implement any best practices of support to any business, organisation or community group that currently operates in the Town.

Reason

In 2022 for the first time the Town of Victoria Park is experiencing actual Covid-19 community transmission and is attempting to remain open without lockdowns while navigating the current restrictions and health advice.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL01 – Everyone receives appropriate information in the most efficient and effective way for them	To share what role the town can play in support.
CL02 - A community that is authentically engaged and informed in a timely manner.	Listen to the stakeholders.
CL03 - Well thought out and managed projects that are delivered successfully.	After hearing and learning the best practices.
CL04 - Appropriate information management that is easily accessible, accurate and reliable.	Open and transparent information.
CL07 - People have positive exchanges with the Town that inspires confidence in the information and the timely service provided.	All responses and inputs are heard.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC01 - A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment and entrepreneurship.	Ensuring commerce can take place.
EC02 - A clean, safe and accessible place to visit.	Maintaining accessibility and safety.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	Handling our covid response correctly to have the best outcome for all.
S02 - An informed and knowledgeable community.	Using the most current and accurate information available.
S03 - An empowered community with a sense of pride, safety and belonging.	Remaining open to encourage that sense of belonging while maintaining safety.

Officer response to notice of motion

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Manager Place Planning and Manager Community
Responsible officer	Chief Community Planner
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Officer comment

1. Administration do not recommend conducting a survey as outlined in the motion. Officers have already undertaken research to identify and then implement best practice support measures within the capacity and capability of the Town's resources. The points below outline the reasons why the Administration do not support the motion.

2. Feedback has already been sought from a sample of the business community at the business breakfast held on 8 February 2022. Two survey questions were asked of attendees:
   (a) How are you feeling about running your business in the current climate?
      (i) The top three answers included nervous, uncertain and apprehensive.
   (b) Is there anything more you think the Town could do to support small business during the COVID pandemic?
      (i) Grants and marketing were mentioned most often.
   (c) In addition to this, the Town commissioned the preparation of a COVID-19 Impact and Opportunities Assessment to help guide the Town's actions with relation to the local economy. This has and is guiding a range of work from the Town.
   (d) A broad survey of the community was also undertaken in 2020 to ascertain the impact of COVID-19. The results of the survey were used to inform the Town's approach to dealing with COVID-19. Questions included:
      (i) *'What do you think the Town should prioritise to assist the community as we enter into the recovery phase of the COVID-19?'* Answers included: supporting local businesses, ongoing communication and encouraging community connection through events and reopening facilities.
      (ii) *'What challenges have you faced or are facing as a result of the pandemic?'* Answers included: Mental and physical related health issues, reduced interaction with others and financial issues.

(iii) For businesses that filled out the survey and noted they had adapted during COVID-19 *'If you adapted, what measures did you undertake?'* The majority of businesses answered they shifted to using different communication tools.

(e) In response to the above, a 'support local' project is being launched, highlighting businesses across the Town and encouraging residents to support their local business community. The feasibility of COVID-19 business grants is also being investigated, with a report going to April 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting.

(f) Information on the Town's approach to supporting the community and the impacts of COVID-19 thus far will likely be presented at the April 2022 Concept Forum.

(g) A Business Perception Survey and a review of the Economic Development Strategy have been recommended in the 2022/23 budget. Both initiatives will include engagement to assess business sentiment.

(h) If a formal survey was to be sent to the business community, it would take a minimum of four weeks from survey creation to gathering of results. COVID-19 community cases are predicted to peak in March/April 2022.

3. The Place Leader (Economic Development) continues to have discussions with local governments on COVID-19 support measures, as well as promoting business support measures from the State Government.

4. Feedback is regularly sourced from a variety of community and not for profit groups regarding their impact and pressure points related to COVID. These include network groups related to children and families, emergency relief, multicultural, Aboriginal, disability access and inclusion, positive relationships. Key findings from these groups include:
   (a) Challenges with attracting and retaining suitably experienced and qualified staff, more than financial resources to deliver programs etc;
   (b) Reduced attendance at programs and activities due to increased concerns by participants / customers / clients related to contracting COVID;
   (c) Families have generally adapted to the changes resulting from COVID, and have networks in place to support their immediate needs, however this area is still a concern;
   (d) There has been an increasing number of vulnerable members of community who require ongoing support from NFP's / support agencies;
   (e) Regular conversations continue to provide insights related to not only COVID, but social and economic challenges being experienced by the wider community, which are then being integrated into program and policy responses by the Town, and other agencies.

5. The Town currently facilitates and or supports the following initiatives that address the impacts of COVID:
   (a) The Town provides a Support for You and Your Family flyer which highlights where support can be accessed for those in need, both in and around the Town, including financial counselling and food parcels;
   (b) Youth Week and Families Week will be delivered utilising COVID-safe outdoor activities with limited numbers as well as opportunities to be informed and engaged online;
   (c) The Town's Healthy Relationships Strategy Group and Family and Children Connect Vic Park Network Group are continuing to meet online and share information on how their services are supporting clients throughout the current COVID outbreak. These meetings offer opportunities for learning and collaboration between local services;
   (d) The Youth Leadership Teams have completed their induction and will commence meeting regularly, both in-person and online. An emphasis of the Youth Action Plan and the Teams is youth mental health, and the Teams will work towards initiatives and activities which will support positive mental health for young people in the Town, particularly as their lives are disrupted by COVID restrictions;

(e) The Town's Mindeera Advisory Group, and Access and Inclusion Advisory Group, have moved to online meetings to maintain meeting attendance and progress for vulnerable individuals. Feedback from these groups continues to be provided to the Town to determine areas it can assist;
(f) The Town's Street Meet 'n' Greet program continues to be implemented with COVID-safe principles in partnership with local community hosts, to address the physical and social isolation impacts of COVID-19.

6. The ABS conducts regular community surveys to provide insights into the prevalence and nature of impacts from COVID-19 on households in Australia. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/household-impacts-covid-19-survey/latest-release

7. Topics covered in this survey include:
   (a) psychological distress
   (b) symptoms of COVID-19 and testing
   (c) changes to job status
   (d) impact of COVID-19 on school or childcare attendance
   (e) unpaid work.

8. Key statistics from the month of February 2022 include:
   (a) 47% of Australians reported a household member had a COVID-19 test in the past four weeks.
   (b) 26% reported the job situation of a household member changed in the past four weeks due to COVID-19.
   (c) 98% reported wearing a face mask in the last week, compared with 44% in June 2021.

   (d) The Town has been conducting a number of community engagement activities in recent months related to the following:
   (e) Strategic Community Plan;
   (f) Social Infrastructure Strategy;
   (g) Safer Neighbourhoods;
   (h) Social Needs Study;
   (i) Events Strategy;
   (j) Transport and Parking Management; and
   (k) Local Planning Strategy.

   (l) In addition to these, a number of other engagements will occur over the coming months related to the following:
   (m) Disability Access and Inclusion;
   (n) Reconciliation;
   (o) Public Health Plan; and
   (p) Community Development Strategy.

   (q) Administration has seen a reduction in community engagement on communications relating to COVID-19 over the past six months.
   (r) Council has requested that consultations aim to be relevant, engaging and that administration considers the impacts of over consulting. Completing further engagement on an issue that the Town has only a small level of impact on could be viewed as over consultation by the community.

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	The Town is seen as over consulting rather than undertaking work to help the community.	Insignificant	Possible	Low	Low	TREAT by not undertaking additional surveys.
	The Town raises community expectations that a variety of services/projects will be delivered as a result of the survey but does not do this due to capacity/capability constraints.	Minor	Likely	Medium	Low	TREAT by not undertaking survey, instead performing desktop research/literature review on community impact of COVID19 and continuing to implement existing initiatives and programs.
Service delivery	There may be some project delivery delays in order to undertake the survey.	Insignificant	Possible	Low	Medium	ACCEPT delays.

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	$110,000 has been recommended in the 2022/23 budget to undertake a Business Perception Survey and a review of the Economic Development Strategy.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

Further consideration

9. The following information was requested at the Agenda Briefing Forum held on 5 April 2022.

10. *Whether the Town has an estimate from regular community inputs around the duration of transmission, length of restrictions, masks, difficulties finding employees, operating costs and revenue reductions.*

    Estimates of community transmission, length of restrictions and mask wearing fall within State Government remit, not the Town or the broader community. The Town has no estimate from the community around the duration of difficulties in finding employees, operating costs and revenue reductions. These will all be dependent on a number of variables, including:

    a. COVID transmission in the community.
    b. The financial health of individual businesses.
    c. Their ability to find employees based on the industry they are operating within.
    d. Interstate and international migration.
    e. The impact of COVID on the broader country and world going forward, and the impact this has on supply chains.

11. *Does the Town have access to Google Mobility Data.*

    Yes, the Town has access to Google Mobility Data. This data is also available to the community on the Google Mobility website. This data (along with other data) helps the Town understand the performance/health of our local economy.

12. *How transmission, restrictions, masks, difficulties finding employees, operating costs and revenue reductions are impacting businesses operating.*

    The Town doesn't have quantitative information on how the items listed above are impacting businesses, just anecdotal evidence that they are.

13. *How much would it cost to run a survey and whether it would come out of the proposed $110,000 proposed in the 2022-2023 annual budget for economic development.*

    The only costs associated with the Town running a survey itself relates to any promotion required. How much promotion needs to be done outside of emails and social media depends on the survey uptake by the community. It is estimated that the Town may need to spend $1,500 on paid promotional activities. This could come out of an existing budget.

    There is the option to outsource the survey creation and delivery. The approximate time taken would be 3 months and the approximate cost would be $15,000. The final time period and cost would be subject to the Town creating a brief and seeking formal quotes from consultants.

    The proposed budget of $110,000 is only for the review of the Economic Development Strategy and a Business Perception Survey.

14. *How long would it take to reach the broad sections of the community with a survey, not just businesses.*

As above, there is the option to outsource the survey creation and delivery. The approximate time taken would be 3 months and the approximate cost would be $15,000. The final time period and cost would be subject to the Town creating a brief and seeking formal quotes from consultants.

15. *What section of the ABS data gives insight into the specific nature of impacts from COVID-19 on households in Victoria Park?*

    The information provided is relative to the Commonwealth of Australia, rather than at a local government level. Consultancy by ABS to extract this data relative to the Town of Victoria Park is estimated to cost between $600 and $2,110.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (86/2022):

Moved: Cr Jesse Hamer **Seconded:** Cr Peter Devereux

That Council requests the Chief Executive Officer:

1) Run a survey to gather community input and feedback on what they are facing with Covid-19 in 2022 and how the Council can most appropriately support community groups, businesses, residents, ratepayers and electors so they can best support and encourage each other to be a resilient, caring and inclusive community in the face of Covid and the many pressures and stresses it has caused.

2) Seeks to learn and implement any best practices of support to any business, organisation or community group that currently operates in the Town.

3) Report back to Council by October 2022 the findings and look at multiple recommendations to assist

Lost (3 - 5)

For: Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux and Cr Jesse Hamer

Against: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

17.2 Mayor Karen Vernon - Items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23

In accordance with clause 4.3 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*, Mayor Karen Vernon has submitted the following notice of motion.

Motion
That Council request the Chief Executive Officer to list the following items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23: 1. Higgins Park - Floodlighting to the football ovals; 2. Road renewal – Etwell Street Local Centre – areas from the end of the new revitalisation works to extend through each roundabout to finish it off; 3. Koolbardi Park – removable shade sails to create a sheltered area in one or both of the enclosed dog exercise areas; 4. Aqualife – removable shade sails for a portion of the outdoor swimming pool.

Reason

1. The existing floodlighting at Higgins Park is very old and no longer working satisfactorily. There is an underlying issue with the power supply to the whole park that requires intervention from Western Power, which will have a cost for the Town also that should be factored in. New floodlighting for the football oval is a feature of the Master Plan, and descoping the delivery of the floodlighting should now be considered to see if it can be done in the 2022/23 year.
2. Etwell St – residents have complained that the new local centre project looks unfinished because the road surface upgrade finishes before each roundabout at either end of the project, so extending the resurfacing through each roundabout to the other side will make the project look more complete.
3. Koolbardi park dog enclosed areas are very popular but there is a distinct lack of shade, and the trees planted will take a long time to provide useful shade.
4. Aqualife – shade sails over outdoor pools is a necessity to prevent skin cancer.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL03 - Well thought out and managed projects that are delivered successfully.	Placing items for consideration in the budget allows due consideration of projects.

Economic	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC1 – A desirable place for commerce and tourism that supports equity, diverse local employment and entrepreneurship.	Etwell St Local Centre is integrated into the pre-existing road network.

Social	
Strategic outcome	Intended public value outcome or impact
S01 - A healthy community.	Outdoor exercise is able to be done safely.

Officer response to notice of motion

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Finance Manager
Responsible officer	Chief Financial Officer
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Officer comment

1. Town staff will list the proposed projects as part of the capital works program for the 2022/23 financial year. It should be noted that:

Higgins Park floodlighting

2. The delivery of this project is technically feasible, but may not be able to be completed within the 2022/23 financial year. This is based on design, tender requirements, time to fabricate bespoke lighting towers, supply issues for materials, the overheated construction sector and Covid factors.
3. The cost of the project is estimated at $600,000 – $700,000. If a detailed design is completed, the cost estimates can be refined.
4. The lighting design has been requested to be undertaken in the current financial year and will utilise the Masterplan playing field arrangement (Option 3). This will assist in refining the costs to implement.
5. The Higgins Park redevelopment may have required earthworks and retaining to increase the playing surface, which could mean that lighting will be delivered ahead of the fields being ready. This may affect the cost of the lighting depending on final location(s) of the light towers.

Etwell Street resurfacing

6. It is anticipated that the identified sections of Etwell Street can be resurfaced by June 2023.
7. The probable cost of the resurfacing is $300,000.

Koolbardi Park - dog enclosed areas shade

8. Shade sails can be installed by June 2023 subject to uninterrupted supply of materials.
9. Depending on the size of sail area, the probable cost is $20,000 - $25,000.

Aqualife - shade sails over outdoor pools

10. Basic shade sails can be installed by June 2023 subject to uninterrupted supply of materials.

11. The probable cost for the project is $50,000 depending on size of sail area and structural requirements.

Legal compliance

Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Overall risk level score	Council's risk appetite	Risk treatment option and rationale for actions
Financial	Not applicable.				Low	
Environmental	Not applicable.				Medium	
Health and safety	Not applicable.				Low	
Infrastructure/ ICT systems/ utilities	Not applicable.				Medium	
Legislative compliance	Not applicable.				Low	
Reputation	Not applicable.				Low	
Service delivery	Not applicable.				Medium	

Financial implications

Current budget impact	There is no budget impact for the 2021/22 financial year.
Future budget impact	Detailed costs for the proposed projects will need to be determined and inclusion may increase the total amount of the capital works budget for the 2022/23 financial year.

Relevant documents

Not applicable.

Cr Bronwyn Ife declared an interest of impartiality.

Cr Luana Lisandro declared an interest of impartiality.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (87/2022):

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

That Council request the Chief Executive Officer to list the following items for consideration in the draft Annual Budget 2022/23:

1. Higgins Park - Floodlighting to the football ovals;
2. Road renewal – Etwell Street Local Centre – areas from the end of the new revitalisation works to extend through each roundabout to finish it off;
3. Koolbardi Park – removable shade sails to create a sheltered area in one or both of the enclosed dog exercise areas;
4. Aqualife – removable shade sails for a portion of the outdoor swimming pool.

Carried (7 - 1)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Cr Peter Devereux

18 Questions from members without notice

Nil.

19 New business of an urgent nature introduced by decision of the meeting

Nil.

20 Public question time

Nil.

21 Public statement time

Nil.

22 Meeting closed to the public

PROCEDURAL MOTION

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Bronwyn Ife

That Council:

1. Closes the meeting to the members of the public at 10.25pm to consider item 22.1.1, in accordance with Section 5.23(2)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
2. Permits the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Operations Officer, the Manager Property Development and Leasing, the Manager Governance and Strategy and the meeting secretary to remain in the chamber during discussion, in accordance with clause 27(3)(a) of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

The meeting went behind closed doors at 10.28pm.

22.1 Matters for which the meeting may be closed

22.1.1 Tamala Park

22.2 Public reading of resolutions which may be made public

The meeting reopened to the public at 11.28pm.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION (CR88/2022)

Moved: Mayor Karen Vernon **Seconded:** Cr Bronwyn Ife

That Council resolves that this report and its resolution remain confidential in accordance with section 5.23(2)(c) and 5.23(2)(e) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Carried (8 - 0)

For: Mayor Karen Vernon, Deputy Mayor Claire Anderson, Cr Luana Lisandro, Cr Peter Devereux, Cr Jesse Hamer, Cr Vicki Potter, Cr Wilfred Hendriks and Cr Bronwyn Ife

Against: Nil

23 Closure

There being no further business, Mayor Karen Vernon closed the meeting at 11.25pm.

I confirm these minutes to be true and accurate record of the proceedings of the Council/Committee.

Signed: ....

.....

Dated this: ..... Day of: 2022