



— *City of* —  
***Melville***

**AGENDA**

**FOR THE**

**ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**TO BE HELD ON**

**TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

**DISCLAIMER:**

The City of Melville disclaims any liability for any loss arising from any person or body relying on any statement, discussion, recommendation or decision made during this meeting.

Where an application for an approval, a licence, or the like is considered or determined during this meeting, the City of Melville warns that neither the applicant nor any other person or body should rely upon that discussion or determination until written notice of either an approval and the conditions which relate to it or the refusal of the application has been issued by the City.

**DISTRIBUTED: 10 OCTOBER 2007**

## **CONTENTS PAGE**

| <b>AGENDA ITEMS</b>  | <b>PAGE/S</b> |
|--|---------------|
| NOTICE OF MEETING/AGENDA   | 2-5           |
| <b>REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>  |               |
| T07/1005 – MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE – POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)   | 6             |
| T07/1006 – ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)  | 15            |
| T07/3000 – MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)   | 19            |
| T07/3001 – PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)   | 23            |
| P07/3021 – PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CORNER MALLAND STREET), MYAREE, ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND OPEN “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT) | 28            |
| C07/8015 – COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FUND (REC) (ATTACHMENT)  | 35            |
| CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)  | 41            |
| CO04/07 - SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)  | 50            |
| CO013/07 - SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)   |               |
| C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER  | 68            |
| C07/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS   | 72            |
| C07/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUTNS  | 76            |
| C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  | 79            |



— City of —  
**Melville**

10 Almondbury Road Booragoon WA 6154  
Postal Address: Locked Bag 1, Booragoon WA 6954  
Tel: 08 9364 0666  
Fax: 08 9364 0285  
Email: [melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au](mailto:melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au)  
Web: [www.melville.wa.gov.au](http://www.melville.wa.gov.au)

## NOTICE OF MEETING

I respectfully bring to the attention of Elected Members that an Ordinary Meeting of the Council will be held in the Council Chambers, Melville Civic Centre, 10 Almondbury Road, Booragoon commencing at 6.30pm on Tuesday, 16 October 2007.

The business paper for the Meeting is scheduled below and your attendance is requested.

10 October 2007

**ERIC LUMSDEN PSM**  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

---

## AGENDA

1. **PRESENT**
2. **IN ATTENDANCE**
3. **APOLOGIES AND APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**
4. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following questions from Agenda Forum 2 October 2007 were taken on notice:

Mr J Addvalue, Applecross

Question 1

“What was the cost of the design and construction of the broken footpath and embankment on the northern side of the Raffles?”

Question 2

“What is the projected cost of the remedial work being done now?”

Question 3

“Who pays?”

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (continued)**

Question 4

“If it is the City of Melville can the City of Melville claim against the relevant designers and contractors, given that the original design was grossly inadequate given the history of that area?”

The A/Director, Technical & Development Services advised that Questions 1 to 4 would be taken on notice with responses being provided at meeting of Council on Tuesday 16 October 2007.

**5. AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS**

A record of functions attended by the Mayor, and Elected Members representing the Mayor for the Council, for the period 19 September 2007 to 15 October 2007, forms an attachment to the Minutes of the Meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT THE RECORD OF FUNCTIONS ATTENDED BY THE MAYOR, AND ELECTED MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE MAYOR ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL, FOR THE PERIOD 19 SEPTEMBER 2007 TO 15 OCTOBER 2007, BE NOTED.**

**6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**6.1 NOTES OF AGENDA FORUM - 4 SEPTEMBER 2007**

**6.2 ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL – 18 SEPTEMBER 2007**

## **DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995**

### **Members' interests in matters to be discussed at meetings to be disclosed**

S.5.65 (1) A member who as an interest in any matter to be discussed at a Council or Committee meeting that will be attended by the member must disclose the nature of the interest -

- (a) in a written notice given to the Chief Executive Officer before the meeting; or
- (b) at the meeting immediately before the matter is discussed.

Penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

### **Meeting to be informed of disclosures**

**S.5.66** If a member has disclosed an interest in a written notice given to the Chief Executive Officer before a meeting then before the meeting -

- (a) the Chief Executive Officer is to cause the notice to be given to the person who is to preside at the meeting; and
- (b) the person who is to preside at the meeting is to bring the notice to the attention of the persons who attend the meeting.

### **Disclosing members not to participate in meetings**

**S.5.67** A member who makes a disclosure under Section 5.65 must not -

- (a) preside at the part of the meeting relating to the matter; or
- (b) participate in, or be present during, any discussion or decision making procedure relating to the matter,

unless, and to the extent that, the disclosing member is allowed to do so under Section 5.68 or 5.69.

Penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

**Please refer to your Handbook for definitions of interests and other detail.**

**7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Disclosures of Interest

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Item No               | : |
| Member                | : |
| Type of Interest      | : |
| Nature of Interest    | : |
| Extent of Interest    | : |
| Request               | : |
| Decision of Committee | : |
| Decision of Council   | : |

**8. APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

**9. IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

**10. PETITIONS**

**11. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | Palmyra/Melville/Willagee   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Parking   |
| Customer Index             | : | Melville Senior High School   |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | T02/3012 – Melville Senior High School and Potts Street parking.                                |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | \$25,000  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | John Cameron<br>Manager Engineering Design  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- There are strong Community concerns over traffic and congestion issues in Potts Street, Melville, associated with the Melville Senior High School (SHS).
- Meetings with Melville SHS, Department of Education and Training, Main Roads WA, and the City of Melville, were held to discuss traffic congestion issues relating to Potts Street adjacent to Melville SHS.
- Preliminary meetings focused on identification of the major concerns and several proposals were discussed to resolve these issues, given the required outcomes of all of the stakeholders.
- The meetings discussed issues revolving around the cost sharing of developing these proposals amongst the major stakeholders, given the limited opportunity to increase school pick-up and set-down within the road reserve at Potts Street.
- The City of Melville and Melville SHS have jointly been developing design proposals to address the traffic concerns in Potts Street.
- The traffic congestion concerns are exacerbated by vehicle access to the school site being limited to only Potts Street.

**BACKGROUND**

The traffic concerns in Potts Street associated with the schools peak traffic periods have been ongoing for some time. These concerns are exacerbated by the geographical location of the school bounded by residential developments on two boundaries, and the Leach Highway on a third boundary. This effectively means that the final boundary, Potts Street, is the only vehicle access point to the school.

A previous report to the Council T02/3012 – Melville Senior High School and Potts Street parking highlighted concerns over traffic congestion in Potts Street during peak pedestrian/vehicle movement periods. The parking and traffic concerns in Potts Street as previously stated have been evident over a long period and are compounded by the continued growth of the student population within the Melville Senior High School.

In early 2006 a meeting was requested by Dr Janet Woollard (MLA) with Elected Members, and Officers of the City of Melville (CoM), Melville Senior High School (Melville SHS), and Department of Education and Training (DoET), to discuss the traffic/parking issues in Potts Street. At this meeting, and subsequent discussions, the issues contributing to the traffic congestion concerns were identified. Discussions into potential solutions to these concerns were developed with a spirit of co-operation between the parties.

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)****DETAIL**

In approximately May 2006 a meeting was held at the Melville Senior High School. The meeting was arranged to discuss the traffic and parking issues associated with the school in Potts Street. During the preceding months there had been much discussion in the local community regarding the Potts Street traffic concerns. These issues had been forwarded to Dr Janet Woollard, who had subsequently contacted the City of Melville to ascertain what could be done to address these concerns. The meeting(s) focused on what could be done to address the traffic concerns if all parties worked together to develop the most appropriate outcomes.

The discussion at the initial meetings focused on identifying the issues contributing to the traffic congestion concerns in the area of Potts Street. Potts Street is the only vehicle access point to the school, giving rise to all traffic/pedestrian issues being focused at this point.

As a Regional High School, students from all areas of the metropolitan region attend the Melville SHS campus. These students arrive at the school generally using regular bus services, and there is no specific bus service using Potts Street in the morning to drop students to the school. However at the end of the scholastic day six buses are provided to collect approximately 285 students. It was advised that the buses are scheduled together to limit the potential anti-social behaviour of students waiting for regular bus services. All anecdotal evidence thus far has pointed to the success of this strategy in reducing the incidence of anti-social issues. The effect of providing this scheduled service is that the six buses are required to queue in Potts Street for approximately twenty minutes whilst loading students exiting the school at 3:00pm. This consequently limits the number of available parking bays available to drivers picking up students during this time.

Other issues discussed were the behaviour of drivers when dropping off or picking up students. Observations of behaviours highlighted concerns over drivers parking in inappropriate locations in Potts Street and alighting from vehicles to walk students onto the school grounds. Whilst away from their vehicles traffic congestion would increase and lead to an increase in inappropriate behaviour. Inappropriate parking of vehicles on the western verge area, adjacent to residential properties, and crossing Potts Street, increases the risk of vehicle/pedestrian conflict given the high vehicle density during these times. The high congestion periods also mean the vehicle speeds are often quite low.

Discussion regarding the most effective means of improving the traffic congestion and parking issues revolved around the possibility of increasing the internal car parking facilities with an emphasis on pick-up and drop-down circulations to try and address the inappropriate driver behaviours. Further to this, the possible relocation of the bus bays in Potts Street to increase the number of parking bays available for picking up students in the afternoons was also raised. The option of providing a bus embayment or separate lane off the Leach Highway and modifications to the internal layout of the school to allow the student catching buses to access this area was discussed. It was considered that further development of this proposal was warranted.

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The issues relating to funding these proposals was also discussed, and it was agreed in principle that the City of Melville, Melville SHS and the Department of Education and Training would develop a cost sharing structure for the development of the off-street parking in Potts Street. The construction of the bus embayment or service lane off Leach Highway would need to be funded by DoET and Main Roads WA. The City of Melville indicated that in a facilitative role it would undertake the design development of these proposals.

Given the limited opportunities within Potts Street, the proposal of providing on-site parking within the school site immediately adjoining Potts Street is in line with the current City of Melville School Parking Policy 30-001 which allows for the contribution toward on-site parking facilities.

Following the initial meetings, a feature survey of the Melville Senior High School site in Potts Street was carried out. From this survey the CoM Design Team developed a proposal to improve the parking situation given a number of criteria supplied by the Melville SHS administration staff. Further to this a feature survey of the Melville SHS adjacent to the Leach Highway was completed. The Design Team is currently working towards a proposal to allow the installation of the bus parking lane. This proposal is still in development and further discussion with Main Roads WA is required before the proposal receives any approvals.

The design proposal for parking improvement works in Potts Street and with the school immediately adjacent to Potts Street was forwarded to the City of Melville's Operations Team for a construction estimate and the Melville SHS was informed of the cost of the works. No further response was received from the school until a meeting was requested by the Melville SHS in early June 2007 to discuss the construction of the project.

At the meeting of June 2007 between Melville SHS Principal and City of Melville Officers, the school was advised that no specific funding had been listed by the City of Melville on the current Capital Works Programme to undertake these works.

Following this meeting it was considered that the construction of the off-street parking in Potts Street may be staged into two discrete components; Stage one encompassing the works associated with the road reserve and minor works to the existing internal car park whilst Stage two would focus on the development of the internal car park. Stage one proposal is shown in attachment 1264A2-07E [1005A October 2007.pdf](#) and Stage two shown on attachment 1265A2-07E [1005B October 2007.pdf](#). Whilst the proposal has been split into two discrete stages the development of the entire project is considered necessary to address the concerns discussed previously.

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**FUNDING OPTIONS**

The options available to providing the off-street car parks to the school site are:

- A. Undertake the works in conjunction with the Melville SHS as soon as practicable and fund the works through the re-scoping of a project currently listed on the current Capital Works Programme (CWP). It is proposed that the City's 50% contribution of \$25,000 be allocated from the Camm Avenue Capital Drainage project and this project be staged over the 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 financial periods as required.
- B. Delay the commencement of the project until funds can be identified from within the current Capital Works Programme (CWP) in the form of savings on projects already listed on the CWP. It is proposed that the 50% contribution of \$25,000 be allocated from the 2007/2008 financial period.
- C. Commence the construction of the off-street car park with the Department of Education and Training funding the entire project and list the appropriate CoM funding allocation on the 2008/2009 CWP for consideration during the budget preparation period. This proposal has yet to be discussed with or approved by DoET.
- D. Defer the construction of the project until the works can be listed in the Budget development process for the 2008/2009 CWP. This outcome would require the unsatisfactory situation in Potts Street to remain until the 2008/2009 financial period.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

No external consultation with the residents of Potts Street for this particular proposal has been carried out. The reason for this is the works to the car parks predominately occurs within the school site. Any works will be undertaken on grounds of improved safety.

The City continues to receive complaints from residents regarding the current parking issues in Potts Street.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Discussion and consultation with the Melville Senior High School, Department of Education and Training and Main Roads WA have been undertaken at all stages of the development of these proposals.

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 55 (2) of the Lands Administration Act 1977 gives the Council the care and control and management of the roads within the municipality, subject to the Main Roads Act 1930 and the Public Works Act 1902.

The school property is Crown Land vested with the Department of Education and Training for the purposes of Education.

City of Melville School Parking Policy 30-001 provides for City contribution toward on-site parking facilities in particular circumstances.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Should Council agree to fund 50% of the off-street parking area with Melville Senior High School the financial implications of the proposed works are as follows;

1. The construction costs associated with the development of “Stage 1” of the project is an estimated amount of \$18,000. There has been no provision in the 2007/2008 budget to accommodate the funding portion of the City of Melville.
2. The construction costs associated with the development of “Stage 2” of the project is an estimated amount of \$32,000. There has been no provision in the 2007/2008 budget to accommodate the funding portion of the City of Melville.
3. Four funding options have been identified in this report.
4. With respect to on-going maintenance costs; the annual costs for the upkeep and maintenance of the works within the road reserve are considered minimal and to be incorporated into the existing maintenance of the Potts Street road pavement.
5. The works within the Melville SHS site will be the sole responsibility of the DoET and Melville SHS.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The Risk implications to the City of Melville in respect to this issue revolve around the

| <b>Risk Statement</b>  | <b>Level of Risk*</b>  | <b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| The proposed off-street parking is not developed and the traffic concerns in Potts Street will continue and worsen as the school’s student population continues to increase. | Moderate consequences which are likely, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk to the users of Potts Street. | Construct the off-street parking proposal Stages 1 and 2 and work with the Melville SHS, DoET and MRWA to develop the proposed Bus Bays in Leach Highway. |
| The development of the off-street parking facility does not fully resolve the traffic and congestion issues in Potts Street.   | Moderate consequences which are possible, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk                             | Continue to develop the Leach Highway bus service lane proposal to further increase the number of parking bays available in Potts Street.                 |

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| The proposed off-street parking facility does not resolve the traffic and congestion concerns in Potts Street   | Moderate consequences which are possible, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk     | Continue to work with the school to educate the vehicle drivers to adopt a more appropriate traffic management strategy for vehicles using Potts Street in peak periods |
| The existing situation and the current inappropriate behaviour of drivers in Potts Street may result in vehicle damage or pedestrian injury, in conjunction with ongoing complaints from adjoining residents. | Catastrophic consequences which are unlikely, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk | Development of the on-site car parking facilities in conjunction with appropriate driver behaviour and management programmes will assist in minimising this risk.       |

\* As derived from using the Risk Assessment Matrix

For further information on risk management [http://melvillenet/risk/risk\\_intro.html](http://melvillenet/risk/risk_intro.html)

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The City of Melville's School Parking Policy 30-001 is relevant to this matter and the provision and funding of the proposed parking on the grounds of safety and efficiency is supported by the intent of the Policy.

Statements within the policy include:

1. Where the City agrees to modify or provide new infrastructure the following criteria will apply; (g) where the need for parking cannot be accommodated within the road reserve that the parking may be provided on the school site (subject to the agreement of the City, the School, and the Department of Education and Training) with the City's funding contribution going towards those works.
2. Recognising that most problems associated with the provision of educational institution parking are a result of congestion at specific time periods, and the inappropriate behaviour of a minority of road users, the City's policy will give priority to; modification or additions to road infrastructure that encourage responsible traffic behaviour and parking.
3. We only give consideration to assisting with the provision of new or additional parking facilities where the educational institution can show evidence of one or more of the following: Development and implementation of a strategy to manage the institution's parking and traffic requirements.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS & THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Alternate options are discussed within the body of the report.

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)****CONCLUSION**

Discussions with the major stakeholders into the Potts Street traffic congestion concerns have resulted in a proposal being developed to address these issues.

The current situation requires the development of the proposal as soon as practical to address the risk issues associated with the concerns raised.

The restricted vehicle access to the Melville SHS site means that any additional parking provided to the area must be accommodated on the school site. This has been agreed to by the Melville SHS and the DoET. The option for the City of Melville to contribute to these works is accommodated in the current School Parking Policy 30-001.

Should the Council agree to contribute to the construction of the off-street parking facilities with the Melville Senior High School, the installation of these facilities will require the City of Melville to contribute \$25,000 towards the construction costs. No allocation for these works is listed on the current 2007/2008 Capital Works programme.

Given the nature of these concerns and the willingness of all parties to address these issues, it is felt that the installation of these facilities should be undertaken as soon as practicable.

It will be possible to reallocate funding from the current Capital Works Programme by re-scoping and staging projects currently listed on the programme and including them into the 2008/2009 CWP. Alternatively, if funding in the form of savings can be identified from within the current CWP these funds could be reallocated toward undertaking these works.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (1005)****ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

- 1. THAT IN CONSIDERATION OF THE ONGOING TRAFFIC AND PARKING ISSUES IN POTTS STREET, AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF MELVILLE SCHOOL PARKING POLICY 30-001, THE COUNCIL AGREE TO FUND 50% OF THE COST, ESTIMATED AT \$25,000, FOR PARKING IMPROVEMENT WORKS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2, AS SHOWN ON PLAN NUMBERS 1264A2-07E, 1265A2-07E FOR WORKS ON POTTS STREET AND WITHIN THE MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL.**
- 2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE FUNDING OF \$25,000 REQUIRED FOR THE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS WORKS IN POTTS STREET BE TRANSFERRED FROM THE EXISTING 2007/2008 CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME CAMM AVENUE DRAINAGE PROJECT, ACCOUNT NUMBER 484.85143.8103.000, DUE TO A CHANGE IN SCOPE OF THAT PROJECT.**

**T07/1005 - MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MELVILLE - POTTS STREET, OFF ROAD PARKING (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- 3. THAT THE ON-SITE PARKING PROPOSAL SHOWN ON PLAN NUMBERS 1264A2-07E & 1265A2-07E BE CONSTRUCTED AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE.**
- 4. THAT MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL BE ADVISED OF THE CITY'S PROGRAMMES IN RELATION TO SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT INITIATIVES AND TO SEEK THEIR SUPPORT TO ACTIVELY ENCOURAGE PARENTS AND STUDENTS TO USE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORT MODES.**
- 5. THAT THE CITY WRITE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SEEKING FUNDING FOR PARKING AND ACCESS IMPROVEMENT WORKS, INCLUDING THE RELOCATION OF SCHOOL BUSES FROM POTTS STREET ADJACENT TO THE MELVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL.**

**T07/1006 - ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Road Safety Advisory Committee  |
| Customer Index             | : | Road Safety Advisory Committee  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | T05/1011  |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | Not Applicable  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Robert Willis<br>Director Technical & Development Services                                      |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|  | <u>Definition</u>   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy          | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive         | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative       | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial    | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**T07/1006 - ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

The Road Safety Advisory Committee is a networking group formed to help highlight issues of concern such as pedestrian, transport, community road safety and security as well as to identify possible funding initiatives.

Every two years, the role of and necessity for the Committee is reviewed by the City of Melville. This item is seeking the Council's approval for the continuation of the Committee.

**BACKGROUND**

The Road Safety Advisory Committee was formed in the early 1990's with membership including representatives from the City of Melville, the Western Australian Police, Main Roads Western Australia and State politicians from the local area.

Meetings are held every four months.

The function of this Committee is to look at road safety issues such as "Black Spots" and special areas of concern such as facilitation for children and the older pedestrians.

The aims and objectives of this Committee are to improve communication and share information and resources between Government Authorities to improve the safety and efficiency of roads within the City of Melville.

**DETAIL**

The Road Safety Advisory Committee is a networking group formed to help highlight issues of concern such as pedestrian, transport, community road safety and security as well as to identify possible funding initiatives.

**Western Australian Police**

The Western Australian Police is one of the biggest contributors to this initiative, which highlights their commitment to reduce road trauma and enforcing new directions in traffic. Road Safety and traffic control is very important and the presence of the Police will assist to alleviate the number of road crashes. The Police are keen to set-up a Reference Group to check on the implementation of traffic rules and regulations. With the current implementation of the "*anti-Hoon Legislation*" it is envisaged that through the efforts of the WA Police, our roads will become safer.

**T07/1006 - ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)**

Main Roads Western Australia

Representatives from Main Roads Western Australia are also members of the Road Safety Advisory Committee. Main Roads Western Australia assists with implementing traffic flows and tracking traffic movements. The State Black Spot Programme is given priority funding in order to provide a safer community.

The State Black Spot Programme identifies different projects by treating sections of roads where crashes occur to include safety treatments such as shoulder sealing, edge lining and crash barriers.

**Office of Road Safety**

The participation of the Office of Road Safety to the Road Safety Advisory Committee is vital in the sense that different campaigns are being introduced to educate the public. The Office of Road Safety conducts various forums nationwide attended by delegates from various government and non-government sectors, organisations and general public who are interested in promoting road safety awareness.

Local Politicians

Local Politicians currently serving on the Committee are:-  
Hon. Sheila Mills MLC – Member for South Metropolitan Region  
Dr Janet Woollard MLA – Member for Alfred Cove  
Trevor Sprigg MLA – Member for Murdoch

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

The operation of the Road Safety Advisory Committee is a form of public consultation because of representation from various groups within the community.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Nil

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**T07/1006 - ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)****POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS & THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**CONCLUSION**

The aims and objectives of this Committee are to improve communication and share information and resources between Government Authorities to improve the safety and efficiency of roads within the City of Melville. This Committee is of benefit to the City of Melville and it is therefore recommended that it continue in its current form.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (1006)****APPROVAL**

**THAT THE ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONTINUE TO MEET ON A QUARTERLY BASIS AND CONTINUE TO CARRY OUT THEIR CURRENT FUNCTIONS AS DETAILED IN THIS REPORT AND THAT A FURTHER REVIEW OF THE CONTINUING NEED FOR THE GROUP BE CONDUCTED IN 2 YEARS TIME AND A REPORT SUBMITTED TO COUNCIL.**

**T07/3000 - MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Murdoch Precinct Group  |
| Customer Index             | : | Murdoch Precinct Group  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | T05/1013  |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | Not Applicable  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Robert Willis<br>Director Technical & Development Services                                      |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|  | <u>Definition</u>   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy          | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive         | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative       | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial    | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**T07/3000 - MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

The function of this Committee is to share strategic planning information on the proposed development of the Murdoch Precinct.

The aims and objectives are to exchange information on the progress of strategic project development within the Murdoch Precinct and the possibility of joint projects and development of common issues.

Every two years, the role of and necessity for the Committee is reviewed by the City of Melville. This item is seeking Council's approval for the continuation of the Committee.

**BACKGROUND**

The Murdoch Precinct Strategy Group was formed in the early 1990's. The members that form this committee are politicians and representatives from the following industries:

- City of Melville
- St John of God Healthcare Murdoch
- Challenger TAFE
- Spotless Linen
- Rangeview Remand Centre
- Murdoch University
- Murdoch Police
- Department of Planning & Infrastructure
- Health Department of WA
- South West Group
- Western Power
- FESA
- Wesfarmers Energy
- Local Politicians :-
  - Trevor Sprigg MLA – Member for Murdoch
  - Hon Sue Ellery MLC – Member for South Metropolitan Region

The function of this Committee is to share strategic planning information on the proposed development of the Murdoch Precinct. Meetings are held every quarter.

The aims and objectives are to exchange information on the progress of strategic project development within the Murdoch Precinct and the possibility of joint projects and development of common issues.

**T07/3000 - MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)**

**DETAIL**

A number of major planning developments are being initiated:

1. Expansion of St John of God Healthcare Murdoch
2. Development of Public Hospital (Fiona Stanley Hospital)
3. Expansion of Challenger TAFE
4. Strategic Planning and Development of Murdoch University
5. Creation of the South Street Railway Station and associated bus links
6. Monitoring of development of Rangeview Remand Centre and Spotless Linen.

While in the past this committee has exchanged information on proposed building development, its focus is becoming more strategic with future developments of the precinct and the opportunity to interconnect and compliment each other with access and public transport.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

The operation of the Murdoch Precinct Strategy Group is a form of public consultation because of representation from various groups within the community.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Nil

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The role and actions of the City of Melville Murdoch Precinct Strategy Group contributes to the implementation of the following strategies from the City of Melville Strategic Plan *"Our City – Our Future (Revised 2005)*.

**T07/3000 - MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP (BIENNIAL REVIEW) (REC)**

| Vision                                | Strategic Objectives                               | Deployment Objectives  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 3. Community Service and facilitation | 3.3 Transportation                                 | 3.3.1 Transport Strategy   |
| 4. The Native Environment             | 4.2 To achieve an environmentally Sustainable City | 4.2.2 Sustainable urban development<br>4.2.3 Advocacy<br>4.2.4 Education and information |
| 5. Economic Development               | 5.1 Sufficient business and employment             | 5.1.1 Business Development   |
|                                       | 5.3 A vibrant local economy                        | 5.3.1 Strategic relationship   |

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Planned development will have impact in terms of Policy areas for future subdivision, residential development and design guidelines.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS & THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**CONCLUSION**

The aims and objectives of the group are to exchange information on the progress of strategic project developments within the Murdoch Precinct and the possibility of joint projects and development of common issues. This Committee is of benefit to the City of Melville and it is therefore recommended that it continue.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (3000)**

**APPROVAL**

- 1. THAT THE MURDOCH PRECINCT STRATEGY GROUP CONTINUE TO MEET ON A QUARTERLY BASIS AND CARRYING OUT THEIR CURRENT FUNCTIONS AS DETAILED IN THIS REPORT AND THAT A FURTHER REVIEW OF THE CONTINUING NEED FOR THE GROUP BE CONDUCTED IN 2 YEARS TIME AND A REPORT SUBMITTED TO COUNCIL.**
- 2. THAT WITH THE ONGOING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE MURDOCH PRECINCT, THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP BE REVIEWED TO ENSURE AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF REPRESENTATION FROM ALL STAKEHOLDERS INCLUDING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AS APPROPRIATE.**

**T07/3001 - PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Ward                       | : | Palmyra/Melville/Willagee  |
| Category                   | : | Operational  |
| Subject Index              | : | Road Closures  |
| Customer Index             | : | Mr Page  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.<br>Yes. Make contact with your Manager/Director. |
| Previous Items             | : | None   |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable   |
| Funding                    | : | Not Applicable   |
| Responsible Officer        | : | John Cameron<br>Manager Engineering Design   |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy    | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive              | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legislative | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review                 | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial         | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**T07/3001 - PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMDAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- Subdivision of Lot 389 corner Hammad Street and Antony Street Palmyra into five (5) residential lots (survey strata).
- Request by the owner of survey strata lot 4 to reduce truncation.
- Process a Section 58 Road closure as per the Land Administration Act 1997

**BACKGROUND**

A land parcel on the east side of the intersection of Hammad Street and Antony Street (formerly lot 389) was approved for subdivision into five (5) survey strata lots. An extract from the tax plan showing the former lot forms an attachment to this report. [3001 October 2007.pdf](#)

The original lot 389 did not have a truncation at the intersection of Hammad Street and Antony Street. This was a common practice in Palmyra at the time of the original subdivision. A condition was imposed on the subdivision application that a six (6) metre truncation be created on survey strata lot 4.

**DETAIL**

One of the lots created as part of the subdivision (survey strata lot 4) was purchased by a Mr Mat Page. The lot is currently two hundred and one (201) square metres in area with a truncation of eighteen (18) square metres. A plan showing the proposed revision to the truncation forms an attachment to the report.

The owner claims that he only become aware of the six (6) metre truncation after purchasing the land and that this significantly impacts on the scope to include a front court yard area within the property.

He further states that he contacted Landgate to enquire as to possibility of reducing the truncation and was apparently advised that he would need to apply through his local government authority.

His request has been investigated by officers at the City of Melville in relation to traffic issues such as sight distances. It has been determined that reducing the truncation to a four (4) metre truncation would be acceptable to the City of Melville and would not present any additional risk to motorists.

The area of land involved in reducing the truncation to four (4) metres is eight (8) square metres. Therefore the revised area of truncation would be ten (10) square metres.

**T07/3001 - PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The procedure to transfer this portion of road reserve to the owner of the property includes the following steps:

- Gain Council support for proposal.
- Write to Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) on behalf of property owner requesting approval for road closure (assuming Council approval is granted).
- If DPI approval is given, the City of Melville is to advertise the proposed road closure in accordance with Section 58 of the Land Administration Act 1997 and obtain clearances and conditions from statutory service authorities, ie., Telstra, Water Corporation and Western Power.
- Advise Landgate of DPI approval (if given), and information of Statutory clearances and conditions.

After the above processes have been successfully resolved subsequent dealings are between the property owner and Landgate. The property owner will be directly responsible for paying Landgate the cost of the land and providing survey plans of the proposed boundary adjustment.

It should be noted that the area of land that the owner is seeking to acquire does not provide any additional benefit other to give provide an increase in area for open space.

The costs associated with the road closure, including advertising and officers time, will be charged to the owner of property who has been advised that all costs will be incurred by them. The owner has indicated that they are agreeable to this but a confirmation will be sought in writing.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Advertising will be required in accordance with Section 58 of the Land Administration Act.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Advertising in accordance with Section 58 of the Land Administration Act  
DPI – Statutory Planning Division  
Letters to Public Utility Service Authorities  
DPI - Landgate

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The practice of providing 6x6m truncations is still commonplace, however (as indicated below) it is possible to create lesser “default” truncations of 3x3m at the subdivision stage in accordance with requirements of the Western Australian Planning Commission’s (WAPC) Liveable Neighbourhoods Draft Operational Policy. The practice of retrofitting reduced truncations as proposed is not specifically espoused by the Policy, however such is not precluded.

**T07/3001 - PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

All costs associated with the proposed road closure are to be met by the property owner.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Liveable Neighbourhoods indicates that 6x6m truncations have previously been required to provide for sightlines at intersections. “However, sightlines are rarely needed to provide adequate safety at stop signs or other slow point controlled junctions. A balance is required to allow for ease of pedestrian movements at crossings and safety for street users as well as providing for the necessary services within the street reserve. To appropriately align and position stormwater and other services at intersections, a small truncation is generally needed. However, this should be minimal to keep vehicle speeds low because the kerb return radii also influences the swept path of vehicles and the speed at which those turns are made.”

As provided by the Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy, reduced corner truncations should not impact on traffic or pedestrian safety. The only concern raised relates to whether this proposal will set a precedent and as a result increased service delivery demands on the City in terms of processing Road Closures to facilitate reduced truncations following initial subdivision. Notwithstanding, the approach taken with this proposal, where the majority of work involved is undertaken by the applicant or agent this will reduce the workload demands on the City of Melville to some degree.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS & THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Council could resolve to refuse to progress the proposal on the basis that the Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy indicated that the provision of reduced corner truncations should be “handled at the detailed planning and engineering design phase, following preliminary approval” (of subdivision).

**CONCLUSION**

Whereas the Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy of the WAPC actively encourages reduced corner truncations at a 3x3m default at subdivision, it does acknowledge that “specific situations may require an increase in the default requirements.” Accordingly, given that the subject property is located opposite the District Centre Precinct 4 - Petra Centre and that Hammad Street would provide a link between Carrington Road and Petra Street and Access to signalised intersections with Canning Highway for commercial traffic use, it is desirable from a traffic safety point of view it would be preferable to have a 4x4m truncation as indicated above.

Accordingly, it is recommended that Council initiate road closure procedures with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure at the applicant’s cost.

**T07/3001 - PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO TRUNCATION LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (3001)**

**APPROVAL**

1. THAT COUNCIL PROVIDES ITS IN PRINCIPLE SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ROAD CLOSURE OF THE PORTION OF ROAD RESERVE ABUTTING LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET, PALMYRA, SUBJECT TO THE APPLICANT MEETING ALL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CLOSURE AND ACQUISITION OF THE AREA.
2. THAT THE PROPOSED CLOSURE OF THE PORTION OF ROAD RESERVE ABUTTING LOT 4 CORNER ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET, PALMYRA, AS SHOWN ON THE ATTACHED PLAN, BE ADVERTISED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 58 OF THE LAND ADMINISTRATION ACT 1997.
3. THAT SUBJECT TO:
  - NO OBJECTIONS BEING RECEIVED;
  - APPROVAL FROM THE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE;
  - FINAL WRITTEN AGREEMENT FROM THE OWNER OF LOT 4 ANTONY STREET TO MEET ALL ASSOCIATED COSTS BEING RECEIVED.

LANDGATE BE REQUESTED TO CLOSE THE PORTION OF ROAD RESERVE ABUTTING LOT 4 ANTONY STREET AND HAMMAD STREET, PALMYRA, AS SHOWN ON THE ATTACHED PLAN, AND AMALGAMATE THE RESULTANT LAND WITH LOT 4.

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ward                       | : City  |
| Category                   | : Strategic   |
| Application Number         | : CPS5-53   |
| Property                   | : Lot 56 (485) Marmion Street (cnr Malland Way)   |
| Proposal                   | : Amend CPS No. 5 to provide for Additional Uses of “Offices” and “Warehouse”.  |
| Applicant                  | : Tuscom Subdivision Consultants Pty Ltd  |
| Owner                      | : Screentech Australia Pty Ltd  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.   |
| Responsible Officer        | : Keith Weymes<br>Manager Planning and Development Services   |
| Previous Items             | : P07/5005 – Finalisation of Amendment No 47 to CPS No 5 – Modification of Myaree Mixed Business Frame and Precinct by addition of new zones, Precincts, development requirements, definitions and modification to the Use Class Table. |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy               | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive              | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council.<br/>e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legislative | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review                 | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial         | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person’s right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- Proposed Amendment to CPS No. 5 to provide for Additional Uses of “Office” and “Warehouse” at Lot 56 (485) Marmion Street (cnr Malland Street), Myaree which is currently zoned “Living Area Precinct MY1 – Myaree” with a density coding of R20.
- The owner made a previous submission on Amendment No 47 to CPS No 5 seeking support for rezoning of the subject property to “Mixed Use Frame”. This was not supported due to concerns that it would require readvertising and hence delay the progression of the Amendment. The matter was referred to Strategic Planning Services for consideration under the review of CPS No 5.
- The property is located immediately between existing residential and commercial/industrial developments and zones.
- The residential amenity of the property is diminished to the point that the current adjacent development and zoning discourages redevelopment and blights the adjacent residential character of the area.
- If supported Special Conditions are required to control future development and ensure that residential character is achieved in this section of Marmion Street.
- It may be logical to apply a similar “Mixed Use Frame” zone to the property consistent with the proposal for rezoning of the properties to the south in accordance with Amendment No 47.
- Although storage is currently proposed to be supported in the “Mixed Use Frame” zone under Amendment No 47, proposals for warehousing under the review of CPS No 5 list this use as not permitted.
- Recommended that the Amendment be initiated by Council for Additional Use of “Office” and “Medical Centre” with appropriate Special Conditions.

**BACKGROUND**

During the advertising period of Amendment No 47, the owner made a submission on the Amendment to seek rezoning of the subject property to “Mixed Use Frame”. In support of the proposal, the owner indicated as follows:

*“Amendment is supported with a request for the boundary of the “Mixed Use Frame” to be reassessed to include an existing residential property in the state of disrepair at 485 Marmion Street (cnr Malland Street). The property is bounded by the existing “Mixed Business Frame” and proposed “Mixed Use Frame”, and faces the “Mixed Business Precinct” to the east and the proposed “Mixed Use Precinct”. It is acknowledged that the Amendment excludes this property from the “Mixed Use Frame” to maintain residential character along Marmion Street west of Malland Street. In order to address this, it is proposed to redevelop the site with a 2 storey office / warehouse with residential façade facing Marmion Street. Access for commercial vehicles would be proposed to Malland Street, with parking to the rear and residential style fencing onto Marmion Street to maintain residential character. This proposal represents a good compromise between maintaining residential character and providing for the redevelopment of the site to its full potential.”*

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

In response to this submission, it was noted that:

*“the subject property is on the periphery of the study area and whilst the proposal may have some merit, it has not been advertised for public comment. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to modify the zoning applicable to the property, without going through additional consultation to determine to extent of public support for the proposal. Readvertisement of this proposal under this Amendment would delay its progression. Accordingly, it is recommended that this matter be referred to Strategic Planning Services for consideration under the current review of the Community Planning Scheme.”*

Accordingly, Part 3 of Council’s resolution (P07/5005 – Council 19 June 2007) indicated that:

*“all submissions to the advertisement of Amendment No 47 which requested modifications which were not specific to the Amendment area or were inappropriate to uphold without further public consultation be referred to the City of Melville’s Strategic Planning Services for consideration of inclusion under the current review of the Community Planning Scheme.”*

**Scheme Provisions**

|              |   |                                   |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| MRS Zoning   | : | Urban                             |
| CPS 5 Zoning | : | Living Area Precinct – MY1 Myaree |
| R-Code       | : | R20                               |
| Use Type     | : | N/A                               |
| Use Class    | : | N/A                               |

**Site Details**

|                                      |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Lot Area                             | : | 817sqm                                    |
| Retention of Existing Vegetation     | : | N/A                                       |
| Street Tree(s)                       | : | N/A                                       |
| Street Furniture (drainage pits etc) | : | N/A                                       |
| Site Details                         | : | <a href="#">P07 3021 PROPERTY MAP.pdf</a> |

[P07 3021 October 2007.pdf](#)

The site is presently developed with a single dwelling.

---

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****DETAIL**

The applicant has raised the following points in support of the amendment proposal:

1. The site is located adjacent and abutting a variety of landuses and zonings. To the north and west of the Lot are established single residential dwellings within the Living Area Precinct – MY1 Myaree. To the south is an abutting warehouse within the Myaree “Mixed Business Frame” (proposed “Mixed Use Frame” under Amendment No 47) and to the east is a large undeveloped open lot used for mass storage in the “Mixed Business Precinct” (proposed “Mixed use Precinct”). Accordingly, it is appropriate that the property be utilised for office and warehouse uses.
2. The proximity of the site to heavy commercial/semi industrial uses coupled with intense traffic volumes in Marmion Street and the nearby Norma Road intersection impact on the residential amenity of the site. It is considered that the site is inappropriately located for continuing residential use.
2. It is understood that the City of Melville is strongly in favour of maintaining residential character along Marmion Street to the west of Malland Street. Accordingly, it is proposed that the site be redeveloped into a purpose built two (2) storey office/warehouse building with a residential facade to Marmion Street (see attached plan). Along the Marmion Street façade, it is proposed to erect a visually permeable front fence to secure the area which is to be complemented with high quality landscaping within the lot and on the road verges. All vehicular access and parking is proposed off Malland Street (as the commercial/industrial street) to eliminate unsightly car parking areas from the residential character in this portion of Marmion Street. The proposal is a good compromise between maintaining residential character and providing for the site to be developed to its full commercial potential.
3. The proposal will provide for the redevelopment of the existing dwelling (which is in a current poor state of repair) and as a result improve the residential amenity of the location. The locational characteristics and the sites ineligibility for subdivision do not encourage repair of the existing dwelling or redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.
4. The impacts of the proposal on the adjoining residential property owner have been taken into consideration in the preparation of the concept plan (attached). The owner of the adjoining residential property has been consulted and provided a letter of support for the proposal.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Part 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 provides for Council to initiate amendments to town planning schemes. Once initiated, Council must advertise the Amendment, consider submissions and forward the proposal to the Hon. Minister for Planning and Infrastructure for determination.

The decision from Council on whether or not to initiate the subject Amendment is final and no appeal rights exist.

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

On conclusion of the Amendment, any future development application will be subject to assessment of CPS no 5 and Council Policy requirements.

**CONSULTATION**

If supported, the proposed Amendment will require formal advertising to seek public comment in accordance with procedures outlined in the Western Australian Planning Commission Bulletin No. 29. It is noted that following the publication of this draft item on the Agenda for the Agenda Forum meeting held on 2 October 2007, Councillors have received a submission indicating objection to the proposed warehouse component of the amendment application. Although not a formal submission on the Amendment at this point, the submission does indicate support for redevelopment for grouped dwellings, residentially designed offices or medical suites on the site.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS & THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Council could choose to refuse to initiate the subject Amendment on the grounds that the matter be considered under the Scheme Review as previously resolved in consideration of Amendment No 47.

**COMMENTS**

The subject corner site is subject to diminished residential amenity due to adjacent commercial and industrial type landuses and associated traffic. In addition, it is recognised that the current locational characteristics, traffic and zoning requirements (R20 density coding) do not encourage the redevelopment of the existing development. Accordingly, these constraints will continue to blight the amenity of the locality and impact on the residential character of this section of Marmion Street.

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The City of Melville Strategic Urban Planning Services has indicated that although this proposal may be considered as part of the Scheme review, the current proposal may be supported in its own right to actively encourage redevelopment of the site and improve the residential character of the locality. In this regard, the preliminary design presents a residential façade to Marmion Street. In addition, it may be logical to apply a similar “Mixed Use Frame” zone to the property consistent with the proposal for rezoning of the properties to the south in accordance with Amendment No 47. Although “storage” is currently proposed to be supported in the “Mixed Use Frame” zone under Amendment No 47, proposals for “Warehouse” under the review of CPS No 5 list this use as not permitted. Accordingly it is considered undesirable to allow for “Warehouse” as part of this Additional Use proposal. “Medical Centre” would be another desirable use in this location, being consistent with both the current “Mixed Use Frame” proposal under Amendment No 47 and the review of CPS no 5.

It is noted that the preliminary development concept plan has no statutory recognition. However, elements of the plan may if the proposal is supported be incorporated within Special Conditions of Schedule 3 of CPS No 5 – Additional Uses and Special Conditions table. In this regard, it is considered desirable to include the following Special Conditions for any future development:

1. Provision of residential setbacks to all streets, with the primary street setback of 6.0 metres to apply to the Marmion Street frontage.
2. Marmion Street frontage to be landscaped and developed as a typical residential front garden with any fencing being open screen fencing.
3. All vehicular parking to be provided off Malland Street behind the Marmion Street front setback and behind landscape screening to Marmion street.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposal will provide for the redevelopment of the subject site in a manner which will provide a balance between contributing to the residential character of Marmion Street west of Malland Way and ameliorating the amenity impacts of adjacent commercial/industrial development on the subject property.

In view of the strategic planning direction for the locality, it is recommended that CPS No 5 be amended to provide for “Office” and “Medical Centre” Additional Uses together with the application of Special Conditions for any future development designed to reduce the impact of the proposal on adjacent residents.

**P07/3021 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 – LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR MALLAND STREET), MYAREE – ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “WAREHOUSE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (3021)**

**APPROVAL**

1. PURSUANT TO PART 5 OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2005, COUNCIL RESOLVE TO INITIATE AMENDMENT NO 53 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO 5 AS FOLLOWS:

AMENDING SCHEDULE 3: ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE LOT 56 (485) MARMION STREET (CNR) MALLAND STREET, MYAREE WITH ADDITIONAL USES OF “OFFICE” AND “MEDICAL CENTRE” AND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL CONDITIONS FOR ANY FUTURE DEVELOPMENT:

- I) PROVISION OF RESIDENTIAL SETBACKS TO ALL STREETS, WITH THE PRIMARY STREET SETBACK OF 6.0 METRES TO APPLY TO THE MARMION STREET FRONTAGE.
  - II) MARMION STREET FRONTAGE TO BE LANDSCAPED AND DEVELOPED AS A TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL FRONT GARDEN WITH ANY FENCING BEING OPEN SCREEN FENCING.
  - III) ALL VEHICULAR PARKING TO BE PROVIDED OFF MALLAND STREET BEHIND THE MARMION STREET FRONT SETBACK AND BEHIND LANDSCAPE SCREENING TO MARMION STREET.
  - IV) THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE OF A RESIDENTIAL SCALE AND HAVE A RESIDENTIAL FAÇADE TO MARMION STREET WITH ANY SIDE SETBACKS BEING AS WOULD BE REQUIRED BY THE RESIDENTIAL PLANNING CODES IF IT HAD APPLIED AND ASSUMING THAT ANY OPENING IS A MAJOR OPENING.
2. THAT HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE AUTHORISED TO ENDORSE THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT.
3. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE FORWARD A COPY OF THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENTATION TO:
- A) THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 81 OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2005.
  - B) THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION FOR INFORMATION.
4. THAT ON RECEIPT OF ADVICE FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY UNDER SECTION 48A OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT INDICATING THAT THE AMENDMENT NEED NOT BE SUBJECT TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, THE AMENDMENT BE ADVERTISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TOWN PLANNING REGULATIONS FOR NOT LESS THAN 42 DAYS.
5. THE APPLICANT BE ADVISED OF 1-4 ABOVE.

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Recreation  |
| Customer Index             | : | Department of Sport and Recreation  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | NIL.  |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | \$35,400  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Todd Cahoon<br>Manager Health and Lifestyles  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|  | <u>Definition</u>   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive           | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative         | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review              | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial      | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

This report seeks Council approval, priority and ranking for two grant applications received as part of the annual Community Sport and Recreation Facility Fund (CSRFF) facilitated by the Department of Sport and Recreation (DSR). These projects are:

- The redevelopment of the Leeming Recreation Centre
- The Marmion Reserve Sporting Association request for floodlighting and undercover improvements.

**BACKGROUND**

This year officers spoke to 6 community groups regarding a range of CSRFF projects.

- Palmyra Primary School - Netball Courts
- Brentwood Scout Group - Clubroom improvements
- Brentwood Karoonda Sporting Association - Floodlighting improvements
- Willagee Sports Association - Installation of floodlights
- Kardinya Bowling Club - Cool Room Installation
- Marmion Reserve Sporting Association - Floodlighting and Undercover improvement

The projects for Palmyra Primary School and Brentwood Scout Group did not fit the DSR criteria and therefore would not have received any funding and can not be considered.

The project for the Brentwood Karoonda Sporting Association became too expensive as additional lighting towers may be required. The timeframe for submitting the technical detail as part of this application and the additional fundraising that would be required to fund the project was also considered too short. However officers may be in a position to list a capital budget request for the 2008/2009 financial year should the new lighting towers not be required.

The Willagee Sporting Association project has also experienced higher than expected costs and there is an additional uncertainty regarding a rezoning of the rugby league competition by the sports peak body which may require the Willagee Rugby League Club to relocate out of the City of Melville into the City of Cockburn.

The Kardinya Bowling Club made initial enquiries regarding the installation of a cool room which would not have received any funding from the DSR. However the club has already completed the project from club funds.

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)**

The City of Melville introduced some changes regarding the application process for the 2007 CSRFF applications with the view of presenting applications to Council with the appropriate planning and building approvals in place. The City of Melville received a late application from the Marmion Reserve Sporting Association (MRSA) for upgrading of floodlights and the construction of undercover areas. The application has been lodged with planning and building and the City of Melville is awaiting signed copies of the original plans. The delay is due to the designers suffering from ill health and it is expected that approvals will be given shortly after these documents are received.

**DETAIL****Leeming Recreation Centre**

At the August 2007 round of Council meetings the City of Melville approved an \$8,100,000 redevelopment at the Leeming Recreation Centre. A CSRFF application will be submitted for;

- Better compliance issues, completion of works identified within the disability report work leading to better access and inclusion,
- Roof replacement
- A range of physical activity opportunities for all ages and
- Interactive water play and pool upgrades.

These components of the redevelopment total \$4,275,000 million dollars. Submitting an application solely for the above components of the project will provide a greater chance of success in the CSRFF funding round. Whilst the City of Melville will be investing considerable amounts of capital allocations for the completion of this project it is likely that requesting a full one third contribution would not be approved.

Therefore the City of Melville will seek funding for the project of \$1,425,000 through the CSRFF. It is proposed that the City of Melville gives this project a number 1 ranking and a priority of A.

**Marmion Reserve Sporting Association**

The application received by the MRSA is for a new undercover area catering for winter and summer sports and for lighting modifications at the Marmion Street Reserve.

Whilst the main funding body is the Melville Junior Football Club the project will also benefit the following sporting groups;

- Melville Junior Football Club (The main club funding the project)
- Lakers Netball Club
- East Fremantle Tee Ball Club
- Melville Women's Football Club and
- Olympia Little Athletics.

The benefits of the project include:

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)**

## Undercover area

- Provide safer access from/to the ground by eliminating a potential unsafe mix of vehicles and children.
- Provide much needed shelter from the weather in both summer and winter seasons providing benefits to over five community groups.
- Enhance participation in junior sports by players, officials and spectators as they will be more inclined to participate in inclement weather if there is protective shelter.

## Lighting Upgrade

- Increased usage and participation at the reserve.
- Provide a safer environment with training drills that may involve contact.
- Provide for the development of players skills.

The total cost of the project exclusive of Goods and Services Tax (GST) is \$102,100. Subject to the application receiving a grant the breakdown for the funding of the project will be as follows:

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| City of Melville  | \$34,034         |
| CSRFF Grant       | \$34,033         |
| Club Contribution | <u>\$34,033</u>  |
| Total             | <u>\$102,100</u> |

Within the Support for Sport Clubs Policy the Marmion Reserve falls within the community category of the hierarchy of reserves and facilities allowing for funding of up to one third of the total costs of the project. The new covering and improvements to the floodlighting also fit within the minimum infrastructure identified within the hierarchy. Therefore it is proposed that the City of Melville gives this project a number 2 ranking and a priority of A, and that a full one third contribution of \$34,034 be made.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Extensive community public consultation was conducted regarding the redevelopment of the Leeming Recreation Centre and the City of Melville has considered a range of options prior to adopting the approved concept at its August 2007 round of council meetings.

The application from the MRSA will be subject to the normal planning and building consultations as part of the approval process.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

The Department of Sport and Recreation are aware that these applications will be lodged from community groups within the City of Melville.

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)**

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Due to the increasing construction costs associated with CSRFF developments a 4% contingency has been added to the MRSA project costing.

Therefore the total financial implication of this report is as follows

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Redevelopment of Leeming Recreation centre<br>(\$8.1 Million capital allocations over 2008/2009 and 2009/2010) | \$0.            |
| Marmion Reserve Sporting Association   | \$34,034        |
| 4% Contingency on MRSA project.  | <u>\$ 1,361</u> |
|  | <u>\$35,395</u> |

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Each of these proposals has been assessed against a risk category of low, medium and high.

| <b>Risk Statement</b>   | <b>Level of Risk*</b>   | <b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| Risk of increased ongoing maintenance expenses due to proposed changes in layout, structures and use of the park or facility. | Minor consequences which are almost certain, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk | Review use of materials and design plans such that more durable and lower maintenance materials are used. Designate park or facility for only certain uses. |

**C07/8015 - COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND (REC)****POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The recently adopted Active Melville Plan provides for a strategic approach for the development of community facilities and the projects that are covered within this report. These applications are also supported by the recently adopted Support for Sports Club and Physical Activity Policies.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**CONCLUSION**

The recommendations within this report provide an opportunity to gain CSRFF grants to improve and contribute to two important community projects.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (8015)****APPROVAL**

- 1. THAT THE CSRFF APPLICATIONS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AT THE LEEMING RECREATION CENTRE AND THE FLOODLIGHTING AND UNDERCOVER IMPROVEMENTS AT THE MARMION RESERVE SPORTING ASSOCIATION BE RANKED AS FOLLOWS:**

**LEEMING RECREATION CENTRE  
NUMBER 1 PRIORITY - RANKING A,**

**MARMION RESERVE SPORTING ASSOCIATION  
NUMBER 2 PRIORITY - RANKING A, AND  
RECEIVES A FULL ONE THIRD CONTRIBUTION OF \$35,400 DOLLARS**

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ward                       | : All   |
| Category                   | : Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : Tenders   |
| Customer Index             | : City of Melville  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : Not Applicable  |
| Works Programme            | : 2007/2008 Annual Plant Program  |
| Funding                    | : 2007/2008 Budget  |
| Responsible Officer        | : Doug Bartlett<br>Fleet Manager  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- To accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the ‘Supply and delivery of two (2) only 28 cubic metre rear loading waste compactor trucks’.

**BACKGROUND**

Tenders for the ‘Supply and delivery of two (2) only 28 cubic metre rear loading waste compactor trucks’, were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday 8th August 2007 with a closing date of 4pm Thursday 23rd August 2007.

The tender was invited for the replacement of two existing trucks. The large rear loaders are used to collect bulk verge waste from the city, including junk and green waste. They will also assist with the City of Fremantle verge collection service.

**Price Schedule**

The Price Schedule forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

**Tender Evaluation Process**

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

The Evaluation Sheet forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Client Liaison Contracts Manager, the Senior Design Engineer and the Landscape Architect.

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

**1. Relevant Experience**

The Tenderer's experience on similar supply contracts for Local government, and history as an agent of the equipment.

**2. Technical Skills**

The key staff of the Tenderer, and ability of the Tenderer to provide technical solutions.

**3. Resources**

The availability of parts from the Tenderer, both common and unusual, any requirement for genuine parts, and the Tenderer's working hours and response times.

**4. Management Systems**

The management systems including quality assurance, safety, customer services, and insurance cover of the Tenderer.

**5. Methodology**

The adherence to specification of the tendered vehicle, including a completed specification checklist, and delivery and warranty times.

**6. References**

Responses from referees nominated by the company for similar work, and also other referees at the discretion of the City of Melville, including operator and mechanics' assessments.

**7. Price**

Prices are requested on a whole-of-life basis, including purchase price, estimated residual price at end of life, and common operating costs such as fuel, tyres and servicing.

**DETAIL**

**Tenders received**

Ten sets of tender documents were distributed with three tender submissions subsequently being received, with those being from:

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- Skipper Trucks
- Major Motors
- WA Hino

All tenders were received in accordance with the tender compliance and qualitative selection criteria and were therefore accepted for consideration by the tender evaluation panel.

**Rear Loading Waste Compactor Trucks**

The Waste Services department of the City of Melville has recently commenced collection of the bulk verge waste materials, green waste and household junk. The standard collection methods for bulk waste collection is using a small loader to pickup the material and load it into a rear loading waste compactor truck. A truck fitted with a crane is used to collect metal products for recycling.

The two trucks that are the subject of this tender are large rear loading waste trucks, used for the bulk verge collection service.

Waste Services currently operates two, second-hand rear loaders in its bulk verge collections. These second hand units were purchased in May to enable a quick setup period for the collections. The second hand units, being over ten years old, are only suitable for short term use while this tender process is completed for new trucks.

The specified trucks are 28 cubic metre capacity rear loading waste truck with a desired payload of at least eight and a half tonnes. Of specific note is the payload of the truck is not a critical issue, as the bulk waste and green waste has substantially lower density than domestic waste. In addition to a number of specific requirements for lighting and ergonomics, the truck will be painted in Operations Services colours (large dark green circle with yellow line through it) to match the existing fleet.

**Relevant Experience, Technical Skills, Resources and Management Systems**

Tenders were received for the supply of new trucks from Skipper Trucks, WA Hino and Major Motors. Major Motors specialises in Isuzu trucks, while Skipper Trucks specialises in Iveco and Mitsubishi trucks. WA Hino offer Hino trucks. All of these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems. However, service levels have not been consistent for some, and this is reflected in the weighted attribute scoring.

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Tenders included the option of selecting a waste compactor unit from either MacDonald Johnston Engineering or Transpacific Superior Pak (referred to as a Wastemaster body). Both these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems.

**Methodology**

Major Motors submitted an Isuzu FVY1400, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Isuzu has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration (i.e. three axles)
- 6 speed automatic transmission
- 206 kW engine power
- 1030 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 8.7 tonne
- Turning circle 21.3m
- Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 14 to 19 weeks, with cab-chassis and power train warranties of 3 year / 200,000km.

Skipper Trucks submitted an Iveco Acco 2350G, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Iveco has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- Allison Gen 4 5 speed automatic transmission
- 194 kW engine power
- 1085 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 8.8 tonne
- Turning circle 17.6m
- No Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 26 to 32 weeks, with cab-chassis and power train warranties of 2 years / 400,000km and higher.

WA Hino submitted a Hino Ranger-Pro 14, with only the MacDonald Johnston Engineering body (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Hino has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- World series 5 speed automatic transmission
- 191 kW engine power
- 745 Nm torque

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- 26000 GVM
- Fitted payload 9.2 tonne
- Turning circle 20.4m
- No Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 22 weeks, with a 3 year / 200,000km warranty.

Transpacific Superior Pak manufactures waste compactor bodies in eastern Australia and supplied locally under the name of "Wastemaster". They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The Wastemaster waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 25 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Body floor of 5mm high tensile steel,
- Hopper of 8mm Bisalloy 360 (360 BHN<sup>2</sup>) (NB: discrepancy in submission)

The warranty offered is 24 months for the structure, with key components having warranties of six and twelve months. The truck, if supplied with a Wastemaster body, would need to be driven from Victoria to Perth.

MacDonald Johnston Engineering (MJE) manufactures waste compactor bodies in Perth. They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The MJE waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 28 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Body floor of 5mm 350 grade high tensile steel
- Hopper of 8mm, 1,250 MPa UTS<sup>1</sup>, 400 BHN<sup>2</sup>, "Hardox 400" steel,

The warranty offered is 12 month / 2,400hr.

<sup>1</sup> Ultimate tensile strength

<sup>2</sup> Brinell hardness number

Key issues from the specifications are:

1. The Hino truck has a lower torque than the Isuzu or Iveco. This is not considered to be a significant issue in this application;
2. The Wastemaster body is 3 m<sup>3</sup> below specification. This is considered to be a significant restriction to the efficiency of the unit.
3. The payloads all exceed 8.5 tonnes and hence are acceptable. No advantage is considered for the higher payload in this application;
4. The delivery periods vary, and although an earlier delivery is desirable, this is not considered a critical element in this assessment.
5. The warranty for Iveco is for a lesser period than Hino and Isuzu in this application, where the time would be exceeded before the kilometres.

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

6. The warranty period for the MJE body is shorter than the Wastemaster warranty. The effectiveness of the term of warranty cover is limited by the warranty service offered, and in this respect despite the shorter warranty term, the MJE warranty service is considered to be superior.
7. The turning circle is not considered to be a critical element in this application.
8. The quality of the steel used in the manufacture of the body is better in the MJE submission than the Wastemaster submission. This may reduce the maintenance required towards the end of the truck's life.

**References**

Referees were not called specifically for this tender, as it is the practice of the Fleet Manager to maintain contact with a number of other local authorities to determine servicing, parts, and product support for a range of equipment.

Internal references were conducted with mechanics' and operators' assessments. The operators' assessment is considered the most critical aspect of the tender assessment as the machine must be the best suited to the operation to gain the greatest productivity over its seven years:

- The mechanics favoured the Isuzu and Iveco trucks due to the relative ease of service and repair, however the service level from Skipper Trucks has been noticed to be poor in recent months. The selection of a Hino truck is not considered to be a problem.
- The mechanics substantially favour the MJE service, having found that all aspects of callout service, shop service, warranty service, parts availability, technical skill and customer service exceed that offered by Wastemaster.
- The Operators favoured the Isuzu for ease of ingress and egress. In other respects, for this application any truck is sufficient.

**Price**

No trade-in was requested with the tender, as the City of Melville intends to seek market value for the old rear loaders, by advertising it nationally. The price analysis was therefore based directly on the prices submitted.

For prices please see the confidential attachment. Comments relating to the financing of the purchase are under the section "Financial Implications".

**Options and Exceptions**

Major Motors and Skipper Trucks offered both waste compactor bodies as options. WA Hino only offered the MacDonald Johnston Engineering body. Due to different cab-chassis configurations, the prices are different between tenderers, as reflected in the scores.

Each tenderer also offered workshop manuals as a requested option.

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The following budget is available for this tender:

420-80228-1575-000                      \$550,000.00

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement of Goods and Services Through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy  
13-005

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable

**CO01/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY 28 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****CONCLUSION**

The main considerations that contributed to the evaluation of the scores in this assessment (aside from the price) were:

- Service response from the waste compactor body manufacturers, which is considered to be more important than the specification differences
- Dealer after-sales support, both in responding to services and parts supply
- Specification details for the bodies.

The WA Hino submission, for a Hino Ranger-Pro 14 with MacDonald Johnston Engineering JP5 waste compactor, including a workshop manual, has achieved the best score and is supported as the best value submission.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (CO001/07)****APPROVAL**

- 1. THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY WA HINO FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TWO (2) ONLY HINO RANGER-PRO 14 TRUCKS WITH MACDONALD JOHNSTON ENGINEERING REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR BODY AS SPECIFIED FOR SUM OF \$545,200.00 EXCLUDING GST BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.**

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Tenders   |
| Customer Index             | : | City of Melville  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | Not Applicable  |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | 2007/2008 Budget  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Doug Bartlett<br>Fleet Manager  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- To accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the 'Supply and delivery of one (1) only 19 cubic metre rear loading waste compactor truck'.

**BACKGROUND**

Tenders for the 'Supply and delivery of one (1) only 19 cubic metre rear loading waste compactor truck', were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday 8th August 2007 with a closing date of 4pm Thursday 23rd August 2007.

The tender was invited for the replacement of an existing truck, the replacement period being selected based on whole of life principles. The large rear loader in question is used to collect commercial waste from streets and park litter bins.

**Price Schedule**

The Price Schedule forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

**Tender Evaluation Process**

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

The Evaluation Sheet forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Client Liaison Contracts Manager, the Senior Design Engineer and the Landscape Architect.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

**1. Relevant Experience**

The Tenderer's experience on similar supply contracts for Local government, and history as an agent of the equipment.

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****2. Technical Skills**

The key staff of the Tenderer, and ability of the Tenderer to provide technical solutions.

**3. Resources**

The availability of parts from the Tenderer, both common and unusual, any requirement for genuine parts, and the Tenderer's working hours and response times.

**4. Management Systems**

The management systems including quality assurance, safety, customer services, and insurance cover of the Tenderer.

**5. Methodology**

The adherence to specification of the tendered vehicle, including a completed specification checklist, and delivery and warranty times.

**6. References**

Responses from referees nominated by the company for similar work, and also other referees at the discretion of the City of Melville, including operator and mechanics' assessments.

**7 Price**

Prices are requested on a whole-of-life basis, including purchase price, estimated residual price at end of life, and common operating costs such as fuel, tyres and servicing.

**DETAIL****Tenders received**

Eight sets of tender documents were distributed with three tender submissions subsequently being received, with those being from:

- Skipper Trucks
- Major Motors
- WA Hino

All tenders were received in accordance with the tender compliance and qualitative selection criteria and were therefore accepted for consideration by the tender evaluation panel.

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Rear Loading Waste Compactor Trucks**

The Waste Services department of the City of Melville collects waste from parks and reserves, businesses and retirement villages in addition to the standard domestic services. Due to access and the size of waste materials, many of these other services require a rear-loading waste compactor truck as opposed to a side loading waste compactor truck. With the rear loaders, bins are wheeled to the rear of the machine by hand, and then a hydraulic lifter is engaged to tip the bin's waste into the rear hopper of the truck.

Waste Services currently operates five rear loaders.

The truck that is the subject of this tender is a large rear loading waste truck, used for two primary functions:

- Parks and Reserves bin collections;
- Commercial services collections.

The specified truck is a 19 cubic metre capacity rear loading waste truck with a desired payload of ten tonnes. Lifting capabilities are needed for a range of bin sizes: 120, 240, 660 and 1100 litres. In this application, operators frequently get in and out of the trucks, therefore the cab access is considered important. Due to the dense nature of the collected materials, the trucks are expected to carry 8 to 10 tonnes (within legal limits), and hence the torque of the engine becomes important. The torque provides the 'pulling-away' power for the trucks.

In addition to a number of specific requirements for lighting and ergonomics, the truck will be painted in Operations Services colours (large dark green circle with yellow line through it) to match the existing fleet.

**Relevant Experience, Technical Skills, Resources and Management Systems**

Tenders were received for the supply of new trucks from Skipper Trucks, WA Hino and Major Motors. Major Motors specialises in Isuzu trucks, while Skipper Trucks specialises in Iveco and Mitsubishi trucks. WA Hino offer Hino trucks. All of these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems. However, service levels have not been consistent for some, and this is reflected in the weighted attribute scoring.

Tenders included the option of selecting a waste compactor unit from either MacDonald Johnston Engineering or Transpacific Superior Pak (referred to as a Wastemaster body). Both these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems.

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Methodology**

Major Motors submitted an Isuzu FVY1400, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Isuzu has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration (i.e. three axles)
- Allison 'World series' 6 speed automatic transmission
- 206 kW engine power
- 1030 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 8.9 tonne
- Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 22 to 23 weeks, with cab-chassis and power train warranties of 3 year / 200,000km.

Skipper Trucks submitted an Iveco Acco 2350G, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Iveco has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- Allison Gen 4, 5 speed automatic transmission
- 194 kW engine power
- 1085 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 9.8 tonne
- No Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 26 to 32 weeks, with cab-chassis and power train warranties of 2 years / 400,000km and higher.

WA Hino submitted a Hino Ranger-Pro 14, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Hino has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- Allison 'World series' 5 speed automatic transmission
- 191 kW engine power
- 745 Nm torque
- 26000 GVM
- Fitted payload 8.6 tonne
- No Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 16 to 18 weeks, with a 3 year / 200,000km warranty.

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Transpacific Superior Pak manufactures waste compactor bodies in eastern Australia under the name of “Wastemaster”. They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The Wastemaster waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 19 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Low profile format for hopper
- Body floor of 5mm high tensile steel
- Hopper of 6mm Bisalloy 360 steel (NB: discrepancy in submission)

The warranty offered is 24 months for the structure, with key components having warranties of six and twelve months. The truck, if supplied with a Wastemaster body, would need to be driven from Victoria to Perth.

MacDonald Johnston Engineering (MJE) manufactures waste compactor bodies in Perth. They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The MJE waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 19 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Hi-lift format for hopper
- Body floor of 5mm grade 350 high tensile steel
- Hopper of 6mm Bisalloy 360 steel

The warranty offered is 12 month / 2,400hr.

Key issues from the specifications are:

- The Hino truck has a lower torque than the Isuzu or Iveco. This is considered to be a significant issue and the Hino submission is not suitable for this application;
- The higher the payload, the better for this application. In this respect the MJE units are specified better;
- The delivery periods vary, and although an earlier delivery is desirable, this is not considered a critical element in this assessment.
- The warranty for Iveco is for a lesser period than Hino and Isuzu in this application, where the time would be exceeded before the kilometres.
- The warranty period for the MJE body is shorter than the Wastemaster warranty. The effectiveness of the term of warranty cover is limited by the warranty service offered, and in this respect despite the shorter warranty term, the MJE warranty service is considered to be superior.
- The quality of the steel used in the manufacture of the body is similar for both manufacturers.
- The MJE submission is for a high-lift hopper, which is not required. If the MJE submission is accepted, the Fleet Manager will arrange a variation to change the specification upon placement of the order (this will result in a small cost saving).

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**References**

Referees were not called specifically for this tender, as it is the practice of the Fleet Manager to maintain contact with a number of other local authorities to determine servicing, parts, and product support for a range of equipment.

Internal references were conducted with mechanics' and operators' assessments. The operators' assessment is considered the most critical aspect of the tender assessment as the machine must be the best suited to the operation to gain the greatest productivity over its seven years:

- The mechanics favoured the Isuzu and Iveco trucks due to the relative ease of service and repair, however Skipper Trusts has not met City of Melville service standards/expectations in recent months.
- The mechanics substantially favour the MJE service, having found that all aspects of callout service, shop service, warranty service, parts availability, technical skill and customer service exceed that offered by Wastemaster.
- The Operators favoured the Isuzu and Hino for ease of ingress and egress, and passenger comfort. The Operators specifically did not favour the Iveco due to poor seating conditions for passengers in this particular application. Operators are indifferent to the body manufacturer.

**Price**

No trade-in was requested with the tender, as the City of Melville intends to seek market value for the old large rear loader, by advertising it nationally. The price analysis was therefore based directly on the prices submitted.

For prices please see the confidential attachment. Comments relating to the financing of the purchase are under the section "Financial Implications".

**Options and Exceptions**

Each principal tenderer offered both waste compactor bodies as options. Due to different cab-chassis configurations, the prices are different between tenderers, as reflected in the scores.

Each tenderer also offered workshop manuals as a requested option.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The tenders for all waste trucks are showing a dramatic increase in pricing. The funding for waste trucks is normally increased by 2% average per year, and is insufficient at this level. The prices submitted in August indicate an increase over the last twelve months equivalent to an average 3.9 to 4.1% per year.

The current submissions and the recommended submission exceed the original assigned budget.

In order to ensure the replacement can proceed, capital funds have been released from other vehicle commitments within the Annual Plant Replacement Program.

The following budget is therefore available for this tender:

|                    |              |
|--------------------|--------------|
| 420-80228-1575-000 | \$284,560.00 |
| 420-80252-1575-000 | \$33,000.00  |

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement of Goods and Services Through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy 13-005

**CO04/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 19 CUBIC METRE REAR  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable

Due to the dense nature of the collected materials, the trucks are expected to carry 8 to 10 tonnes (within legal limits), and hence the torque of the engine becomes important. The torque provides the ‘pulling-away’ power for the trucks.

**CONCLUSION**

The key considerations that contributed to the evaluation of the scores in this assessment (aside from the price) were:

- Operator preference
- Manoeuvrability
- Truck torque
- High level of driver/passenger movement in and out of the cab
- Service response from the waste compactor body manufacturers, which is considered to be more important than the specification differences
- Dealer after-sales support, both in responding to services and parts supply

The Major Motors tender submission, for an Isuzu FVY1400 with MacDonald Johnston Engineering JP5A waste compactor, including a workshop manual, is supported as the best value submission and has resulted in the highest scoring under the evaluation matrix.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (04/07)****APPROVAL**

- 1. THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY MAJOR MOTORS FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY ISUZU FVY1400 TRUCK WITH MACDONALD JOHNSTON ENGINEERING REAR LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR BODY AS SPECIFIED FOR SUM OF \$315,745.00 EXCLUDING GST BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.**

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ward                       | : All   |
| Category                   | : Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : Tenders   |
| Customer Index             | : City of Melville  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : Not Applicable  |
| Works Programme            | : 2007/2008 Annual Plant Program  |
| Funding                    | : 2007/2008 Budget  |
| Responsible Officer        | : Doug Bartlett<br>Fleet Manager  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council reviews decisions made by Officers.</i>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- To accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the 'Supply and delivery of one (1) only 29 cubic metre side loading waste compactor truck'.

**BACKGROUND**

Tenders for the 'Supply and delivery of one (1) only 29 cubic metre side loading waste compactor truck', were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday 8th August 2007 with a closing date of 4pm Thursday 23rd August 2007.

The tender was invited for the replacement of an existing truck, an older recycling side loading waste truck. The side loading waste truck in question is one of four core trucks used to collect domestic recycling waste in the yellow-top plastic bins from the community.

**Price Schedule**

The Price Schedule forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

**Tender Evaluation Process**

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

The Evaluation Sheet forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Client Liaison Contracts Manager, the Senior Design Engineer and the Landscape Architect.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

**1. Relevant Experience**

The Tenderer's experience on similar supply contracts for Local government, and history as an agent of the equipment.

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****2. Technical Skills**

The key staff of the Tenderer, and ability of the Tenderer to provide technical solutions.

**3. Resources**

The availability of parts from the Tenderer, both common and unusual, any requirement for genuine parts, and the Tenderer's working hours and response times.

**4. Management Systems**

The management systems including quality assurance, safety, customer services, and insurance cover of the Tenderer.

**5. Methodology**

The adherence to specification of the tendered vehicle, including a completed specification checklist, and delivery and warranty times.

**6. References**

Responses from referees nominated by the company for similar work, and also other referees at the discretion of the City of Melville, including operator and mechanics' assessments.

**7. Price**

Prices are requested on a whole-of-life basis, including purchase price, estimated residual price at end of life, and common operating costs such as fuel, tyres and servicing.

**DETAIL****Tenders received**

Six sets of tender documents were distributed with five tender submissions subsequently being received, with those being from:

- Skipper Trucks
- Major Motors
- WA Hino
- Wastemaster –Non Conforming x 2

All tenders with the exception of Wastemaster were received in accordance with the tender compliance and qualitative selection criteria and were therefore accepted for consideration by the tender evaluation panel. Wastemaster's submission whilst being submitted as a non-conforming tender was not evaluated as the submission was for a compactor body only and the tender required a waste compactor truck complete.

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Side Loading Waste Compactor Trucks**

The Waste Services department of the City of Melville collects recyclable waste from residents using the yellow-topped green plastic 240 litre bins. The standard waste compactor format for this collection is a side-loading waste truck. The operator of the vehicle controls the arm with a grab attachment by activating a joystick from within the cab. This permits the arm to slide out, the grab to open and grasp the bin, and then the arm to lift the bin and tip the contents into the hopped off the waste truck. Four side-loading trucks collect an average of 1,200 bins per day, collecting the domestic recycling waste in the plastic bins. The fully green bins are collected by a separate group of side-loaders.

The specified truck is a 29 cubic metre capacity side loading waste truck with a desired payload of at least 4.8 tonnes. The truck torque is not critical as the density of the material is very low, and hence the total mass is low. In addition to a number of specific requirements for lighting and ergonomics, the truck will be painted in Operations Services colours (large dark green circle with yellow line through it) to match the existing fleet.

**Relevant Experience, Technical Skills, Resources and Management Systems**

Tenders were received for the supply of new trucks from Skipper Trucks, WA Hino and Major Motors. Major Motors specialises in Isuzu trucks, WA Hino in Hino trucks, while Skipper Trucks specialises in Iveco and Mitsubishi trucks. All of these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems.

Tenders included the option of selecting a waste compactor unit from either MacDonald Johnston Engineering or Transpacific Superior Pak (referred to as a Wastemaster body). Both these companies have a long history in their industry, with similar levels of technical skills and management systems.

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Methodology**

Major Motors submitted an Isuzu FVY1400, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Isuzu has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration (i.e. three axles)
- 'World series' automatic transmission
- 206 kW engine power
- 1030 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 9.5 tonne (MJE)
- Turning circle NS
- Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 18 to 24 weeks, with cab-chassis and powertrain warranties of 3 years / 200,000km.

Skipper Trucks submitted an Iveco Acco 2350G, with compactor bodies fitted by either Wastemaster or MacDonald Johnston Engineering (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Iveco has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- 'World series' automatic transmission
- 194 kW engine power
- 1085 Nm torque
- 24000 GVM
- Fitted payload 9.3 tonne (MJE), 11.4 Tonne (Wastemaster)
- Turning circle 17.6m
- No Driver's airbag

The delivery period offered is 24 to 30 weeks, with cab-chassis and powertrain warranties of 2 years / 400,000km and higher.

WA Hino submitted a Hino Ranger-Pro 14, with compactor body fitted by MacDonald Johnston Engineering only (the bodies are assessed separately: refer below). The Hino has the following distinctive features:

- 6x4 configuration
- 'World series' automatic transmission
- 191 kW engine power
- 745 Nm torque
- 26000 GVM
- Fitted payload 9.0 tonne (MJE)
- Turning circle 20.4m
- No Driver's airbag

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The delivery period offered is 16 to 26 weeks, with cab-chassis and power train warranties of 3 year / 200,000km.

Transpacific Superior Pak manufactures waste compactor bodies in eastern Australia under the name of “Wastemaster”. They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The Wastemaster waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 25 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Body floor of 5mm high tensile steel,
- Hopper of 8mm Bisalloy 360 (360 BHN) steel

The warranty offered is 24 months for the structure, with key components having warranties of six and twelve months. The truck, if supplied with a Wastemaster body, would need to be driven from Queensland to Perth.

MacDonald Johnston Engineering (MJE) manufactures waste compactor bodies in Perth. They have provided subcontract pricing for all the principal tenderers. The MJE waste compactor has the following distinctive features:

- 29 m<sup>3</sup> capacity body
- Body floor of 3.2mm, 1,250 MPa UTS, 400 BHN, “Hardox 400” steel,
- Hopper of 8mm, 1,630 MPa UTS, 470 BHN, “Creusabro 8000” steel

The warranty offered is 12 month / 2,400hr.

Key issues from the specifications are:

- The Hino truck has a lower torque than the Isuzu or Iveco. This is considered to be a significant issue and the Hino submission is not suitable for this application;
- The Wastemaster body is 4 m<sup>3</sup> below specification. This is a significant loss of volume for the low density material, and the Wastemaster option for a body is not suitable for this application;
- The payloads all exceed 4.8 tonnes and hence are acceptable. No advantage is considered for the higher payload in this application;
- The delivery periods vary, and although an earlier delivery is desirable, this is not considered a critical element in this assessment.
- The warranty for Iveco is for a lesser period than Isuzu and Hino in this application, where the time would be exceeded before the kilometres.
- The warranty period for the MJE body is shorter than the Wastemaster warranty. However, the effectiveness of the term of warranty cover is limited by the warranty service offered, and in this respect despite the shorter warranty term, the MJE warranty service is considered to be superior.
- The turning circle is a critical consideration, provided it is within 18m due to the need to negotiate cul-de-sacs. From experience both the Isuzu and Iveco trucks are suitable.

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- The quality of the steel used in the manufacture of the body is superior in the MJE submission. This reduces the maintenance required towards the end of the truck's life.

**References**

Referees were not called specifically for this tender, as it is the practice of the Fleet Manager to maintain contact with a number of other local authorities to determine servicing, parts, and product support for a range of equipment.

Internal references were conducted with mechanics' and operators' assessments. The operators' assessment is considered the most critical aspect of the tender assessment as the machine must be the best suited to the operation to gain the greatest productivity over its seven years:

- The mechanics favour the Isuzu and Iveco trucks equally on the basis of the relative ease of service and repair, however the service level from Skipper Trucks has not met City of Melville expectations in recent months.
- The mechanics substantially favour the MJE service, having found that all aspects of callout service, shop service, warranty service, parts availability, technical skill and customer service exceed that offered by Wastemaster.
- The Operators favoured the Iveco substantially over the Isuzu due to the mirror image instrumentation, cab layout and the overall handling of the vehicle.

**Price**

No trade-in was requested with the tender.

For prices please see the confidential attachment. Comments relating to the financing of the purchase are under the section "Financial Implications".

**Options and Exceptions**

Major Motors and Skipper Trucks offered both waste compactor bodies as options. WA Hino only offered the MacDonald Johnston Engineering body. Due to different cab-chassis configurations, the prices are different between tenderers, as reflected in the scores.

Each tenderer also offered workshop manuals as a requested option.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE  
LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The tenders for all waste trucks are showing a dramatic increase in pricing. The funding for waste trucks is normally increased by 2% average per year, and is insufficient at this level. The prices submitted in August indicate an increase over the last twelve months equivalent to an average 3.9 to 4.1% per year.

The current submissions and the recommended submission exceed the original assigned budget.

In order to ensure the replacement can proceed, capital funds have been released from other vehicle commitments within the Annual Plant Replacement Program.

The following budget is therefore available for this tender:

|                    |              |
|--------------------|--------------|
| 420-80228-1575-000 | \$296,200.00 |
| 420-80252-1575-000 | \$23,000.00  |

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement of Goods and Services Through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy  
13-005

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable

**CO013/07 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY 29 CUBIC METRE SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**CONCLUSION**

The key considerations that contributed to the evaluation of the scores in this assessment (aside from the price) were:

- Operator reference
- Body size
- Truck torque
- Service response from the waste compactor body manufacturers, which is considered to be more important than the specification differences
- Dealer after-sales support, both in responding to services and parts supply

The Skipper Trucks submission, for an Iveco Acco 2350G with MacDonald Johnston Engineering waste compactor, including a workshop manual, whilst has achieving the second best score is recommended as the best value submission based on the key considerations above.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (013/07)**

**APPROVAL**

**THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY SKIPPER TRUCKS FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY IVECO ACCO 2350G WITH MACDONALD JOHNSTON ENGINEERING SIDE LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR, AS SPECIFIED FOR THE SUM OF \$317,470 EXCLUDING GST BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.**

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Common Seal Register  |
| Customer Index             | : | City of Melville  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | Standard Item   |
| Works Programme            | : | Not applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | Not applicable  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Bruce Taylor<br>Manager Information & Corporate Support   |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- This report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied and recommends that the information be noted.

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

**BACKGROUND**

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995 states that a Local Government is a Body Corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal. A document is validly executed by a Body Corporate when the common seal of the Local Government is affixed to it by the Chief Executive Officer, and the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer attest the affixing of the seal.

**DETAIL**

| <b>Document Type</b>                   | <b>Party</b>   | <b>Description</b>  | <b>File Reference</b> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Deed of Variation                      | Canning Bridge Seniors Citizens Club Inc               | Lot 100 The Esplanade Mount Pleasant                              | 1704436               |
| Deed of Variation                      | Willeton Hockey Club                                   | Trevor Gribble Reserve  | 1700369               |
| Deed of Licence                        | Melville Athletics Club Inc                            | Len Shearer Reserve Clubrooms                                     | 1760915               |
| Deed of Variation to Licence           | Nulsen Haven Association                               | Blue Gum Community Centre   | 1704430               |
| Deed of Lease                          | Melville Bowling Club                                  | 592 Canning Highway, Alfred Cove                                  | 1700375               |
| Addendum to Scheme Amendment Report 47 | Numerous properties are involved                       | Rezoning of Myaree Business Area                                  | 1767870               |
| Deed of Lease                          | The Scout Association of Australia WA Branch Brentwood | Sicklemore Street, Booragoon                                      | 1750008               |
| Deed of Variation                      | Kardinya Murdoch Playgroup Inc                         | Kardinya Community Hall Creche Building, Morris Buzzacott Reserve | 1695056               |
| Deed of Variation                      | Capital Community Radio Inc                            | Wireless Hill Reserve, Ardress                                    | 1711626               |

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**CONCLUSION**

That is a standard report for Elected Members information.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (5000)**

**NOTED**

**THAT THE ACTION OF HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER IN EXECUTING THE DOCUMENTS LISTED UNDER THE COMMON SEAL OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE, BE NOTED.**

**C07/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Financial Investments and Statements  |
| Customer Index             | : | Not applicable  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | Standard Item   |
| Works Programme            | : | Not applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | Not applicable  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Bob Searle<br>Manager Financial Services  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- This report presents the investment statements for the month of September 2007 and recommends that the information detailed in the attachments be noted.

**BACKGROUND**

The investment of surplus cash holdings is undertaken in accordance with Council's investment policy, with the objective of maximising returns whilst maintaining low levels of credit risk exposure.

**C07/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**DETAIL**

[6000A October 2007.pdf](#) and [6000B October 2007.pdf](#) the Investment Statements for the month of September 2007, form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 10 October 2007.

The Investment of Surplus Funds is undertaken in accordance with the Finance Investment Policy document for the City of Melville. [6000D October 2007.pdf](#) a graph showing the total levels of funds invested forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 10 October 2007.

A report prepared by Grange Securities has again been included for members' information. [6000C October 2007.pdf](#) The reports form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 10 October 2007.

Elected Members are aware of the impact on investments arising from the extreme volatility in world financial markets in July and August. This volatility created a situation whereby it has been extremely difficult to arrive at a true meaningful valuation for the Collateralised Debt Obligation (CDO) element of the investment portfolio. This situation has eased somewhat in September but remains problematical. The best estimate based on the valuations provided is that had all investments been disposed of at the end of September, a loss of 4.0% would have been realised. The market valuation of the CDO element of the investment portfolio at the end of September represented 90.5% of its cost figure, with individual valuations ranging between 74.6% and 100.4%. It should be emphasised that the investment products in question continue to retain their very high credit ratings and that there is reason to believe that they will continue to pay their full interest yield and to pay full value on maturity.

Statements 6000A, 6000B and the graph 6000D show the value of the investments based on cost, which is consistent with long standing practice. The report from Grange Securities is based on their calculation of market value as at the end of September. That report shows a performance when compared to the benchmark, being the UBS Warburg 90 day bank bill Index + 0.35%, of +0.34% for over the benchmark in the month of September and a negative return of 1.02% compared to the benchmark for the portfolio since inception in December 2003. As the credit markets regain stability the performance of the portfolio should continue to improve.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) have been engaged to provide advice in regards to the appropriateness of the City's investment strategy in light of the recent volatility in the credit markets. The report has been received and a meeting arranged to clarify it's recommendations. Following this meeting a full report will be prepared for the Audit Risk and Compliance Committee.

**C07/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 19 – Management of Investments.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As at the end of September 2007, total interest, excluding Reserve Fund interest, earned was \$629,917 against a budget of \$716,690. The full year budget is \$2,555,887.

Reserve Fund interest earned was \$339,566 against a budget of \$308,700. The full year budget is \$1,175,245.

Apart from the book value of investments moving according to market volatility there are no financial implications in relation to the cash position of Council.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Whilst there has been increased market volatility risk associated with Council's investment portfolio the credit risk of the portfolio remains low and therefore the risk of losing capital or interest earnings is also low. Council's investment policy was carefully constructed to minimise credit risk through investing in highly rated securities and diversification.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate Policy 13-PL-002 – Investment of Surplus Funds.

As resolved at the August full meeting of Council, the policy has been placed under review to incorporate mechanisms that protect Council's investments from undue volatility risk as well as the risk to reputation as a result of investments that may be perceived as unsuitable by the Community.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**CONCLUSION**

Base interest rates softened slightly in the period. The rates for thirty day bank bills fell by 0.0867% from 6.8567% to 6.77% whilst longer term returns held steady, with the ninety day rate falling by 0.005% to 6.885%. Reflecting the recent extreme volatility and subsequent partial recovery in the financial markets, the performance of the City of Melville portfolio managed by Grange Securities exceeded the agreed benchmark of the UBS Bank Bill Index plus 0.35% by 4.2% annualised in the month but shows a shortfall to the benchmark of 7.37% over the last twelve months.

**C07/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (6000)**

**THAT THE INVESTMENT STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER 2007, AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE NOTED:**

[6000A October 2007.pdf](#)

[6000B October 2007.pdf](#)

[6000C October 2007.pdf](#)

[6000D October 2007.pdf](#)

**C07/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Financial Statement and Investments   |
| Customer Index             | : | Not applicable  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | Standard Item   |
| Works Programme            | : | Not Applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | 2007/2008 Budget  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Bob Searle<br>Manager Financial Services  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council.<br/>e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**C07/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- This report presents details of the payments made to suppliers for the provision of goods and services for the month of September 2007 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts be noted.

**BACKGROUND**

Delegated Authority CE23 has been granted to the Chief Executive Officer to make payments from the Municipal and Trust Funds. This authority has then been on-delegated to the Director Customer and Corporate Services. In accordance with Regulation thirteen (13), two (2) and three (3) of the Local Government (Financial Administration) Regulations 1996 where this power has been delegated, a list of payments for each month is to be compiled and presented to the Council. The list is to show each payment, payee name, amount and date of payment and sufficient information to identify the transaction.

**DETAIL**

The Schedules of Accounts for the period ending 30 September 2007 [6001 October 2007.pdf](#) including Payment Registers numbers 29 and 30 were distributed to the Members of Council on Wednesday, 10 October 2007.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable.

**C07/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

This report meets the requirements of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 11 - Payment of Accounts, Regulation 12 - List of Creditors and Regulation 13 - Payments from the Trust Fund and the Municipal Fund.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Expenditures were provided for in the 2007/2008 Budget.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Management Procedure 1.8 - Certification of Accounts.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**CONCLUSION**

This is a regular monthly report for Elected Members information.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (6001)**

**THAT THE SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2007, AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR CUSTOMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELEGATED AUTHORITY CE23, AND DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6001\\_October\\_2007.pdf](#) BE NOTED.**

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ward                       | : | All   |
| Category                   | : | Operational   |
| Subject Index              | : | Financial Statements and Investments  |
| Customer Index             | : | Not applicable  |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items             | : | Standard Item   |
| Works Programme            | : | Not applicable  |
| Funding                    | : | Not applicable  |
| Responsible Officer        | : | Bob Searle<br>Manager Financial Services  |

**AUTHORITY / DISCRETION**

|   | <u>Definition</u>   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy             | <i>when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.</i>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive | <i>the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council.<br/>e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative          | <i>includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes &amp; policies.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review               | <i>when Council review decisions made by Officers.</i>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quasi-Judicial       | <i>when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.</i> |

**KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY**

- This report presents the first draft of the financial statements to the end of September 2007 and recommends that they be noted by Council.

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**BACKGROUND**

The Financial Statements for the end of the month of September 2007 have been prepared and tabled in accordance with Regulation thirty-four (34) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 as amended in March 2005, which requires that:

- (1) A local government is to prepare each month a statement of financial activity reporting on the sources and applications of funds, as set out in the annual budget under regulation 22(1)(d), for that month in the following detail-
  - (a) annual budget estimates, taking into account any expenditure incurred for an additional purpose under section 6.8(1)(b) or (c);
  - (b) budget estimates to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
  - (c) actual amounts of expenditure, revenue and income to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
  - (d) material variances between the comparable amounts referred to in paragraphs (b) and (c); and
  - (e) the net current assets at the end of the month to which the statement relates.
- (2) Each statement of financial activity is to be accompanied by documents containing-
  - (a) an explanation of the composition of the net current assets of the month to which the statement relates, less committed assets and restricted assets;
  - (b) an explanation of each of the material variances referred to in subregulation (1)(d); and
  - (c) such other supporting information as is considered relevant by the local government.
- (3) The information in a statement of financial activity may be shown-
  - (a) according to nature and type classification;
  - (b) by program; or
  - (c) by business unit.
- (4) A statement of financial activity, and the accompanying documents referred to in subregulation (2), are to be-
  - (a) presented to the council-
    - (i) at the next ordinary meeting of the council following the end of the month to which the statement relates; or
    - (ii) if the statement is not prepared in time to present it to the meeting referred to in subparagraph (i), to the next ordinary meeting of the council after that meeting; and
  - (b) recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which it is presented.
- (5) Each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with AAS 5, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**DETAIL**

The attached reports have been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the legislation. Whilst they give a fair indication of the situation for the month of September, the Budget phasing requires further development. The initial budget phasing required by users has been loaded into the system, but at this stage has been subject to limited review. Some users still have yet to respond with their phasing information and at present these budgets are spread evenly over the year. Additionally, difficulties have been experienced with adjusting phasing since a software upgrade, and no phasing corrections have been possible since mid August.

Investments have been valued at the cost of acquisition for the purpose of these monthly reports.

The following attachments form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 10 October 2007.

| <b>DESCRIPTION</b>  | <b>LINK</b>                                   |
|---|---|
| Statement of Financial Activity – September 2007  | <a href="#"><u>6002A October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 30 September 2007                    | <a href="#"><u>6002B October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Representation of Working Capital as at September 2007                                    | <a href="#"><u>6002E October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 30 September 2007                             | <a href="#"><u>6002F October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Notes on Operating Statements for September 2007 reporting on variances of 10% or greater | <a href="#"><u>6002H October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of September 2007                 | <a href="#"><u>6002J October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Summary of Rates debtors as at 30 September 2007  | <a href="#"><u>6002L October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Graph showing Rates collections as at 30 September 2007                                   | <a href="#"><u>6002M October 2007.pdf</u></a> |
| Summary of general Debtors aged 90 days old or greater as at 30 September 2007            | <a href="#"><u>6002N October 2007.pdf</u></a> |

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Local Government Act 1995 Division 3 – Reporting on Activities and Finance Section 6.4 – Financial Report.

Local Government (Financial Regulations) 1996 Part 4 – Financial Reports

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Amendments to the 2007/2008 Budget have been included in the budget amendment reports.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**CONCLUSION**

The attached reports reflect the financial situation of the City of Melville as at 30 September 2007.

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (6002)**

1. THAT THE STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY AND THE OPERATING STATEMENTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2007 AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE ADOPTED:

| DESCRIPTION   | LINK                                   |
|---|--|
| STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY – SEPTEMBER 2007  | <a href="#">6002A October 2007.pdf</a> |
| OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2007                    | <a href="#">6002B October 2007.pdf</a> |
| REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT SEPTEMBER 2007                                    | <a href="#">6002E October 2007.pdf</a> |
| RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2007                             | <a href="#">6002F October 2007.pdf</a> |
| NOTES ON OPERATING STATEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2007 REPORTING ON VARIANCES OF 10% OR GREATER | <a href="#">6002H October 2007.pdf</a> |
| SUMMARY OF RATES DEBTORS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2007  | <a href="#">6002L October 2007.pdf</a> |
| GRAPH SHOWING RATES COLLECTIONS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2007                                   | <a href="#">6002M October 2007.pdf</a> |
| SUMMARY OF GENERAL DEBTORS AGED 90 DAYS OR GREATER AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2007                | <a href="#">6002N October 2007.pdf</a> |

2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION, THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS, AS LISTED IN THE BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2007, AS DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6002J October 2007.pdf](#) BE ADOPTED.

12. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

13. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL

14. CLOSURE