

OFFICIAL



City of
Melville

NOTES
AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30 PM Tuesday, 14 April 2026

Held in the Council Chambers, Melville Civic Centre,
10 Almondbury Road, Booragoon

The City of Melville acknowledges the Bibbulmun people as the Traditional Owners and custodians of the lands on which the City stands today and pays its respect to the Whadjuk people, and Elders both past, present and emerging.

Notes to be confirmed at the next Ordinary Council Meeting

These minutes are hereby confirmed as true and accurate

Presiding Member

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. S. J.', written over a horizontal line.

Date

21 APRIL 2026



Vision

Vibrant, Sustainable, Inclusive Melville

Mission

To provide good governance and quality services for the City of Melville community.

Values

In everything we do, we seek to adhere to our values that guide our behaviour.

- **Excellence** - Striving for the best possible outcomes.
- **Participation** – Involving, collaborating and partnering.
- **Integrity** - Acting with honesty, openness and with good intent.
- **Caring** – Demonstrating empathy, kindness and genuine concern.

Our Approach

To put our customer at the centre of everything we do.



Social / Community	Environment	Built Environment	Economic	Governance
Healthy, Safe and Inclusive	Clean and Green	Sustainable and Connected Development	Vibrant and Prosperous	Good Governance and Leadership
Healthy, safe and inclusive communities with a sense of belonging and wellbeing.	A clean, green and sustainable City for current and future generations.	Sustainable, connected development and transport infrastructure across our City.	Economic prosperity and vibrant resilient communities and businesses.	Leadership and good governance for the benefit of the whole community.

OFFICIAL Sensitive

Making A Deputation

A deputation is a verbal presentation by one or more members of the public on a matter to be considered at the Council meeting. Deputations are made at the relevant Agenda Briefing Forum, held one week prior to the Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Information on making a deputation is available on the City's website. [Request to make a Deputation.](#)

Public Question Time

You can ask a question at a Council meeting during Public Question Time. Information on how to ask a question can be found on the City's website. [Public Question Time.](#)

Complex questions or those related to matters on the agenda and requiring a response at the meeting are "questions on notice" and should be submitted in writing, by the close of business the Tuesday prior to the meeting.

Disclaimer

Any plans or documents in agendas and minutes may be subject to copyright. The express permission of the copyright owner must be obtained before copying any copyright material.

Any statement, comment or decision made at a Council or Committee meeting regarding any application for an approval, consent or licence, including a resolution of approval, is not effective as an approval of any application and must not be relied upon as such.

Any person or entity who has an application before the City must obtain, and should only rely on, written notice of the City's decision and any conditions attaching to the decision, and cannot treat as an approval anything said or done at a Council or Committee meeting.

Any advice provided by an employee of the City on the operation of written law, or the performance of a function by the City, is provided in the capacity of an employee, and to the best of that person's knowledge and ability. It does not constitute, and should not be relied upon, as a legal advice or representation by the City. Any advice on a matter of law, or anything sought to be relied upon as representation by the City should be sought in writing and should make clear the purpose of the request.

Audio-Visual Recording and Live Streaming

In accordance with the Council Policy CP-088 Live Streaming and Audio-Visual Recordings of Public Meetings of the Council, this meeting is electronically recorded and broadcast to the [City of Melville Council Meetings YouTube Channel](#). All recordings are retained as part of the City's records in accordance with the *State Records Act 2000* and the General Disposal Authority for Local Government Records. Learn more about [live streaming and audio-visual recordings of meetings](#) on the City of Melville website.

Purpose of Agenda Briefing Forum

The purpose of this Forum is to provide an opportunity for Elected Members to ask questions and obtain additional information in respect to reports and items on the attached Council Agenda. It is not a decision making forum, nor is it open for debate on matters. Members of the public are able to present deputations in respect to matters on the Council Agenda at this Forum, prior to matters being formally deliberated upon at the next Ordinary Council Meeting.

Confirmed

Contents

1	Official Opening	7
2	Attendance and Apologies	7
3	Declarations by Members.....	9
3.1	Declarations by Members who have not read and given due consideration to all matters contained in the business papers presented before the Meeting	9
3.2	Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin	9
4	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion).....	9
	Approved Deputations.....	9
	Approved Written Submission.....	9
5	Disclosure of Interest	9
5.1	Financial or Proximity Interests	9
5.2	Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict	9
6	Public Question Time.....	10
6.1	Questions Received with Notice.....	10
6.1.1	Mr M McLerie, Bicton	10
6.1.2	Ms K Bajars, Mount Pleasant.....	14
6.2	Questions Received at the Meeting.....	14
6.2.1	Ms D Corbyn, Willagee on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park.....	14
6.2.2	Mr J Kosh, Leeming on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park	16
6.2.3	Ms K Webster, Mindarie on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park.....	16
6.2.4	Ms K Bajars, Mount Pleasant.....	17
6.3	Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting	17
7	Awards and Presentations	18
8	Applications for New Leave of Absence	18
9	Confirmation of Minutes	18
10	Business of an Urgent Nature.....	18
11	Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed.....	18
12	Petitions.....	19
13	Reports	19
13.1	Reports from Committees	19
13.2	Items Brought Forward.....	20
UP26/107	Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial"	20
CD26/62	John Connell Reserve Field Extension Proposal	22
E26/97	RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting.....	31

13.3	Reports of the Chief Executive Officer.....	35
	Management Services	35
M26/74	Proposed Local Laws - City of Melville Cat & Fencing Amendment Local Laws 2026	35
M26/73	Common Seal March 2026	37
M26/75	Local Government Reform - Committee Review	38
M26/76	CEO Performance Review Panel - Appointment.....	41
	Corporate Services	44
C26/370	Investment Statements for February 2026	44
C26/371	Schedule of Accounts Paid for February 2026.....	44
C26/373	Statements of Financial Activity for February 2026	45
	Community Development.....	47
CD26/60	Response to Petition - Wren Street Mount Pleasant Parking Concerns.....	47
	Environment and Infrastructure.....	49
E26/95	Response to Petition - Streetscape Upgrade - Hulme Court and McCoy Street	49
E26/99	RFT252629 Construction of Goolugatup Stage 2 Welcome Place	51
E26/97	RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting.....	51
	Planning.....	51
UP26/107	Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial".....	52
14	Motions with Previous Notice	53
15	Motions Without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority)	53
16	Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public	52
C26/374	Draft Digital Strategy 2026–2030 Endorsement.....	53
C26/375	Recreation Leasing Opportunity Update - Barrisdale Open Space, 40 Bedford Road, Ardross	53
C26/376	RFP Outcomes: 788-794 Canning Highway, Applecross.....	53
17	Decisions Made While Meeting was Closed to the Public.....	54
18	Closure.....	54

1 OFFICIAL OPENING

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, officially declared the meeting open at 6:30pm and invited Cr M McGoldrick to read the Acknowledgement of Country and advised those present of the Purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum, the Disclaimer, the Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility and the Audio Recording Advice.

2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

In Attendance

K Mair

Mayor

Councillors

Cr M Woodall

Cr J Spanbroek

Cr G Barber

Cr G Panayotou

Cr N Robins

Cr S Hong (*until 7:00pm*)

Cr C Ross

Cr D Lim

Cr K Wheatland

Cr M McGoldrick

Cr S Green

Cr C Yorke

Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward (*electronic attendance*)

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Central Ward

Central Ward

Officers

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Mr G Tuffin

Director Corporate Services

Mr J Coten

Director Environment & Infrastructure

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance & Risk

Mr P Varelis

Director Planning

Mr D Burton

Acting Director Community Development

Ms D Heera (*from 6:41pm until 8:03pm*)

Chief Information Officer (*electronic attendance*)

Mr G Ponton (*until 7:07pm*)

Manager Strategic Urban Planning

Mr J Bird (*until 9:10pm*)

Manager Natural Areas & Parks

Mr G Edwards (*until 9:10pm*)

Coordinator Sport & Recreation

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Ms M Smith Poulton

Lead Governance

Mr O Pugh

Governance Officer (Council Support)

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery 24

Apologies

Nil.

On Approved Leave of Absence

Nil.

Confirmed

3 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS

3.1 Declarations by Members who have not read and given due consideration to all matters contained in the business papers presented before the Meeting

Nil.

3.2 Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin

Nil.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Approved Deputations

CD26/62 John Connell Reserve Field Extension Proposal

- Dr E Wajon on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park
- Mr A Lacquiere, Mr B Hadley & Mr M Jones on behalf of Bull Creek Leeming Senior & Junior Football Clubs
- Ms S Sibbald, Applecross
- Mr P Coombs on behalf of Leeming Spartan Cricket Club

UP26/107 Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial".

- Mr S Allering on behalf of Allering & Associates

Approved Written Submission

Nil.

5 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

5.1 Financial or Proximity Interests

Under sections 5.60A and/or 5.60B of the *Local Government Act 1995*

Nil.

5.2 Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict

Under *22 Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021* or a City of Melville (Code of Conduct)

Nil.

6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

At 6:34pm, the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

6.1 Questions Received with Notice

6.1.1 Mr M McLerie, Bicton

Preamble:

The 21 April 2026 OMC agenda lists item C26/374 Draft Digital Strategy 2026–2030 Endorsement, but this item is deemed confidential to be completely dealt with behind closed doors. Please clarify;

Question 1:

Which specific City officer(s) made the decision that this item is to be considered confidential.

Question 2:

Why Council deemed this confidential. That is, exactly what are the details as to why the City considers disclosure of this information would be “be contrary to the public interest as it deals with a matter that if disclosed”.

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

The item is deemed confidential as it includes sensitive information about the City’s technology landscape that could pose security risks if exposed.

Question 3A:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

Council’s key risks including “Information/records lost, inaccurate or compromised.”, Failing to understand and meet stakeholder and community expectations and needs.”

Response to Question 3A:

The Digital Strategy has been specifically designed to address these key organisational risks through a structured, risk-based and customer-focused approach aligned to local government legislative and operational requirements.

Information and records management is already governed through the City’s approved Recordkeeping Plan. Robust backup and recovery processes are in place to ensure records can be restored in the event of an incident.

Question 3B:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

Persistent problems with the City's portal as recognized by a City officer by stating "we hope that new systems currently under development will reduce the customer effort in lodging applications in future and errors in lodging experienced."

Response to Question 3B:

The Digital Strategy directly addresses these issues by prioritising the uplift and replacement of existing customer-facing systems, including the City's website.

Question 3C:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

Risks associated with City officers inappropriately accessing and modifying information relating to residents and ratepayers. There is evidence that this has happened in the past.

Response to Question 3C:

The Digital Strategy sets out a digital transformation pathway to enable the City to be digitally focused with appropriate and fit for purpose digital systems. The City's record management protocols align and comply with the City's Record Keeping Plan, ensuring all records are accessed and retained appropriately.

Question 3D:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

The State Government's Open Government / Open By Design Principles (<https://www.wa.gov.au/organisation/office-of-the-information-commissioner/open-government-principles>), that is it will be much easier for the public to access much more information about the City's affairs.

Question 3E:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

Persistent problems with the City's record management practices and performance, making it much easier for the public to access information under the FOI Act. That is, the City will substantially reduce the City's excuse that accessing documents is too hard, or their staff are otherwise too busy.

Response to Questions 3D & 3E:

The City is not aware of any systemic issues with its record management practices or performance. Existing processes are in place to ensure records are appropriately captured, managed and retrievable in accordance with legislative requirements.

Question 3F:

Will, and if so how will the Digital Strategy 2026-2030 address issues such as:

Central consolidated, searchable, and easily accessible listings for all past public questions and responses (as the State Parliament does) and Council's motion execution status.

Question 3G:

Poor Council meeting agenda and minutes online versions control.

Response to Questions 3F & 3G:

The Digital Strategy is a high-level document which aligns with the City of Melville Council Plan for the Future 2024–2034, with a focus on digital transformation to enable and support the Council Plan objectives. The Digital Strategy is not designed to address website version control.

Question 4:

What is the forecasted expenditure over the 2026-2030 period,

Response to Question 4:

The forecasted expenditure over the 2026-2030 period is \$10.3 million. This is an indicative figure for budget planning purposes and reflects the City's commitment to modernising its existing systems and digital platforms.

Question 5:

What performance metrics/targets have been established to drive the strategy and further implementations.

Response to Question 5:

Project Governance is established to ensure that strategic projects are delivered within agreed targets. Monthly reporting is in place internally to ensure that targets are on track. There is also quarterly reporting to Elected Members on high level progress of the Digital Strategy.

Question 6:

What are the potential benefits, as quantified by the City officers; including what are the expected savings from FTE reductions, or savings from costs of persistent errors.

Response to Question 6:

Potential benefits include:

- Enable smarter ways of working by reducing manual, repetitive and fragmented processes through integrated, end-to-end digital workflows.
- Strengthen customer experience and service outcomes through faster response times, improved transparency and more consistent, data-driven service delivery.
- Lift organisational productivity and capacity by automating routine tasks and streamlining approvals, allowing staff to focus on higher-value, customer-facing and strategic activities.

- Embed best-practice local government processes through modern ERP modules purpose-built for local government operating, governance and compliance environments.
- Support innovation and continuous improvement by leveraging workflow automation, advanced analytics and artificial intelligence to identify trends, optimise resources and improve service delivery.
- Create a scalable and resilient digital foundation that supports future growth, evolving community expectations and long-term organisational sustainability.
- Strengthen the cyber security position of the organisation through better controls and proactive measures.

Question 7:

What are the external end user requirements currently specified (external users being residents, ratepayers and the public)

Response to Question 7:

The Digital Strategy will consider external end-user requirements, with a strong focus on delivering customer-centric, accessible and efficient digital services for residents, ratepayers and the broader community.

The specific end user requirements will be considered based on approved projects that are being implemented in a timely manner.

Question 8:

When will Council facilitate customer focus or think groups to help finalize the external end user requirements.

Response to Question 8:

Customer focus groups will be undertaken as required for the relevant projects. The actual timing will vary depending on approved project timeframes and deliverables.

Question 9:

When will the Digital Strategy be available for review, should Council continue to decide this the strategy is to be kept confidential.

Response to Question 9:

The Digital Strategy contains information of a sensitive nature, including elements relating to the City's ICT systems, security settings and future technology roadmap. On this basis, it is proposed that the full Strategy remain confidential. Subject to Council endorsement, a public version of the Strategy will be prepared and released. This version will outline the key objectives, strategic priorities and intended outcomes, while ensuring that sensitive operational and security-related information is not disclosed.

6.1.2 Ms K Bajars, Mount Pleasant

Preamble to Question 1:

I wanted to share my concerns regarding the proposed foreshore path lighting project along The Esplanade. From what I understand, this appears to be progressing without any direct consultation with residents along The Esplanade, who will be most impacted. While I appreciate the intent to improve safety and connectivity, I am concerned about the potential visual impact of additional lighting poles, impacts on amenity, and interference with river views. Many residents in this area would not support additional infrastructure without first having the opportunity to review the plans and provide input. There is already some path lighting in place along sections of the foreshore, with more limited coverage further south of Deep Water Point. Any extension should be carefully considered and informed by those living closest to it.

Question 1:

E26/97 RFT 252623 Design & Construct for Mount Pleasant Foreshore Lighting. In particular clarification is requested on what consultation has been undertaken with affected residents, and whether there will be an opportunity for residents to review concept plans prior to any decision or installation?

Response to Question 1:

This project involves replacing the existing lighting infrastructure that has reached the end of its useful life. The new lighting will consist of light poles and bollards and is not expected to negatively impact amenity. The existing poles will be removed. The project is being designed to meet relevant lighting standards. The work is being undertaken as a Design and Construction contract, so the design has not yet been undertaken. The concept design will be made available once it has been undertaken. The proposed design can be shared with the community, and staff will endeavour to address any concerns, although it will not be practical to significantly alter the design based on community consultation, due to the need to comply with relevant lighting standards.

6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting

6.2.1 Ms D Corbyn, Willagee on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park

Question 1:

What is the total cost of the project?

Response to Question 1:

There are six options that are being considered by Council at this time, but the officer recommendation is looking at \$4.68 million for the full project cost.

Question 2:

What is the cost of the cricket pitch construction portion?

Question 3:

How much will the KHP offset revegetation cost?

Response to Questions 2 & 3:

The \$4.68 million rounded figure includes the revegetation costs, which are estimated at \$1.3 million, leaving \$3.38 million for the cricket pitch construction portion.

Question 4:

How much will the state government contribute to the total cost?

Response to Question 4:

There hasn't been a contribution from the state government at this stage.

Question 5:

How much will the Commonwealth government contribute to the total cost?

Response to Question 5:

At the moment, there is an allocated portion from the federal government to the cricket club. However, further discussions need to occur on whether this will be allocated to the project, should Council determine at a later date that the project proceed.

Question 6:

How much will the City of Melville contribute and how much will that increase our rates?

Response to Question 6:

Further information is available in the Council report, however it will be subject to what Council determines at next week's Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Question 7:

Can the public have a copy of the budget estimate report?

Response to Question 7:

A copy is included in the Council report attachments.

Question 8:

Will the City of Melville revegetate bushland to create a corridor between Roe Highway and Melville Glades Golf Course?

Response to Question 8:

This question was taken on notice in accordance with section 6.8(1)(b) and 6.9(c) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*. The question and response will be provided in the May 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda.

Question 9:

Do you think it will have an impact on our rates?

Response to Question 9:

We're not able to answer that question at this time because Council hasn't made a decision on this yet. The City will have an indication of the rates impact once a decision has been made.

6.2.2 Mr J Kosh, Leeming on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst ParkPreamble to Question 1:

We've been planting and replanting areas of Ken Hurst Park for many years. And even with intensive care and tree guards and repeated watering, our survival of the plants we put in is between 0-30%.

Question 1:

With the offset in Ken Hurst Park, is Melville City going to do repeat plantings and look after these plants for for year after year, because there's a good chance the survival will be very low?

Response to Question 1:

Planting and watering on an ongoing basis for a number of years would be a part of the proposal that has been included in the costings that have been prepared.

Question 2:

Does the City have any measure of the success of the plantings in the degraded areas?

Response to Question 2:

This question was taken on notice in accordance with section 6.8(1)(b) and 6.9(c) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*. The question and response will be provided in the May 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda.

6.2.3 Ms K Webster, Mindarie on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst ParkPreamble to Question 1:

The cockatoos are really important and if we don't start looking after them, they will be non-existent in 15 to 20 years. Every bit of trees that they utilise, including bank shears that they need to eat, is very important to keep.

Question 1:

How are trees that are important for the survival of the endangered black cockatoo and Carnaby's birds going to be protected for future in the City of Melville, including the remnant bushland near the proposed cricket club?

Response to Question 1:

This question is broader than just this particular topic. Obviously, if the trees are removed as part of the clearing, the trees won't be kept.

6.2.4 Ms K Bajars, Mount PleasantQuestion 1:

Are you saying the City is replacing the lighting due to it coming to its end of life? I would expect if you're not going to have detailed consultation with the residents who it most affects, you're actually just replacing them almost like for like. Is that the case?

Response to Question 1:

Originally, we had intended to award a contract first for the design of the lights, and then we would have had a detailed concept design that we could have gone to consultation on. The City didn't actually get any submissions as part of that process, so we've gone to a design and construct. We don't actually have a design at the moment, and it is unlikely it'll be exactly the same. The existing infrastructure will be removed, but it will probably be a combination of light poles and bollards, but the location of them will be designed based on an assessment of the design which hasn't yet been undertaken. So at that time, the concept design can certainly be made available to the public. It may be similar to the existing design or it may not be, we don't know at this stage.

Question 2:

Would the Esplanade residents be consulted, and would there be a letter drop explaining changes prior to the project being approved?

Response to Question 2:

Yes, once the concept design has been undertaken, there is an intention to do a letter drop to the adjoining residents.

6.3 Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting

This item is detailed in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

At 6:41pm, Ms D Heera, Chief Information Officer electronically connected to the meeting.

At 6:47pm, the Presiding Member declared public question time closed.

7 AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

8 APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVE OF ABSENCE

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

10 BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

At 6:47pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that the following items have been identified as either confidential or containing confidential attachments, and may be considered behind closed doors:

- C26/374 Draft Digital Strategy 2026-2030 Endorsement
- C26/375 Recreation Leasing Opportunity Update – Barrisdale Open Space, 40 Bedford Road, Ardross
- C26/376 RFP Outcomes: 788-794 Canning Highway, Applecross
- E26/97 RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting (Confidential Attachment)
- E26/99 RFT252629 Construction of Goolugatup Stage 2 Welcome Place (Confidential Attachment)

12 PETITIONS

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

13 REPORTS

13.1 Reports from Committees

Nil.

Confirmed

13.2 Items Brought Forward

At 6:49pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item UP26/107 - Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial" for the convenience of the person making a deputation and the officer providing a presentation.

UP26/107 Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial".

Deputations At 6:49pm, Mr S Allerding gave a deputation on behalf of Allerding & Associates which concluded at 6:56pm.

At 7:03pm, Mr S Allerding returned to the Public Gallery.

[Deputation – Mr S Allerding](#)

Officer Presentation At 7:03pm, Mr G Ponton, Manager Strategic Urban Planning provided an officer presentation which concluded at 7:04pm. At 7:04pm, Mr G Ponton responded to questions which concluded at 7:07pm.

[Officer Presentation – UP26/107](#)

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

Notes from Forum General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

There was commentary from one of the deputations that if there was a fire, then the existing usages that are currently there would not be able to go back, because it would be reverted back to a "light industrial". Is this correct?

Response to Question 1:

Yes, as indicated in their presentation, the existing uses operate under what's called non-conforming use rights. In normal circumstances, the intent of the non-conforming use right is to allow users over time to revert to something more in keeping with the zoning. If there was a discontinuance of use, through a vacancy or an issue such as a fire, and if there is not continuous use for six months or more, then that can trigger the extinguishing of those non-conforming use rights.

As the applicants have indicated, the current development on the site was approved under a previous planning scheme where these types of uses were allowed. The site in this case lends itself to those types of uses, notwithstanding the new zoning. The applicants' grounds for the application is just to provide security for the ongoing continuation of the current type of land uses in the event of a fire or a discontinuance for six months.

At 7:00pm, Cr S Hong electronically disconnected from the meeting and did not return.

SUMMARY

- A request has been received to rezone Lot 15 (No. 305-307) Stock Road Palmyra from “Light Industry” zone to “Service Commercial” zone.
- The subject site is located at the intersection of Sainsbury Road and Stock Road, is 12,004m² in area and is currently developed with a purpose-built commercial complex comprising a mix of bulky goods retail, private recreation and service uses across 7 tenancies. It was originally approved in February 2000 under the City’s previous planning scheme, Community Planning Scheme No 5 (CPS 5), as a Showroom/Warehouse development and has been in continuous operation since.
- Under Local Planning Scheme No 6, the subject site is zoned “Light Industry” resulting in the existing uses operating as non-conforming uses despite representing an ongoing commercial operation rather than an interim or opportunistic use of industrial land. The proponents are concerned that this results in unnecessary risk and uncertainty for a site that was designed and developed for these uses and historically approved by the City on this basis.
- It is proposed that the zoning of the subject site be amended to reflect the original approved development and land uses that have operated from the site for over two decades, acknowledging that the development on site is not intended to support the types of light industrial land uses promoted by the “Light Industry” zone, and in doing so allow the current lawful operation with an appropriate zoning.
- It’s recommended that Council endorse the scheme amendment for the purpose of advertising. The application will be presented to Council for further consideration following completion of the advertising period.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. Pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, resolves to initiate Scheme Amendment No. 19 to Local Planning Scheme No. 6 to rezone Lot 15 (307) Stock Road Palmyra from “Light Industry” zone to “Service Commercial” zone.
2. Forward the application to the Western Australian Planning Commission seeking approval to advertise the proposed amendment.
3. Subject to approval from the Western Australian Planning Commission, authorises the preparation, processing, and public advertising of documentation for the Scheme Amendment in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.
4. Resolve that the amendment is a “complex” amendment under the provisions of the Regulations for the following reasons:
The proposed amendment is not consistent with a local planning strategy that has been endorsed by the Commission.
5. Notes that a further report will be presented to Council at the conclusion of the advertising period to consider submissions and provide recommendations to the Western Australian Planning Commission on whether the proposed amendment should be approved, modified, or refused.

At 7:07pm, Mr G Ponton left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:07pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 7:07pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item CD26/62 John Connell Reserve Field Extension Proposal for the convenience of those making a deputation and the officer providing a presentation.

At 7:08pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk addressed the Council to advise that the Council that 360 additional signatures had been received by lead petitioner, Ms S Sibbald of Applecross, in relation to the item. The additional pages would be verified and the report updated to include the information.

At 7:08pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that Alternative Motions had been received from Cr N Robins and Cr J Spanbroek, and both are being processed by officers and will be circulated as soon as possible this week.

CD26/62 John Connell Reserve Field Extension Proposal

Deputations

At 7:09pm, Mr Dr E Wajon gave a deputation on behalf of Friends of Ken Hurst Park which concluded at 7:22pm. At 7:40pm, Dr E Wajon returned to the Public Gallery.

[Deputation – Dr E Wajon](#)

At 7:40pm, Mr A Lacquiere gave a deputation on behalf of the Bull Creek Leeming Senior & Junior Football Clubs which concluded at 7:46pm. At 7:51pm, Mr A Lacquiere returned to the Public Gallery.

At 7:52pm, Ms S Sibbald of Applecross gave a deputation which concluded at 7:56pm. At 8:02pm, Ms S Sibbald returned to the Public Gallery.

[Hardcopy Deputation – Ms S Sibbald](#)

At 8:03pm, Mr P Coombs gave a deputation on behalf of the Leeming Spartan Cricket Club which concluded at 8:09pm. At 8:31pm, Mr P Coombs returned to the Public Gallery.

[Hardcopy Deputation – P Coombs](#)

Officer Presentation

At 8:31pm, Mr D Burton, Acting Director Community Development and Mr J Bird, Manager Natural Areas & Parks provided an officer presentation which concluded at 8:47pm. At 8:48pm, Mr D Burton and Mr J Bird responded to questions which concluded at 9:10pm.

[Officer Presentation – CD26/62](#)

Disclosure of Interest

Coordinator – Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Planning, Life Member of the Bull Creek Leeming Football Club and coach at Bull Creek Leeming Junior Football Club.

Notes from Forum

General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

What will be the impact of rates on the adoption of option 2?

Response to Question 1:

It's quite difficult to put a number on it at the current time because the budget hasn't been set. However, if we work off the basis that every half percent is \$600,000, you can divide that by the amount to get an approximate rate increase.

Question 2:

The \$1.3 million figure, for the revegetation, would that be over a number of years or one budget year?

Response to Question 2:

That would go over a number of years, up to about five years is what we're anticipating at this point.

Question 3:

The deputations tonight have indicated that Ken Hurst Park is very difficult for growing things. Was it the City's decision to do this, or DWER?

Response to Question 3:

This was the City's decision. The City had to find a suitable offset location at a size that would meet DWER's criteria. So the 7.36 hectares is a significant piece of area to revegetate. Looking at sites across the City, this was the only option which would meet their criteria, and it's in close proximity to the clearing site as well, which is an advantage.

Question 4:

Can we follow up with DWER and let them know about what we've heard from some experts tonight through the deputations, which have said they've had a 0-30% success rate, to see if the 70% success rate should be revisited?

Response to Question 4:

The City is not really in a position to challenge a criteria set by the state government.

Question 5:

Why haven't we utilised that empty space area, where the old rubbish tip was?

Response to Question 5:

I understand that the City tried to work with the state in a development proposal for the site. That was about 10 years ago, and that fell through for whatever reasons. However, there would have to be some serious remediation works that would have to take place. The City has developed a draft John Connell Master Plan, which includes a vision for the overall site and that landfill site in particular.

The challenge we have as part of that works is identifying what the remediation costs would be to meet those requirements. At the moment, we're working through that issue and anticipating that sometime next year we'll be in a position to bring back something to Council that advises what the potential cost is to remediate based on that vision in the draft master plan.

Question 6:

0.35 hectares was thrown around a lot tonight, but that's incorrect. It's 0.55 hectares, is that correct?

Response to Question 6:

The club has developed a plan which is within the business case and they have calculated 3.38 hectares, I believe that is the correct number. However, the City has provided those concept plans that are also in the report, and based on allowing a field in the eastern portion of the reserve to fit a fourth soccer pitch, 0.55 is the area that we would be required to clear on the basis of that plan. However, there might be options to trim that down slightly over the course of the detailed design period.

Question 7:

Do you know exactly how many trees will need to be removed for option two?

Response to Question 7:

It depends on exactly the final layout of the oval extension and how much bushland that would take up, but when we did some assessments early on, we recognised about 210 trees in that space, 46 of which included grass trees if you consider them as trees. So there's a significant amount of trees, and the size varies significantly; there are two larger trees in there, right down to some trees that are from zero to 5 metres in height.

Question 8:

With regard to the CSRFF funding, I believe that funding has ceased to exist and is no longer available, so what is the state government funding pool that we'll be seeking an allocation from for option two?

Response to Question 8:

In consultation with the state government we have been advised that, in lieu of not having an active CSRFF program, we can ask local Members of Parliament for funding.

An example of this, albeit it's not at the scale of this, is the Melville Cricket Club which from memory was brought to Council in regard to an ongoing cost back in November last year. Part of the works they are doing is to replace their cricket pitch on field one, and they were looking to apply for CSRFF but it was obviously closed. They spoke to their local Member of Parliament and were able to receive \$40,000 to contribute to the project.

Question 9:

How much would need to be budgeted for 2026/2027?

Response to Question 9:

We haven't identified what we would actually need for 26/27, and that is on the basis that the expectation is we would want to confirm the external funding for the project to proceed, which is based on the officer recommendation.

With that being said however, and in order to get the project going, you would probably need around 12 or so months for a detailed design period. If say the funding was to come in within the next couple of weeks, we estimate it would potentially be \$200,000 to undertake that process.

If things were to line up and happen fairly quickly in terms of those first three, that being if the officer recommendation is to proceed, then we would probably need to look at allocating \$200,000 to next year's budget.

Question 10:

You mentioned that some of the lighting might need to go in the construction process, and so what would the timing of that be? Having regard to the soccer season and when that would happen, would that be at the end of this coming season for soccer or perhaps sooner?

Response to Question 10:

We haven't gotten into the detail in terms of timing of the construction and that sort of thing. The intent would be to undertake all the works at once from economies of scale and minimise disruption to the clubs. It will be very dependent on the timing and the feedback we receive from DWER and also the timing of those first three options. If we had flexibility we would also work with the groups to minimise the disruption. That being said, it is a considerable project and would cause some disruption to both of the groups for a period of time.

Question 11:

If there is no impact on rates, and if the City still has to fund 50%, which is about \$1.6 million, it has to come out of rates or out of reserves. Doesn't that equate to about 1.5% of current rates?

Response to Question 11:

Yes, that's correct. A 1% increase in rates at the moment is approximately \$1.2 million. In terms of my previous comment, I wasn't saying it wouldn't impact rates, I just made the comment that the budget hasn't been adopted, so it's difficult to actually establish the impact that it would potentially have on proposed rate increase at this time.

Question 12:

Could you please confirm that the area to be cleared did not qualify for any threatened ecological communities (TEC)?

Response to Question 12:

I can confirm that. As mentioned previously, our consultant that did the survey in 2020 did not consider it to qualify as TEC.

Question 13:

If a cricket pitch were to be constructed on Beasley and the football club were to train as per normal, can you please explain what the ground would be like come summer?

Response to Question 13:

We have experienced challenges out of Beasley Park for a number of years, and that's due to a combination of three key factors, one being the usage. There's a large number of playing members at the football club, however we have been working with the club in reducing the amount of foot traffic on the oval that contributes to the poor state of the oval, particularly towards the back end of the season. The other two challenges are Sting Nematode and Bassendean soils.

The Natural Areas & Parks team is responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of that reserve, and that includes renovations which typically tend to happen in the spring period for most reserves, but in recent years we've had to push that out into the summer period which impacts the playing surface and recuperation of that reserve come the following winter. It probably wouldn't be a great playing experience when you've got renovations that are happening during the summer period for the cricket, which was raised during one of the deputations previously.

Question 14:

With point one, which is seeking and receiving a suitable amendment to the clearing permit, what happens if it is rejected, that there is no consideration for that?

Response to Question 14:

The City and or the club are required to meet the requirements under the clearing permit, and obviously one is the time frames. If DWER decided not to approve an extension, that would obviously cause a challenge with our ability to clear.

Question 15:

Can you give some explanation on what would happen to the entire project, and also would it mean potentially that the City would prioritise the project and then to try and get things moving?

Response to Question 15:

The challenge we've got with this is, as I mentioned previously, is that there's detailed design that needs to occur, and there are still other approvals that need to occur. One is that that portion of land is part of the broader contaminated site. Based on the information we've got at the time, we don't believe that area will have any major significant impact in terms of contamination.

With that being said though, the advice is that we would need to excise the area of where we're proposing to clear and create that as part of a lot of the reserve, which is a statutory process that takes time. We would also have to obtain approvals through DWER's other arm in terms of the contaminated sites to make sure it is safe to proceed. However, the advice that we've got at the moment is that it's likely we'd get those approvals, it's just the time factor for those approvals to look at.

Question 16:

With the Council resolution back in June 2023, 0.65 hectares were actually adopted for the clearing permit to be submitted to DWER, however they have come back and actually increased that to 0.68 hectares. With the offset area being nearly 11 times greater than the area to be cleared, DWER certainly would not propose something if they didn't think it was completely impossible. Is that something I can just get from your own experience with regard to the clearing that's actually been put forward now with the offset area?

Response to Question 16:

In a previous deputation there was discussion around the complexities of revegetating the area at Ken Hurst Park, including access, previous success rates, and watering. The deputation spoke about one litre of water per plant. In our proposal, we're looking at additional watering, so that wouldn't be the limit. In that space it is extremely challenging, and would be a project that we'd have to work through on exactly how we manage that site to get it to the requirement that DWER is expecting.

Question 17:

What do we need to put in place to ensure that this offset and rehabilitation obligations are met, especially if, as we've heard tonight, it's unable to be delivered over the five-year time frame?

Question 18:

And if those conditions aren't met, where does that responsibility sit? Does that sit with the Leeming Spartan Cricket Club, or will that revert back to the City of Melville?

OFFICIAL SensitiveResponse to Questions 17 & 18:

The Council authorised the Leeming Spartan Cricket Club to apply on behalf of the City of Melville, so it is actually the responsibility of the City of Melville to meet the permit conditions. That's why staff have developed a plan to look at how they're going to meet the requirements in the clearing permit conditions, which includes the five-year program, and there's a contingency built in on top of the original quote, so that it's \$1.3 million over that five years.

It will be challenging and we'll need to work with the State Government, if the Council was to approve this, to try and meet those conditions and continue to work with them to meet those obligations.

Question 19:

If the City doesn't meet those requirements, what cost and risk impact would that have on the City?

Response to Question 19:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

Question 20:

From your officer's report you're saying that it's already optimistic to try to achieve that 70%, so it seems like we have all the information to tell us that we should probably challenge what DWER was saying about that 70%. Can you look for avenues where we can challenge that number? It seems like it could be one of those cases where, again, this is the huge assumption that they could just take from one scenario in the past and apply it to this area and assume it's the same thing.

Response to Question 20:

This matter will be followed up and an update provided to the Council.

SUMMARY

- The proposal to extend playing fields at John Connell Reserve is being driven by the Leeming Spartans Cricket Club (the Cricket Club), who have held a long-term desire to undertake the project.
- The Cricket club secured an election commitment of \$650,000 through the Australian Labor Party, Member for Tangney – Sam Lim as a part of the 2022 Federal Election to fund a field extension at John Connell Reserve.
- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council in June 2022, the Council resolved to:
 1. To provide authorisation to the president of the Leeming Spartan Cricket Club to submit a vegetation clearing application for an area of 0.65ha to the east of the existing playing fields to accommodate the oval extension to the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation.
 2. To advise the club that it is the City's preference to work in conjunction with the clubs to manage the planning, design and construction works associated with the oval extension, should this proceed.
- The Leeming Spartan Cricket Club submitted a native vegetation clearing permit to the

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation in June 2023 and the permit was granted in June 2025, subject to a range of conditions being met including environmental offsets for the revegetation and rehabilitation of Ken Hurst Park, estimated to cost \$1.05 - \$1.30M.

- Following confirmation of the permit, and in line with the June 2022 Council resolution, officers commenced preparatory works to assess the feasibility of the proposed field extension at John Connell Reserve, as well as alternative options to achieve additional sports field capacity.
- At the October 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council a petition was received, signed by 276 residents and 38 non-residents that requested,

“We, the undersigned, all being electors of the City of Melville, respectfully request that the Council: Action Sought: Do not remove the mature trees at John Connell Reserve to extend the cricket pitch.”

- The Council resolved the following at the October 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council:
 1. Acknowledge the Petition; and
 2. Request the CEO prepare a report on the matters raised be prepared by April 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.
- The Cricket Club and Leeming Striker Soccer Club are unified in their support for Option 2, which is estimated to cost \$4,684,991, with an additional \$118,250 estimated to be required for life cycle costs per annum.
- The timeframe to deliver Option 2 in line with the clearing permit timeframes is challenging, therefore it is recommended that an extension on the clearing permit be sought from Department of Water and Environmental Regulation.
- Currently funding is not allocated in the City's Long Term Financial Plan, however there is a need for further playing field space in the City of Melville.
- As a result, it is proposed that the project proceed contingent on:
 - Seeking and receiving a suitable amendment to the clearing permit timeframes.
 - The Leeming Spartans Cricket Club re-allocating their remaining federal grant monies to the City should the City be in a position to complete the project.
 - Seeking 50% of the estimated project costs (excluding revegetation) from the State Government in line with the currently inactive Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities Fund.

The City will also need to allocate an estimated \$2,522,495.50 within the 2026/27 Annual Budget should the Officers Recommendation be endorsed and will advise the lead petitioner from the Ordinary Meeting of Council in October 2025 of the outcome.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council requests the CEO to proceed with Option 2, as identified in this report, subject to:

- 1. Seeking and receiving a suitable amendment to the clearing permit timeframes in order to deliver the project;**
- 2. Negotiating with Leeming Spartan Cricket Club and Federal Government to re-allocate the remaining grant (~\$470,000) to the City to complete the project, should external funding be received;**
- 3. Seek an amount of 50% (\$1,692,495.50) of estimated project costs (excluding revegetation cost) from the State Government that is in-line with the currently inactive Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities Fund;**
- 4. Notes that should external funding be received and a suitable extension on the clearing permit time frame, the City will need to allocate an estimated \$2,522,495.50 to complete the project and undertake the revegetation of Ken Hurst Park;**
- 5. Advise the lead petitioner of Item 12.1 of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 14 October 2025 the abovementioned resolutions.**

At 7:09pm, Mr D Burton left the meeting.

At 7:10pm Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 7:10pm, Mr D Burton returned to the meeting.

At 7:53pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting

At 7:54pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

At 7:59pm, Mr P Varelis left the meeting.

At 8:03pm, Ms D Heera electronically disconnected from the meeting and did not return.

At 8:09pm, Mr O Pugh left the meeting.

At 8:10pm, Mr P Varelis returned to the meeting.

At 8:14pm, Mr O Pugh returned to the meeting.

At 8:24pm, Cr N Robins left the meeting.

At 8:24pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 8:27pm, Cr N Robins returned to the meeting.

At 8:28pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 8:32pm, Cr G Barber left the meeting.

At 8:32pm, Cr C Yorke left the meeting.

At 8:32pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting.

At 8:33pm, Cr G Barber returned to the meeting.

At 8:34pm, Cr C Yorke returned to the meeting.

At 8:35pm, Cr M Woodall returned to the meeting.

At 9:10pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item E26/97 RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting.

At 9:10pm, Mr J Bird left the meeting and did not return.

At 9:10pm, Mr G Edwards left the meeting and did not return.

At 9:10pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

At 9:15pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

E26/97 RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 9:12pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 9:24pm.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

Notes from Forum General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

In relation to what's been discussed and proposed prior to this Item coming before Council for the lighting, was any community consultation undertaken on whether new lighting or replacement lighting was supported by local residents?

Response to Question 1:

No, there wasn't any consultation. This just came through our normal asset management processes – that there's existing infrastructure at the end of its life, and was put on this year's budget and adopted by Council, and staff were implementing it.

Question 2:

Given that there hasn't been community consultation to date, and following discussions we've had about other city assets that may be in a similar category, is there an opportunity to put this on hold until we undertake community consultation about whether lighting along the foreshore is actually desired and or required, prior to just continually renewing assets which the community may not actually value potentially?

Response to Question 2:

In relation to putting that on hold, the report before Council is as to whether or not to award a contract. If it was put on hold, then presumably the decision would be not to award a contract. There is a validity period where the tenderers hold their price after which they can increase it or vary it.

As mentioned earlier, originally we had gone out to the market to get a design, so it would have design first and then construction. That would have made it a bit easier to do the consultation because people were obviously concerned about the amenity and what it's going to look like and things like that.

If we had a design, we would have actually had something that we could do the consultation on, but as it's turned out we're going for the design and construction in one go.

Essentially, if it was put on hold the tender wouldn't be awarded. The difficulty would be that if it was decided that the lighting was required, we may not get much response from the market when we go to tender again. We didn't get a lot of tenderers for this particular job, so that would be a risk that if we did decide to do it in future, we wouldn't get people bidding for it.

Question 3:

And just around lighting along river foreshore paths, are there significant areas of foreshore paths throughout the City that don't have lighting currently?

Response to Question 3:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

Question 4:

It was mentioned earlier that we're looking at this project because we're pretty much at the end of life cycle. Should we not be looking at this as a maintenance project as opposed to capital expenditure?

Response to Question 4:

No, the value of the expenditure means that it would be classified as capital under our financial accounting system.

Question 5:

Is it at the end of life and a total replacement, is that correct?

Response to Question 5:

Different sections of it are in different conditions, some of it is actually unsafe and has been switched off. There's some that are corroding, some of the lights are corroding and some of the footings of the lights have been impacted by erosion on the path, so some of it just doesn't meet standards. It's not all at the end of its life, but some of it is in worse condition than the rest. It is a highly used path, and we have had to turn it off in some areas. Not having lighting there in some of those sections does increase our risk exposure as well in terms of liability claims.

Question 6:

I keep hearing the word erosion, potential erosion and results from actual erosion on these lights, and yet we're going ahead and pursuing the same project while the erosion is still there, I don't understand that. I personally feel that this is something we should defer, because until we get the erosion under control, it seems like it would potentially be a waste of money.

Response to Question 6:

The intention with the part of the design process would be to position the lighting infrastructure where it's not exposed to the river. It would be a combination of light poles and bollards, but it would be located in a more appropriate location than on the river edge.

Question 7:

Can you confirm the estimate of \$50,000 for decommissioning of the lighting?

Response to Question 7:

I'll preface my comments by saying this is only a very rough estimate and Council shouldn't rely on it. However based on removing the existing infrastructure, which is around 47 or 50 existing poles and removing exposed footings, we've estimated it would be roughly in the order of \$50,000. Some of what would be removed would actually be because we don't have the design, but as some of the other infrastructure would be removed, there'd be cables etc. that could be pulled from out of conduit. In some cases we may not be able to pull them out, so it is likely the conduits would remain in the ground. It's just a very rough order of magnitude estimate.

Question 8:

Was the tender put forward based on any area other than The Esplanade in the City of Perth that has a similar arrangement with lighting along a footpath where there's an adjacent street?

Response to Question 8:

The tender document wasn't based on other locations, but there would be other locations where there is lighting along paths that are next to roadways, and likewise there would be some that aren't. The tender document was put together based on the scope of work that was required.

Question 9:

If we do any studies and were to find out there would be an increase in cost, could we pull away?

Response to Question 9:

The tender has been submitted based on the scope of works. The tenderers are aware of the issues associated with the project.

Question 10:

Do we already have street lighting along the footpath and the roadway along The Esplanade?

Response to Question 10:

Yes, there is street lighting along there. In some cases the path veers away from the immediate roadway, but there is lighting along The Esplanade.

Question 11:

Is there any idea on the usage of the path at all? Do you have numbers of the people who use it?

Response to Question 11:

We only have anecdotal evidence from what people have reported. We don't have numbers of it.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252623 Design and Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

- 1. Notes the requirement for a budget allocation to be carried forward in the 2026/2027 Budget and accepts the recommendation as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252623 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes; and**
- 2. Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

OFFICIAL Sensitive**13.3 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer****Management Services****M26/74 Proposed Local Laws - City of Melville Cat & Fencing Amendment Local Laws 2026**

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:24pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARYCity of Melville Cat Local Law 2025

- The [City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025](#) was gazetted on 25 July 2025 and came into effect on 26 October 2025.
- On Tuesday, 21 October 2025, the City of Melville received correspondence from the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) requesting the Council resolve undertakings to address matters within the both the City's Cat Local Law & Fencing Local Laws. The Cat Local Law undertakings include the deletion of clause 4.6 and amendments to subclause 3.7(5), and Item 2 in Schedule 1.
- Subsequently, the Council resolved the undertakings for both local laws at the Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) held on [Tuesday, 18 November 2025](#), to be completed within 12 months.

City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025

- The [City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025](#) was gazetted on 25 July 2025 and came into effect on 8 August 2025.
- The Fencing Local Law undertakings include amending drafting errors in Schedule 3 and to advise on whether the City provides public access to Figure 3.3 of the AS 2890.1:2004.

Local Law Process

- The process to amend a local law is the same as the process to make a new local law and requires the completion of all steps outlined in section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act).
- This report now presents both local laws, including their purpose and effect, to request the Council commence the local law-making procedure to amendment both the Cat and the Fencing Local Laws.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council by Absolute Majority:

1. Proposes to make a Cat Amendment Local Law (set out in Attachment 1) with the following purpose and effect:
 - (a) The purpose of the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026* is to amend the *City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025*.
 - (b) The effect of the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026* is to remove the reversal of onus of proof and to ensure that the *City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025* is compliant with requirements of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.
2. Proposes to make a Fencing Amendment Local Law (set out in Attachment 2) with the following purpose and effect:
 - (a) The purpose of the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026* is to amend the *City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025*.
 - (b) The effect of the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026* is to provide clarity to the public on the requirements for “sight triangles” under subclause 3.1(2) and to ensure that the *City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025* is compliant with the requirements of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.
3. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to commence the local law-making procedure for the proposed Cat Amendment Local Law & Fencing Amendment Local Law, under section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995* by:
 - (a) Giving local public notice and inviting public submissions in accordance with section 6.12(3)(a) of the Act for a minimum six-week period on the proposed local laws; and
 - (b) Giving a copy of the public notice and proposed local laws to the Minister for Local Government in accordance with section 3.12(3)(b) of the Act; and
 - (c) After the last day of submissions, preparing and presenting a report for Council to consider and determine whether to make the local laws in accordance with section 3.12(4) of the Act.

M26/73 Common Seal March 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:24pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No general discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied for the period from 24 January 2026 up to and including 23 March 2026 for the Council's noting. This is a standing report to the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the actions of the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer in executing the documents listed under the Common Seal of the City of Melville from 24 January 2026 up to and including 23 March 2026 for the Council's noting.

At 9:24pm, Mr J Coten left the meeting.

Confirmed

At 9:25pm, Mr M Yildiz advised the Council that minor changes suggested by the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee had been incorporated into the attachment.

M26/75 Local Government Reform - Committee Review

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:25pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk responded to questions which concluded at 9:31pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>In relation to being an Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee member, do we have to have six or can it be one per ward?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>That is suggested in accordance with the Terms of Reference, however it is open to Council to determine otherwise.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Just looking at the officer recommendation, it appears we would appoint a deputy for the Mayor, but I'm just wondering how that works if everyone will already be allocated as either a member or a deputy. Is that correct in the table and if so, how will that work in practice?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>You'll see in the Terms of Reference document we've actually blacked out where there is no deputy. There's no deputy for the Mayor or external members, they serve as their own deputies.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>So just to confirm, next week we won't be appointing a deputy for either the Mayor or the external members?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 3:</u></p> <p>Correct.</p> <p><u>Question 4:</u></p> <p><i>In terms of compliance issues in the past and the upcoming disbandment of the Policy & Legislation Committee, could I get some clarity around how we will address outstanding issues?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 4:</u></p> <p>We are working through developing and finalising a draft of a policy framework. Subject to the Council considering and adopting components of that, we'll be looking to then establish a working group that'll allow all policies that would've normally gone to the Policy & Legislation Committee to go to that particular group.</p>

What we're proposing for that group is actually a workshop-style instead of considering policies on a fait accompli basis. It will be a far more interactive and collaborative process to develop policies with the consideration that once they come through the Council process, every Elected Member will have an opportunity to engage in the development of the policy. Therefore, once it gets to Council they will hopefully go through and be adopted accordingly.

Any issues that are outstanding in regards to policy will be considered through that process if there is sufficient time to do so, if not it will go through an EMES or Council adoption process; no issues will be unconsidered. We are expecting to have the policy framework ready to go in significant time, but hopefully before the 30th of June we'll have it all in place for consideration.

Question 5:

On the blurb about this item in the agenda, you've included the petition submitted by Mr G Waugh signed by 46 residents, where they respectfully asked that the City of Melville for some voluntary community inclusiveness, but you haven't made any reference to it. Why is that?

Response to Question 5:

We have addressed it in the Council Report. There is a section that deals with the Policy & Legislation Committee and the reasoning behind some of the considerations that we've made.

SUMMARY

- In late 2024 the City revised its Committee structure and operations as part of a staged approach to implementing changes anticipated to come into effect as a result of Local Government Reform and changes to the Local Government Act and Regulations.
- In December 2024 the Local Government Amendment Bill was enacted and changes to the Local Government Act have come into effect since in a phased manner. On 1 January 2026, a range of changes to Committees came into effect.
- This report considers the current City of Melville Committee operations against the new legislative requirements and proposes a series of changes to improve the efficiency of Committee meetings, ensure compliance with new legislation and support improved governance outcomes.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council, notes the City of Melville Committee Review Paper – March 2026 and endorses:

1. That the City of Melville Conduct Committee be formally disbanded;
2. That the City of Melville Governance Committee be formally disbanded;
3. That the City of Melville Policy and Legislation Committee be formally disbanded; and
4. By absolute majority, adopts the revised Terms of Reference for the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC), set out in Attachment 2, with the membership of the ARIC being vacated and reappointed as follows:

		Member	Deputy
1	Mayor	Mayor K Mair	
2	Elected Member Applecross-Mount Pleasant Ward		
3	Elected Member Bateman-Kardinya-Murdoch Ward		
4	Elected Member Bicton-Attadale-Alfred Cove Ward		
5	Elected Member Bull Creek-Leeming Ward		
6	Elected Member Central Ward		
7	Elected Member Palmyra-Melville-Willagee Ward		
8	External Member Presiding Member	Mr P Draber (expiry May 2027)	
9	External Member Deputy Presiding Member	Mr T Cheong (expiry May 2027)	
	CEO or Delegate	(non voting member)	

5. That the remaining meeting dates for the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee for 2026 are:

- 11 May 2026
- 27 July 2026
- 23 November 2026

And these dates be published on the City's website as the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee is open to the public for the community to attend.

At 9:26pm, Mr J Coten returned to the meeting.

At 9:28pm, Cr C Yorke left the meeting.

At 9:30pm, Cr C Yorke returned to the meeting.

M26/76 CEO Performance Review Panel - Appointment

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:31pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk responded to questions which concluded at 9:37pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>Just in terms of appointing an independent facilitator, is there any requirement to go out to tender or to invite quotes to appoint an independent facilitator?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>The <i>Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996</i> have certain thresholds where if met they are required to go out to tender. The spend on that is expected or realised spend of \$250,000. In relation to all other requirements around the quotation process and everything else, Council's Procurement Policy will set up the threshold in relation to that, and then if there are any exemptions to that, they'll also be set out in the policy.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Does the Mayor have to be the chair of the panel?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>The framework that we're proposing sets out who the chair of the review panel is, however that is a Council decision. If Council determines to amend or require amendments to the framework, then they can amend who the chair is.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>Is there a potential conflict of interest because of the close working relationship between the Mayor and the CEO?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 3:</u></p> <p>The Mayor and the CEO in all local governments will have a close working relationship. The Act is designed in that way, and there's a special requirement for the Mayor and the CEO to be able to engage, so there wouldn't be any conflict of interest on the basis of their professional relationship. If there is a conflict of interest identified in regard to a financial or proximity relationship or anything along those lines, then yes, but in this circumstance we don't believe there is any.</p>

Question 4:

There doesn't seem to be much discussion in the report about what led to the decision to recommend to the Council that we appoint Ms Helen Hardcastle as the independent facilitator for the CEO performance review process. I'm just wondering if there's any further documentation or evidence around that process and how that decision was made that could be provided to Elected Members?

Response to Question 4:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

SUMMARY

- Following a proposal to disband the Governance Committee this report considers the process and supporting document associated with the mandatory CEO Annual Performance Review.
 - Council Policy CP-117 Standards for CEO Recruitment, Performance and Termination was adopted in 2023 and has undergone a review with minor amendments recommended.
 - The CEO Performance Review Framework has been reviewed to improve clarity, modernise terminology, and streamline the overall process, with the revised Framework presented to the Council for consideration.
- This report seeks to commence the CEO Annual Performance Review, through the:
- ○ appointment of CEO Performance Review Panel and the endorsement of Terms of Reference for the Panel.
 - ○ Appointment of Ms Hardcastle from learning Horizons as the Independent Facilitator for this process.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **By absolute majority adopts the revised Council Policy CP-117 Standards for CEO Recruitment Performance and Termination (Attachment 1)**
2. **Endorse the commencement of the annual CEO Performance Review, the Terms of Reference (Attachment 3) for the CEO Performance Review Panel and appoint the Panel members as follows:**

		Member	Deputy
1	Mayor		
2	Deputy Mayor		
3	Elected Member Applecross-Mount Pleasant Ward		
4	Elected Member Bateman-Kardinya-Murdoch Ward		
5	Elected Member Bicton-Attadale-Alfred Cove Ward		
6	Elected Member Bull Creek-Leeming Ward		
7	Elected Member Central Ward		
8	Elected Member Palmyra-Melville-Willagee Ward		

3. **Endorse the CEO Performance Review Framework, as amended (Attachment 2).**
4. **Appoint Ms Helen Hardcastle of Learning Horizons to be the Independent Facilitator to the CEO Performance Review Panel for the remaining term of Ms Bowman’s contract.**
5. **Request the CEO Performance Review Panel to provide a report to the Council on the CEO 2026 Annual Performance Review no later than 18 August 2026.**

Corporate Services**C26/370 Investment Statements for February 2026**

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:37pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the investment statements for the period ending 28 February 2026 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 28 February 2026.

C26/371 Schedule of Accounts Paid for February 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:37pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 9:39pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

Looking at Attachment 1 on page 168, I noticed a payment of \$138K made to Ennovative, described as "IT software/licencing and maintenance". Can I assume that is the milestone payment for the proof of concept (POC)?

Response to Question 1:

Yes, that's correct.

Question 2:

Because of that, what integration work has been done in that POC? What systems have been integrated already?

Response to Question 2:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the details of payments made under delegated authority (DA-035) to suppliers for the period of February 2026 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts Paid be noted.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Schedule of Accounts paid for the period February 2026 as approved by the Director Corporate Services in accordance with delegated authority DA-035, and detailed in the attachments to this report; Payment Details February 2026 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details February 2026 (Attachment 2).

C26/373 Statements of Financial Activity for February 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:39pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the Statements of Financial Activity, Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position for the period ending 28 February 2026; and
- Presents the variances for the month of 28 February 2026 and recommends that they be noted by the Council; and
- Presents the budget amendments required for the month of February 2026 and recommends that they be adopted by the Council by Absolute Majority decision.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Notes the statement of financial activity and statement of comprehensive income for the month ending 28 February 2026 as detailed in the following attachments:**
 - **Statement of Financial Activity February 2026 (Attachment 1); and**
 - **Statement of Comprehensive Income February 2026 (Attachment 2); and**
 - **Net Working Capital February 2026 (Attachment 3); and**
 - **Reconciliation Net Working Capital as of 28 February 2026 (Attachment 4); and**
 - **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity February 2026 (Attachment 5); and**
 - **Statement of Financial Position as of 28 February 2026 (Attachment 6); and**
 - **Summary Rate Debtors February 2026 (Attachment 7); and**
 - **Rates Collections Graph February 2026 (Attachment 8); and**
 - **General Debtors Aged 90 Days February 2026 (Attachment 9).**
2. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the Budget Amendments, as detailed in the attached Budget Amendment Reports for February 2026 (Attachment 10).**

Confirmed

Community Development**CD26/62 John Connell Reserve Field Extension Proposal**

This item was brought forward in the Agenda – please see page 23.

CD26/60 Response to Petition - Wren Street Mount Pleasant Parking Concerns

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 9:39pm, Mr D Burton, Acting Director Community Development was available to answer questions.

At 9:45pm, the Presiding Member returned to the item, and Mr D Burton responded to questions which concluded at 9:46pm.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

Notes from Forum General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

I like the idea of a permit system. Yes it won't improve the parking, but it will stop the infringements, so I'm just wondering, couldn't we give them a permit to stop them getting infringed?

Question 2:

I know there's a lot of development on Wren Street, so I'm wondering, are there tradies parking there or what were the infringements for?

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

These questions were taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

SUMMARY

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) held In November 2025, the Council received a petition signed by 37 residents of the City, requesting the introduction of 'Residents Only' or permit-based parking on Wren Street, Mount Pleasant. At that meeting, the Council resolved to acknowledge the petition and requested that a report be prepared on the matters raised by April 2026 OMC.
- Following site inspections and a meeting with petitioners in March 2026, officers have assessed that the requested changes would not resolve the underlying parking demand and are not supported.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

- 1. Notes the outcome of officer investigations.**
- 2. Notes officers will continue to investigate minor operational improvements to assist short-term servicing and delivery access.**
- 3. Requests the Chief Executive Officer inform the lead petitioner of the outcome of the Council resolution.**

At 9:41pm, Mr M Yildiz left the meeting.

At 9:44pm, Mr M Yildiz returned to the meeting.

At 9:46pm, Ms M Smith Poulton left the meeting.

At 9:48pm, Ms M Smith Poulton returned to the meeting.

Confirmed

Environment and Infrastructure**E26/95 Response to Petition - Streetscape Upgrade - Hulme Court and McCoy Street****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 9:39pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure and Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 9:45pm.**Disclosure of Interest** Nil.**Notes from Forum** General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:Question 1:

Are there any other streetscapes in the City of Melville as what's proposed in this petition?

Response to Question 1:

Yes. There are a number of roads and streets within the City of Melville which have streetscaping elements to them.

Question 2:

Is landscaping taken into consideration with the master plan?

Response to Question 2:

The City is in the process of finalising the Myaree Master Plan, which was advertised to the community some months ago. Landscaping does form part of the consideration of that master plan.

Question 3:

Would the master plan consider treatments to surrounding streets as opposed to streetscapes?

Response to Question 3:

The master plan, as mentioned earlier, is in the process of finalisation. It is looking to draw on existing programs that the City has identified through capital works planning for road renewals, potential traffic treatments where warranted, as well as where investigations were potentially to occur and having regard for place outcomes, streetscape improvements and the like.

There is overlap between existing renewals and looking at how those renewals should occur in the context of where the future of the Myaree business area is progressing, and the Hulme Court area and McCoy Street is a key focus. They are key nodes within the Myaree Master Plan area where there's hives of activity and town teams, and we would be looking at enhancing them through place activation lens.

Question 4:

Is pedestrian access rather than vehicle access also something being considered in the master plan?

Response to Question 4:

The key actions of the master plan do look, as I mentioned earlier, at drawing on existing programs for renewal and the like, and where there's opportunities to improve pedestrian connectivity they will be looked at and enhanced as part of that process.

SUMMARY

- At the October 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC), the Council received a petition signed by 57 residents and 17 non-residents, requesting the City to prepare a design for verge upgrades at Hulme Court and McCoy Street Myaree. At this meeting, the Council resolved to acknowledge the petition and requested that a report be prepared on the matters raised by April 2026 OMC.
- The City's Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP) contains no funding for verge design or upgrade works in this location.
- Verge maintenance and upgrades adjacent to commercial properties are the responsibility of adjoining owners, in line with the City's Verge Treatment Policy (CP-086).
- The Myaree Business Area Master Plan is currently being finalised and will be presented to the Council at a future meeting. The master plan will provide the strategic framework for future public realm and verge improvements across Myaree.
- Officer recommendation is not to proceed with preparing a verge upgrade concept design and that any upgrades to the area are in line with the Myaree Business Area Master Plan.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council does not support the petition and that any verge or streetscape upgrades for Hulme Court/McCoy Street be considered as part of the Myaree Business Area Master Plan.

At 9:45pm, the Presiding Member returned to item CD26/60 Response to Petition - Wren Street Mount Pleasant Parking Concerns upon request from Cr G Barber (please refer back to page 49).

E26/99 RFT252629 Construction of Goolugatup Stage 2 Welcome Place

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:47pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252629 Construction of Goolugatup Stage 2 – Welcome Place

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252629 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes; and**
2. **Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

E26/97 RFT252623 Design & Construct for Mt Pleasant Foreshore Lighting

This item was brought forward in the Agenda – please see page 33.

At 9:48pm, Ms M Smith Poulton returned to the meeting.

Planning**UP26/107 Proposed amendment to LPS 6 to rezone Lot 15 (305 - 307) Stock Road Palmyra from "Light Industry" to "Service Commercial".**

This item was brought forward – please see page 21.

14 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE

At 9:47pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that a motion with notice had been received from Cr C Ross which would be distributed to Elected Members later this week.

15 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 21 April 2026.

Confirmed

16 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

At 9:49pm Cr M Woodall moved, seconded Cr S Green

That the Council considers the confidential report(s) listed below behind closed doors in accordance with Section 5.23(2) of the Local Government Act 1995:

C26/374 Draft Digital Strategy 2026–2030 Endorsement

This matter is considered to be confidential under section 5.23 of the Local Government Act, and the Council is satisfied that discussion of this matter in an open meeting would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest as it deals with a matter that if disclosed, could be reasonably expected to –

- (i) impair the effectiveness of any lawful method of procedure for preventing, detecting, investigating or dealing with any contravention or possible contravention of the law; or**
- (ii) endanger the security of the local government’s property; or**
- (iii) prejudice the maintenance or enforcement of a lawful measure for protecting public safety.**

C26/375 Recreation Leasing Opportunity Update - Barrisdale Open Space, 40 Bedford Road, Ardross

This matter is considered to be confidential under section 5.23 of the Local Government Act, and the Council is satisfied that discussion of this matter in an open meeting would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest as it deals with a matter that if disclosed, would reveal –

- (i) a trade secret; or**
- (ii) information that has a commercial value; or**
- (iii) information about the business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of a person.**

C26/376 RFP Outcomes: 788-794 Canning Highway, Applecross

This matter is considered to be confidential under section 5.23 of the Local Government Act, and the Council is satisfied that discussion of this matter in an open meeting would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest as it deals with a matter that if disclosed, would reveal –

- (i) a trade secret; or**
- (ii) information that has a commercial value; or**
- (iii) information about the business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of a person.**

At 9:49pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

At 9:55pm Cr J Spanbroek moved, seconded Cr K Wheatland

That the Council re-open the meeting to members of the public.

At 9:55pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)

17 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

At 9:56pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that the following item was discussed behind closed doors:

- C26/374 - Draft Digital Strategy 2026–2030 Endorsement

18 CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 9:56pm.

Confirmed