



City of  
**Melville**

## **NOTES**

### **AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM**

**6:30pm Tuesday, 10 March 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

Date

---



**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
<b>Healthy, Safe and Inclusive</b>	<b>Clean and Green</b>	<b>Sustainable and Connected Development</b>	<b>Vibrant and Prosperous</b>	<b>Good Governance and Leadership</b>
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.

## **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.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Official Opening</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Attendance and Apologies</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Declarations by Members</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Declarations by Members who have not read and given due consideration to all matters contained in the business papers presented before the Meeting</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)</b> .....	<b>9</b>
	<b>Approved Deputations</b> .....	<b>9</b>
	<b>Approved Written Submissions</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Disclosure of Interest</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Financial or Proximity Interests</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Public Question Time</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Questions Received with Notice</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Questions Received at the Meeting</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Awards and Presentations</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Applications for New Leave of Absence</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>New Business of an Urgent Nature</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Petitions</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Adoption of Recommendations en bloc</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>94</b>	<b>Reports</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>149.1</b>	<b>Items Brought Forward</b> .....	<b>12</b>
UP26/104	Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre - 729 Canning Highway, Applecross .....	<b>12</b>
UP25/95	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.7 - Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment.....	<b>14</b>
UP25/96	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.10 - Amenity.....	<b>15</b>
UP25/97	Review of Local Planning Policy 3.3 - Exhibition and Display Homes.....	<b>18</b>
UP26/102	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 - Design Review (Minor Administrative Changes) .....	<b>19</b>
<b>14.2</b>	<b>Reports from Committees</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>14.3</b>	<b>Reports of the Chief Executive Officer</b> .....	<b>22</b>
	<b>Management Services</b> .....	<b>22</b>

M26/69	WALGA - Electoral Reform Advocacy Position.....	22
M26/70	Review of Code of Conduct Elected Members, Committee Members and Candidates.....	23
M26/71	Deferral - Petition, Community Input to Policy Development .....	24
<b>Corporate Services .....</b>		<b>25</b>
C26/365	Investment Statements for January 2026 .....	25
C26/366	Schedule of Accounts Paid for January 2026 .....	25
C26/367	Statements of Financial Activity for January 2026 .....	26
<b>Community Development.....</b>		<b>27</b>
CD26/58	Deferred Consideration of the Feasibility of an Advertising Policy for Restricting Alcohol & Unhealthy Food Advertising on or in City Owned Property .....	27
CD26/57	Adoption of the Community Safety Technology Roll-out Plan 2026- 2031 & Other CCTV Related Matters .....	29
<b>Environment and Infrastructure.....</b>		<b>35</b>
E26/93	Response to Notice of Motion - Applecross Ferry Terminal Carpark Funding.....	35
E26/90	Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities .....	37
E26/91	Response to Notice of Motion – Bus Shelter Lighting.....	40
E26/92	Response to Notice of Motion - Additional Green Waste Bins .....	41
<b>Planning .....</b>		<b>44</b>
UP26/104	Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre - 729 Canning Highway, Applecross.....	44
UP25/95	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.7 - Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment.....	44
UP25/96	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity .....	44
UP25/97	Review of Local Planning Policy 3.3 - Exhibition and Display Homes.....	44
UP26/102	Review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 - Design Review (Minor Administrative Changes).....	44
<b>15</b>	<b>Motions with Previous Notice .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Motions without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority) .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Decisions Made While meeting was Closed to the Public .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>109</b>	<b>Closure .....</b>	<b>46</b>

## 1 OFFICIAL OPENING

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

## 1 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

Cr C Ross

Cr D Lim

Cr K Wheatland

Cr S Green

Cr C Yorke

### Ward

Bull Creek – Leeming Ward

Bull Creek – Leeming Ward (*electronic attendance*)

Bicton – Attadale – Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton – Attadale – Alfred Cove Ward

Bateman – Kardinya – Murdoch Ward

Bateman – Kardinya – Murdoch Ward

Applecross – Mount Pleasant Ward

Applecross – Mount Pleasant Ward

Palmyra – Melville – Willagee Ward

Central Ward

Central Ward

### Officers

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Ms M Pickering

Director Community Development

Mr G Tuffin

Director Corporate Services

Mr J Coten

Director Environment & Infrastructure

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance & Risk

Mr G Ponton

Acting Director Planning

Ms K Bainbridge (*until 7:07pm*)

Manager Development Approvals

Mr P Molony (*until 8:14pm*)

Manager Resource Recovery & Fleet Services

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 0

**Apologies**

Nil.

**On Approved Leave of Absence**

Nil.

## **2 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS**

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

Nil.

### **2.2 Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin**

Nil.

## **3 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)**

### **Approved Deputations**

- Mr B McCarthy, Applecross – Item UP26/104 Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre – 729 Canning Highway, Applecross

### **Approved Written Submissions**

Nil.

## **4 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

### **4.1 Financial or Proximity Interests**

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

Nil.

### **4.2 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.

## **5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

At 6:33pm, the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

### **5.1 Questions Received with Notice**

Nil.

### **5.2 Questions Received at the Meeting**

Nil.

### **5.3 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, 17 March 2026.

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

**6 AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

**7 APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

**8 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

**10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE**

Nil.

**11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

At 6:34pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that item C26/368 Update – Disposal 410 Canning Highway, Attadale has been identified as confidential and would be considered behind closed doors.

**12 PETITIONS**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

**13 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS EN BLOC**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

At 6:34pm, Ms M Smith Poulton left the meeting.

At 6:35pm, Ms M Smith Poulton returned to the meeting.

## 94 REPORTS

### 149.1 Items Brought Forward

At 6:35pm, the Presiding Member brought item UP26/104 Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre – 729 Canning Highway, Applecross forward for the convenience of the person making a deputation.

#### **UP26/104 Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre - 729 Canning Highway, Applecross**

**Deputations** At 6:35pm, Mr B McCarthy of Applecross gave a deputation which concluded at 6:38pm. At 6:38pm, Mr B McCarthy returned to the Public Gallery.

**Officer Presentation** At 6:38pm, Mr G Ponton, Acting Director Planning gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 6:40pm. At 6:40pm, Mr G Ponton responded to questions which concluded at 6:43pm.

[Officer Presentation – Item UP26/104](#)

**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:

*Is a zoning change proposed or is it just adding an additional use but keeping the zoning the same?*

Response to Question 1:

The scheme amendment being sought is to add an additional use of medical centre to the existing base zoning of residential R20. It would remain residential R20 but would have the ability to be used as a medical centre and therefore more than the current restriction of two practitioners.

Question 2:

*I imagine there are quite a few of these examples where the zoning is R20 and it might have a committed use of consulting rooms but not a medical centre. Is there going to be any review of where other cases might exist?*

Response to Question 2:

The beauty of retaining the residential zoning is that it provides additional control over scale of any operation. To allow more than two practitioners on site does require that scheme amendment process, and the Council would have a high degree of control over that scheme amendment proposal and initiation of such. We would not recommend initiation of additional uses for additional practitioners or medical centre purposes unless the sites were in an appropriate location.

The one on Marmion Street was on the edge of an existing centre, whereas this site has been operating since circa 1999 as medical use. There would be strategic assessment before we would recommend initiating an amendment.

**SUMMARY**

- An application has been received proposing to amend Local Planning Scheme No. 6 to apply 'Medical Centre' as an Additional Use to the property at Lot 400 (No.729) Canning Highway, Applecross.
- The site is currently approved for use as consulting rooms for up to two practitioners and the proposed amendment seeks to provide flexibility for use by three or more practitioners.
- The Council is requested to consider whether a scheme amendment process should be initiated.
- The proposed scheme amendment is considered suitable for initiation for the purpose of advertising given the current medical use of the site, results of preliminary advertising and the expected limited impacts on amenity given its location.
- It is recommended that the Council initiate the scheme amendment. Initiation will include referral to the Western Australian Planning Commission for approval to commence advertising.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION****That the Council:**

1. Pursuant to Section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, resolves to prepare and initiate Scheme Amendment No. 18 to Local Planning Scheme No. 6 to include an Additional Use of "Medical Centre" for Lot 400 (No. 729) Canning Highway, Applecross.
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 "standard" amendment under the provisions of the Regulations for the following reasons:
  - The amendment aligns the land use with the building's original medical purpose without altering the zoning or density code.
  - The scope of the amendment is limited to the subject site.
  - The amendment is not expected to result in significant environmental, social, economic, or governance impacts.
  - The amendment satisfies the definition of a standard amendment and does not reflect the characteristics of a complex or basic amendment.
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 6:43pm, the Presiding Member brought the following items forward for the convenience of those providing an officer presentation:

- UP25/95 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.7 - Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment
- UP25/96 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity
- UP25/97 Review of Local Planning Policy 3.3 - Exhibition and Display Homes
- UP26/102 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 - Design Review (Minor Administrative Changes)

### **UP25/95 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.7 - Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 6:44pm, Ms K Bainbridge, Manager Development Approvals gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 6:51pm. At 6:51pm, Ms K Bainbridge responded to questions which concluded at 7:06pm.  <a href="#">Officer Presentation - LPP Items - 10 March 2026 - ABF</a>
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

#### **SUMMARY**

- The City continuously reviews and updates the Local Planning Policies regularly to ensure that best practice is enacted in relation to planning decision making.
- Local Planning Policy 1.7 – Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment (LPP1.7) currently provides guidance regarding the assessment of this infrastructure on zoned land, noting that majority of infrastructure is exempt from requiring development approval as public works, low impact or on reserves where the State Government determines the application.
- LPP 1.7 was last reviewed in September 2016 and is operating effectively.
- Only minor administrative amendments are recommended which can be approved by Council without the policy requiring advertising / community consultation as *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.
- It is recommended that the amendments to LPP 1.7 are approved and subsequently published.

#### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

##### **That the Council:**

1. **Note the proposed amendments to Local Planning Policy 1.7 – Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment as being minor in nature in accordance with Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 and therefore do not require advertising; and**
2. **Pursuant to Schedule 2 Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, to adopt the amended Local Planning Policy 1.7 – Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment; and Publish the amended Local Planning Policy 1.7 – Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment as per Schedule 2 Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.**

**UP25/96      Review of Local Planning Policy 1.10 - Amenity****Deputations**

Nil.

**Officer Presentation**

At 6:44pm, Ms K Bainbridge, Manager Development Approvals gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 6:51pm. At 6:51pm, Ms K Bainbridge responded to questions which concluded at 7:06pm.

[Officer Presentation - LPP Items - 10 March 2026 - ABF](#)

**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 clause 1.3 of the Amenity policy, it states:*

*“The Council may require the submission of an amenity impact statement.”*

*Should this be the City, because I’m assuming it wouldn’t come to Council for a decision about whether an amenity impact statement is required, or would it?*

Response to Question 1:

Yes, it should be through the City, not the Council.

Question 2:

*In relation to the Amenity policy, can we add some other classifications of non-residential such as aged care?*

Response to Question 2:

With aged care it is typically residential, but depending on the context of the facility there may be a higher care component and more staffing requirements, so it is more nuanced to the specifics of the aged care facility.

This amenity statement is a really good guidance, but ultimately if someone is proposing an aged care facility we would be requiring them to address the suitability of that use in the zone as well, and we could definitely point them to this policy accordingly. I do not see any issues with it, but as a non-residential use I wouldn’t recommend that it is specified more specifically.

Question 3:

*Residential aged care then?*

Response to Question 3:

Yes definitely, we would be more than happy to accommodate that. It is something we would be requiring anyway to address the amenity impacts of these types of land uses and how they operate slightly differently from a typical residential land use.

Question 4:

*Would that be done administratively or is there a need for some direction from Council next week?*

Response to Question 4:

Officers believe we can accommodate that administratively.

Question 5:

*With regard to one of the considerations which factors in more future amenity, at 25 Almondbury Road and Infinity 8 apartments, there is a house that has been stuck in between the massive development. The future development of 23 Almondbury Road, cannot develop any further because there is no space to build and nowhere else to go. How will the changes to this policy assist in preventing the future developments?*

Response to Question 5:

This question was taken on notice, and the response will be provided in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 17 March 2026.

Question 6:

*That policy as amended, is that going to strengthen or weaken the City or Council's position if a planning decision is challenged at SAT?*

Response to Question 6:

It will absolutely strengthen our position. One of the biggest things officers found was not specific enough was in relation to non-residential uses in a residential zone, where amenities are needed to be protected most. As we are seeing with childcare developments and other non-residential developments in the residential zone, we really need to strengthen our policy framework to make it clear to applicants what we expect in terms of amenity outcome and how they need to document and prove that it will not have an adverse impact.

It is definitely seeking to strengthen our position in the SAT, and making reference to our local planning strategy and also directly addressing SAT case law in a similar context will only strengthen our position, especially regarding our expectations on lodgement requirements as well as our defensive position in the SAT if we end up in that context.

Question 7:

*When you talk about discretion, will it give officers additional discretion when assessing applications against the R codes as well?*

Response to Question 7:

No, it does not seek to increase officers' discretion at all. This policy is very high level, and it is a tool to help us with applicants in establishing the documentation requirements they need to address when seeking discretion. It could be deemed as providing applicants and officers more guidance and making it more specific rather than increasing the discretion and making it more generalised.

**SUMMARY**

- The City continuously reviews and updates Local Planning Policies regularly to ensure that best practice is enacted in relation to planning decision making.
- Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity currently provides guidance in the assessment of amenity impact where there is an exercise of discretion (i.e. performance assessment) in relation to a discretionary land use and/or a built form standard.
- LPP 1.10 was last reviewed in August 2019 and is presently working well.
- Only minor administrative amendments are recommended which can be approved by Council without the policy requiring advertising / community consultation in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.
- It is recommended that the amendments to LPP 1.10 are approved and subsequently published.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION****That the Council:**

1. **Note the proposed amendments as being minor in nature as per Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 and therefore do not require advertising.**
2. **Pursuant to Schedule 2 Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, to adopt the amended Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity. Publish the amended Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity as per Schedule 2 Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.**

**UP25/97      Review of Local Planning Policy 3.3 - Exhibition and Display Homes**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 6:44pm, Ms K Bainbridge, Manager Development Approvals gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 6:51pm. At 6:51pm, Ms K Bainbridge responded to questions which concluded at 7:06pm.  <a href="#">Officer Presentation - LPP Items - 10 March 2026 - ABF</a>
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

**SUMMARY**

- The City continuously reviews and updates Local Planning Policies regularly to ensure that best practice is enacted in relation to planning decision making.
- Local Planning Policy 3.3 – Exhibition and Display Homes (LPP 3.3) currently provides guidance regarding the assessment of this type of non-residential land use which is usually occurs within the residential zone and/or in a residential development. The purpose of the policy is to provide guidance to ensure that the land use is temporary in nature and to ensure the impact is managed accordingly.
- Local Planning Policy 3.3 was last reviewed in October 2019 and continues to operate effectively.
- Only minor administrative amendments are recommended which can be approved by Council without the policy requiring advertising / community consultation as Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.
- It is recommended that the amendments to LPP 3.3 are approved and subsequently published.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION****That the Council:**

1. **Note the proposed amendments to Local Planning Policy 3.3 – Exhibition and Display Homes as being minor in nature as per Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and therefore do not require advertising; and**
2. **Pursuant to Schedule 2 Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, to adopt the amended Local Planning Policy 3.3 – Exhibition and Display Homes; and**
3. **Publish the amended Local Planning Policy 13.3 – Exhibition and Display Homes as per Schedule 2 Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.**

**UP26/102 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 - Design Review (Minor Administrative Changes)****Deputations**

Nil.

**Officer Presentation**

At 6:44pm, Ms K Bainbridge, Manager Development Approvals gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 6:51pm. At 6:51pm, Ms K Bainbridge responded to questions which concluded at 7:06pm.

[Officer Presentation - LPP Items - 10 March 2026 - ABF](#)

**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:

*How many panel members are sitting on the panel each time it meets?*

Question 2:

*How many hours do the meetings generally go for?*

Question 3:

*How many items would be considered per year?*

Question 4:

*Are the fees set by us or the State Government?*

Response to Questions 1 to 4:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 5:

*Should there be a dot point in the scope which asks the Design Review Group to, if not adhere to, be mindful of our local planning policies?*

Response to Question 5:

The design review process is not to replace the planning assessment process. The Development Approvals team's job is to undertake a planning assessment against the local planning policies, and the Design Review Group is to provide design advice against the ten principles of good design. One of those principles is context, and it is the officers' job to brief them on the level of compliance with planning policies and the planning framework applicable, as well as to guide them on the level of discretion being exercised and how appropriate that discretion may be. Ultimately it is not a decision making group.

It is a panel whose advice helps us as assessing officers when preparing recommendations whilst also helping the determining bodies, be it Council or the Development Assessment Panel, in determining how good design is. As we find in some instances, design can be really good but fails to meet planning requirements, or alternatively it could meet planning requirements but be really poor design. By having both the planning assessment and design review together, it helps decision makers make balanced decisions on the appropriateness of a development.

Question 6:

*Would it be useful then to have somewhere in the policy scope that the Design Review Group is to receive advice from your department with regard to context and local planning policies?*

Response to Question 6:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 7:

*If you were not here, would other people know that they are meant to provide the Design Review Group with the appropriate information?*

Response to Question 7:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 8:

*With regard to the DRG, it appears to be uncapped as to how often you would refer things to that group. Do you have any idea on how much it is going to potentially cost?*

Response to Question 8:

It is accommodated in the operational budget, and it is well less than the cost of a planning officer in facilitating the service. The value it brings is professional design advice to decision makers which we otherwise would not have access to. The hours that are allocated to each application is quite small, so it is supposed to be very high level advice and review only. We have a budget for it which is well under the cost of employing an officer, with the budget being around 50% less than the cost of employing a Statutory Planning Officer. The frame in which we refer applications is very specified in the policy, and we only receive a small number of those types of applications.

Question 9:

*Will Council be provided with some sort of semi-regular report on how this cost is going?*

Response to Question 9:

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, 17 March 2026.

**SUMMARY**

- Following the most recent review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 – Design Review Panels (LPP1.2) in June 2023, the State Government has introduced the Local Government Design Review Manual, produced by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage in June 2025. As a result, administrative changes are recommended to LPP1.2 to better align with this manual.

- The Local Government Design Review Manual (manual) provides best-practice guidance for Local Government Design Review Panels in Western Australia. It aims to support consistent, high-quality design outcomes across jurisdictions, aligned with State Planning Policy 7.0 Design of the Built Environment (SPP 7.0)
- Other administrative changes have included an update to the name to the Design Review Group (DRG) to remove any confusion with the Development Assessment Panel. The changes also include updates to increase ease of use of LPP 1.2 and operational efficiency/flexibility of the DRG, clearer outline what does and does not need to be reviewed by the DRG and require the appointment of DRG members by Council (to align with the approach of many other local governments).
- The changes proposed are administrative in nature noting that the policy is procedural and the changes proposed are to align with best practice. Therefore, advertising is not required in accordance with Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.
- The recommendation is to endorse the changes to LPP 1.2 as minor as per Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and adopt the changes to LPP1.2 and publish in accordance with Schedule 2 Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

#### **That the Council:**

- 1. Endorse the changes to LPP1.2 as minor as per Schedule 2 Clause 5 (2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*; and**
- 2. Adopt amended LPP1.2 as recommended; and**
- 3. Request administration to publish the amended LPP1.2 in accordance with Schedule 2 Clause 87 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.**

#### **14.2 Reports from Committees**

Nil.

### 14.3 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer

#### Management Services

#### **M26/69 WALGA - Electoral Reform Advocacy Position**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:06pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

#### **SUMMARY**

- In October 2024 Council resolved advocacy positions with regard to proposed State Government Electoral Reform at the request of the Western Australia Local Government Association.
- WALGA is again providing an opportunity for Council's to submit resolved positions with regard to election frequency and voter participation by 27 March 2026. This information will be presented to State Council.

#### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council request the Chief Executive Officer advise the Western Australian Local Government Association that it reaffirms the following advocacy positions for the City of Melville with respect to Local Government Elections:**

- 1. Participation – supports voluntary voting at Local Government elections;**
- 2. Terms of Office – supports four year terms, with a two year spill;**
- 3. Voting Methods – supports First Past the Post as the preferred voting method for general elections. If Optional Preferential Voting remains as the primary method of voting, the City supports the removal of the 'proportional' part of the voting method for general elections;**
- 4. Internal Elections – supports First Past the Post voting for internal elections;**
- 5. Voting Accessibility – supports postal, in-person and electronic method of voting; and**
- 6. Methods of Election of Mayor – the current legislation with no change – Class 1 and 2 local governments Mayor or President elected by the electors, with regulations preventing a change in this method.**

At 7:07pm, Ms K Bainbridge left the meeting and did not return.

**M26/70      Review of Code of Conduct Elected Members, Committee Members and Candidates**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:07pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk responded to questions which concluded at 7:09pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	<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>Have we got a Code of Conduct policy about this, or is the Code of Conduct just guidelines?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>Yes, it is a policy position but also a Code that is required to be complied with. Any guidelines associated with it will assist Councillors with understanding their obligations under the Code, as well as the procedural processes around how complaints are dealt with and managed by the Local Government Inspector, and subsequently referred to the local government if they are behavioural breaches.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Why do we need a Code of Conduct policy if the Code of Conduct is guidelines in itself?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>The Model Code of Conduct is stipulated in the <i>Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021</i>. The requirement under the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> is that Councils have to adopt a Code, and therefore they adopt it on the basis to apply to them. The policy position is articulated within what the Code actually does, but because the Regulations themselves spell out exactly the model which is required to be adopted, it is exactly as the Regulations articulate.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>How much money have we spent on Code of Conduct complaints over the last two to four years?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 3:</u></p> <p>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, 17 March 2026.</p>

**SUMMARY**

- In 2021 following the introduction of the Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021, the Council adopted its Code of Conduct for Elected Members, Committee Members and Candidates.
- The recent Local Government Amendment Act 2024, made provision for the introduction of the Office of the Local Government Inspector. The enactment of this amendment has amended the Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021, on which the Code of Conduct for Elected Members, Committee Members and Candidates (Code of Conduct) is based upon.
- The amended Regulations came into effect on 1 January 2026, and the City is required to review and amend its Code of Conduct within 3 months of this date.
- This report presents to the Council to a revised, updated version of the Code of Conduct for consideration and adoption, by absolute majority, to meet the requirements of the legislation.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council, by absolute majority decision, adopt the revised version of the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates as contained in Attachment 1.**

**M26/71 Deferral - Petition, Community Input to Policy Development**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:09pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk responded to questions which concluded at 7:10pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	<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>Why is it being deferred again?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>The content in the request of the petition deals with the committee structure which is almost finalised and ready for presentation at EMES. Whilst the Council resolution required it to come back in March, we were not ready to have the committee structure discussion at the time. Given that we are now, we will present it to the next EMES, therefore the Council will deal with the petition in April.</p>

**SUMMARY**

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 16 September 2025, the Council acknowledged a Petition from Mr G Waugh, which contained a request for consideration being given to voluntary community representation on the Policy and Legislation Committee and/or avenues for the community to provide input into policy development.
- The Local Government Amendment Act 2024 has result in a series of reforms which related to the role of Council, and transparency of Committee meetings.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council note the deferral of the report associated with the September 2025 Petition seeking opportunities for the community / community groups to formally provide input into policy development, for consideration at the 21 April 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.**

**Corporate Services**

**C26/365 Investment Statements for January 2026**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:10pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

**SUMMARY**

- This report presents the investment statements for the period ending 31 January 2026 for the Council’s information and noting.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 31 January 2026.**

**C26/366 Schedule of Accounts Paid for January 2026**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:10pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

**SUMMARY**

- This report presents the details of payments made under delegated authority (DA-035) to suppliers for the period of January 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 January 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 January 2026 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details January 2026 (Attachment 2).**

**C26/367      Statements of Financial Activity for January 2026**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:10pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	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 31 January 2026; and
- Presents the variances for the month of 31 January 2026 and recommends that they be noted by the Council; and

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council notes the Rate Setting Statement and Statements of Financial Activity for the month ending January 2026 as detailed in the following attachments:**

- **Statement of Financial Activity January 2026 (Attachment 1); and**
- **Statement of Comprehensive Income January 2026 (Attachment 2); and**
- **Net Working Capital January 2026 (Attachment 3); and**
- **Reconciliation Net Working Capital January 2026 (Attachment 4); and**
- **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity January 2026 (Attachment 5); and**
- **Statement of Financial Position January 2026 (Attachment 6); and**
- **Summary Rate Debtors January 2026 (Attachment 7); and**
- **Rates Collections Graph January 2026 (Attachment 8); and**
- **General Debtors Aged 90 Days January 2026 (Attachment 9).**

At 7:10pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 7:12pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

**Community Development****CD26/58 Deferred Consideration of the Feasibility of an Advertising Policy for Restricting Alcohol & Unhealthy Food Advertising on or in City Owned Property****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 7:11pm, Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development responded to questions which concluded at 7:18pm.**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:

*Would the rescission motion be considered before the item, and how will that process be managed next Tuesday night?*

Response to Question 1:

A part of the impact statement will address the fact that there is an item before Council, and we would time it so that it would be dealt with beforehand. Depending on the outcome of the rescission motion, that would give Council the understanding of whether the item that follows could be dealt with or not.

Question 2:

*I have submitted an alternative motion for the officer recommendation to go hand in hand with the rescission motion, which would only come into play if the rescission went through. In the case that the rescission motion is carried and the Council chooses to rescind parts of the previous recommendation, would we then go to the alternative motion on the item?*

Response to Question 2:

We will consider that as part of the process because we received your alternative motion before we received a valid rescission motion, which was only received this afternoon. We are currently working through all of the validity and implications of that rescission motion as business stands at this point in time.

Question 3:

*Would Councillor Robins be able to influence that? If she in fact had preference with her alternative motion, would she have the option of saying that the rescission motion would be more appropriate to go first, or is that a decision that Governance will come to?*

Response to Question 3:

We will consider the entire package because we need to understand the current state of play of the three points being rescinded and the impact of Councillor Robins' suggested alternative motion given where we stand at this point in time. It may not be appropriate to move that depending on how much work has or has not progressed.

Question 4:

*Given the recommendation is simply noting where we are currently at, it would seem to me that whether the recommendation is supported or not does not have any actual effect on the item. Is that correct?*

Response to Question 4:

We are currently trying to understand the entirety of the package of work that needs to be rescinded, and the case may vary. Given it was only received late this afternoon, we are still working through the details around it.

Question 5:

*If the recission motion gets up, what costs have we already spent on the original motion that was approved, and what are the risks?*

Response to Question 5:

That will all form part of the impact statement.

Question 6:

*Has Councillor Robins' alternative motion been circulated?*

Response to Question 6:

No, because a valid recission motion had not been received at the time it was submitted.

Question 7:

*How long ago was Councillor Robins' alternative motion submitted?*

Response to Question 7:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 8:

*The recission motion was signed last night, so that was actually sent this morning. Is that correct?*

Response to Question 8:

Yes, however it was not processed until this afternoon.

Question 9:

*With regard to the deferral, I understand it has been said that there is no impact on sponsorship revenue on City-managed facilities. Could I get more clarity around that?*

Response to Question 9:

Sponsorship around City facilities was going to be addressed as part of the policy. The original resolution from Council is the part being deferred, and there has been no financial impact or impacts on what clubs can do in terms of advertising at this stage.

**SUMMARY**

- At the Ordinary Meeting on 18 March 2025, Council resolved:
- *“That the CEO investigate, scope and report back by March 2026 on the feasibility of an advertising policy to restrict alcohol and unhealthy food advertising on or in City-owned property.”*
- This report seeks to defer this matter for consideration no later than the March 2027 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council notes that the feasibility of an advertising policy to restrict alcohol and unhealthy food advertising on or in City owned property will be presented to an Ordinary Meeting of Council no later than March 2027.**

**CD26/57      Adoption of the Community Safety Technology Roll-out Plan 2026-2031 & Other CCTV Related Matters**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:18pm, Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development responded to questions which concluded at 7:43pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	<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 the federal funding grant that’s been secured, could we have some more information as to what the terms of that grant are and what it relates to, and whether the long term plan for the fixed CCTV is a requirement of the grant?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>Details of the terms and conditions will be circulated, though my understanding is that the City submitted 11 fixed CCTV locations through its application, with the caveat that the locations and plans had not been endorsed by Council. It was on that basis that the funding was received.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Was there much input from the Federal Government or Federal Member regarding the locations of the fixed CCTV?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>No, there was no direct involvement from the Federal Member in terms of site selections, they came purely from the report that went to community consultation. All sites are within the Federal Member for Tangney’s electoral boundaries.</p>

Question 3:

*Why is there a high concentration of CCTV cameras planned around riverside locations?*

Response to Question 3:

The way the locations were determined was based around three community safety benefits. The first was improving community's sense of safety by providing a visible deterrent and supporting responsible behaviour, followed by enabling MelSafe officers to respond promptly to antisocial behaviour detected through live monitoring, and reducing the impact of crimes, accidents and emergencies. Finally, supporting City investigations and WAPOL inquiries by capturing real time events, timelines and actionable evidence.

Officers took an educated guess on what they thought Elected Members and the community would prioritise, and as a result phase one focused on the high use of public open spaces, which tend to be in the riverside areas. Officers also consider afterhours activity and locations with low passive surveillance around, along with reports of suspicious behaviour, graffiti, people having accidents, emergencies occurring in those areas as well as antisocial behaviour and crime.

Throughout the roll out and implementation, officers also consider the logical and efficient network expansion which includes our cabling routers, power availability and infrastructure sequencing to ensure the plan can be delivered in the most efficient manner possible.

Question 4:

*Is it normal procedure for officers to apply for grant funding prior to council resolution on items?*

Response to Question 4:

The grant became available whilst the City was in the process of engaging Council and the community on the plan, and subsequently a grant submission was made and flagged very clearly that it was still pending Council decision. It was determined that this was the best course of action because there was significant funding available, and it would be more prudent to be successful in the grant funding application and then give the money back as opposed to having no grant at all to implement Council's final decision. This is a unique grant funding pool whereby it is untied and 100% funding, with no matching by the City.

Question 5:

*Can the grant funding be repurposed for other community safety devices?*

Response to Question 5:

The terms and conditions of the grant will be circulated.

Question 6:

*What was the catalyst for the number of planned sites to balloon out to more than twenty sites in the plan?*

Response to Question 6:

The plan was devised quite some time ago, this was the plan that went to community consultation. In the meantime, the grant became available for \$700,000, so the first phases of the plan we were engaged with were selected.

Question 7:

*Would it be open to Council to proceed with the fixed CCTV locations identified as per the grant funding so the funding is expended, and then to reassess further locations once the initial ones have been reviewed and in place for some period of time?*

Question 8:

*Is it a requirement to approve the whole long-term plan now or can we spend the federal grant money and then assess how effective those fixed CCTV cameras are, and subsequently make decisions as to future implementation?*

Response to Questions 7 & 8:

Yes, the funding is not contingent on future roll out of the plan, so Council can certainly endorse an expenditure and roll out in line with the grant only at this stage. We can then produce a report based on the success of the program with decision gates if Council wishes to proceed.

We were clear with the grant funding that this was subject to Council endorsement, but if Council does want to adjust the locations that were submitted for the \$700,000 grant we are confident that, as long as they are still within the Federal Member for Tangney's electorate, we would get support for those changes.

Question 9:

*With regard to the proposed home rebate, how will that be administered and how are decisions made by officers around where the priority is or who has the greatest need?*

Response to Question 9:

Officers have been developing set criteria around the locations of home CCTV that will provide the best impact for the pilot, and that would be the basis for assessment. The way we would run the grant round would be to open it for a certain amount of time and advertise it widely with the conditions and criteria being well established and communicated. Once all applications have been received they would be graded and put into priority order based on how they scored against the criteria. Those which score the highest up to the cap that Council endorses as the limit they want to fund would be selected and offered funding.

Question 10:

*Do you mean criteria will be largely linked to the pilot program, and if so how much will it differ between now and when the pilot program is rolled out?*

Response to Question 10:

There would be criteria for both. At this stage the pilot program is an opt-in for a future pilot program, so we would utilise additional criteria for that particular program's fit, but there would still be non-pilot program submissions.

Question 11:

*When you consider the planned asset renewal provision, can you provide some information on how this will be planned, and also the costs associated with it without taking into account the actual replacement or renewal costs of the equipment including the labour, commissioning allowance and other equipment to go with it, or even the server and technology?*

Response to Question 11:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

Question 12:

*For five locations it is going to cost \$740,000 and for 12 locations an additional \$840,000. If this fixed location is adopted, are we committing to that extra \$880,000?*

Question 13:

*What changes do we need to make to the proposed motion in order to ensure that we are only committing to spend the \$700,000 in funding?*

Response to Questions 12 & 13:

There are two business as usual functions that can assist Council in controlling the spending, the first of which being through the annual budgeting and planning process and not approving any additional expenditure on CCTV outside of the \$700,000 grant. We are not proposing that Council invest any additional money from reserves or municipal funding for this program. The second way Council could do this is by putting in an additional alternative motion to clarify and cap that.

Question 14:

*If the City installed CCTV for the 11 sites as a trial basis for 12 months, and if after this period of time the results were not adequate or as expected we removed the equipment, could this cost be factored into the \$700,000 of grant funding, or would this be an additional cost?*

Response to Question 14:

The 11 sites have been put forward for the \$700,000, though when adding up those 11 sites the current budget comes in at over \$700,000. These were preliminary figures based on information that was best known at the time, however when we go to tender we hope to have one contract which looks at all of the CCTV, getting us a better outcome in terms of what we can deliver for the \$700,000; this tender would come back to Council.

We are not sure that it would be permissible for the Council to run this on a trial and then pull the equipment out after 12 months given that the Federal Government is paying for all of the equipment, but we will check the terms and conditions of the grant for clarification.

Question 15:

*Can you provide some indication about what that criteria staff assess against might be?*

Response to Question 15:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

Question 16:

*Does the criteria relate to the applicants themselves, or has it got to do with the cameras and their placement?*

Response to Question 16:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided in the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

Question 17:

*Regarding the riverside locations, I want to know if the cameras were proposed to be placed in popular locations on the river?*

Response to Question 17:

The riverside locations are a combination of the very popular parks and car parks along the river, areas that we know are not necessarily big draw cards during the day but do attract people after hours in particular, and also areas that lack natural surveillance from shops, houses, clubrooms and changerooms being close by.

**SUMMARY**

- Council is asked to adopt the Community Safety Technology Roll-out Plan 2026 to 2031 to guide delivery of the City's CCTV and related community safety technology program.
- Consultation was undertaken from 6 November to 14 December 2025 across two streams (Roll-out Plan and Home CCTV Rebate Program), with 402 submissions received for the Roll-out Plan and 346 submissions received for the Home CCTV Rebate Program.
- Consultation results show high support for CCTV, including 74% indicating CCTV is important for community safety, and majority support for fixed and mobile CCTV.
- Council is asked to endorse participation arrangements with the Western Australia Police Force to share CCTV via technology system called vGRID under via a WALGA reviewed Memorandum of Understanding that has been accepted by approximately 19 other local governments.
- Council is asked to adopt a new Council CCTV Policy, changing from is currently an operational Policy, to a Council Policy, incorporating the community's feedback into transparent use of the CCTV network.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION****That the Council:**

1. **Endorses the commencement of a Home CCTV Rebate program as outlined within the Community Safety Technology Plan 2026-2031 from 1 July 2026, subject to future budget considerations; and**
2. **Adopts the Community Safety Technology Roll-out Plan 2026–2031; and**
3. **Adopts the Proposed CCTV Policy; and**
4. **Endorses the City's administration to enter participation arrangements with the Western Australia Police Force in relation to vGRID, in accordance with the WALGA reviewed Memorandum of Understanding.**

At 7:22pm, Mr O Pugh left the meeting.

At 7:26pm, Mr O Pugh returned to the meeting.

At 7:33pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting

At 7:36pm, Cr M Woodall returned to the meeting.

**Environment and Infrastructure****E26/93 Response to Notice of Motion - Applecross Ferry Terminal Carpark Funding**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:43pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 7:52pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	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:

*With regard to the response from the Government, they have said we are not going to provide any parking because the ferry terminal is already well integrated with other Transperth services. Are there other plans or discussions being had that Council is not aware of yet?*

Response 1:

The information that has been provided is the current information we have received. The City cannot speak on behalf of the State Government in relation to their rationale.

Question 2:

*In relation to the existing Tivoli carpark and Raffles carpark which are within quite a short walking distance of the proposed ferry terminal site, what sort of capacity do they typically run at, and is there an opportunity to divert or draw the attention of ferry terminal users to those carparks?*

Response to Question 2:

The Tivoli site is under a separate investigation process to look at the highest and best use options, and that will be coming back to Council. Work has commenced in relation to the possibility of parking on that site. There will be a workshop with Council in April to explore some of the options currently being considered and to get some general feedback and direction from Council as to the suitability of those proposed land uses. The project is progressing and will be reported back to Council shortly.

Question 3:

*Could we get all of those different pockets put together in a report about the amount of parking available in close proximity to this area, including the motion we moved about additional carparking at the Tivoli site please?*

Response to Question 3:

Yes, we can provide information about other studies we have done regarding carparking availability in the vicinity and will send that to Elected Members.

Question 4:

*What about bus routes to the bus and train station, is it just the ones on Canning Highway or are there any other ones, such as down Kintail road?*

Response to Question 4:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 5:

*Would you be able to include the chances of getting a grant if the site was shut already to build a carpark potentially?*

Response to Question 5:

I do believe it was part of the requirements for us to look at whether there is any funding available from the State Government, so we would be looking at that as well.

Question 6:

*Is the City considering whether we are limiting ourselves to the potential of a site when we are approaching the government about grant funding, which commits us to do something that may be of a scale that is not worthy of the site?*

Response to Question 6:

We are definitely looking at the highest and best use options for that site, potentially even for investment purposes as well, but we are certainly not looking to apply for any grant funding to commit the Council to anything. We will go through a process with Council regarding different options, the analysis, findings, constraints and opportunities for that site.

As part of the investigations they are looking at the land optimisation study, the current constraints on the site and the highest and best use of the site, and that did include carparking. That was one of the areas we did ask to be assessed in terms of its suitability for that site.

As part of the next workshop which is on 30 March 2026, we will have the consultants in to provide a presentation to Council to gain more direction on two or three potential land uses to do further detailed investigations, so there will be an opportunity there for Council to raise any further questions in relation to the possibilities of that site on the night.

**SUMMARY**

- The City investigated opportunities to obtain State Government funding for public carpark construction associated with the future Applecross Ferry Terminal.
- Discussions with the Department of Transport, Major Infrastructure, and PTA confirm that car parking is outside the ferry project scope, with the focus instead on active and public transport connectivity.
- No suitable State grant programs are currently available for standalone car parking infrastructure, and typical funding models would require significant City co-contributions.
- The City has formally written to Transperth seeking funding support for carparking and awaits a response, with updates to be provided to Elected Members.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council notes the report on obtaining state government funding to construct a public carpark site/s and that the response to the letter will be circulated via Elected Member Bulletin when it is received.**

**E26/90          Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:52pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 7:59pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	<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>Can the officers confirm whether there is any long-term plan to provide a replacement facility for the Attadale Scouts and Baden Powell Girl Guides in the Attadale foreshore following demolition, noting that the scouts have been temporarily relocated to Point Walter?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>The City will be undertaking a study of scout halls as outlined in the report, so that will identify future requirements in the long-term.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>How long will it take to rehabilitate the demolished site so that residents can start using it?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>We do not have an exact time, but we would obtain prices for the demolition. Without providing a specific time, it would be a matter of a couple of months perhaps, which is typical for the demolition of a building.</p>

Question 3:

*In relation to the Girl Guides hall near the Bayden Powell scouts, when this hall is removed what are the City's plans to put there?*

Question 4:

*Have there been any plans to put something where the Girl Guides hall was?*

Response to Questions 3 & 4:

No, there are no specific plans at this stage.

Question 5:

*Is there any possibility the site is going to be turned into a carpark?*

Response to Question 5:

We are not aware of any discussions saying that it was going to be turned into a carpark.

Question 6:

*Could you please confirm exactly where these two facilities are located, are they on the same site at Bayden Powell Reserve?*

Response to Question 6:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 7:

*The Girl Guide hall being used at all, if not where do the Girl Guides currently meet?*

Response to Question 7:

We do not believe it is being used by the Girl Guides, we believe the community group may be using it occasionally. From our understanding the Girl Guides have been out of there for about 12 months

Question 8:

*So they are using another facility or meeting somewhere else?*

Response to Question 8:

To our understanding the Girl Guides have gone next door to the scouts and are using their facility.

Question 9:

*Could officers please confirm the membership of each group, so the Attadale Scouts and the Bayden Powell Girl Guides, and also confirm that the City is committed to finding a permanent home for both groups?*

Response to Question 9:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 10:

*Because we have received correspondence that they are still hiring out to fundraise, why is there a rush to demolish Bayden Powell?*

Question 11:

*What is the risk in delaying demolishing it if it is still in somewhat active use?*

Response to Questions 10 & 11:

There is extensive asbestos throughout the building, and while asbestos in its solid condition is relatively safe there is the risk that if sections of it get broken it will become friable and ultimately a hazard. There are no practical methods to do any renewal there, so the only recommended option is to demolish it. Because of the asbestos risk, staff believe the sooner it is done the better.

Question 12:

*After the scout groups' two year agreement with the Attadale Playgroup facility runs out, are they on their own financially?*

Question 13:

*Is the idea that they would have to find a place to continue to run?*

Question 14:

*If they stayed at the Attadale Playgroup would they have to start paying fees for that instead of the City paying for it, how is that going to play out?*

Response to Questions 12 to 14:

In these two years we will find them a permanent home and make arrangements in terms of either:

- The City's financial contribution to it with a Council resolution; or
- With the scouts themselves contributing to the cost.

**SUMMARY**

- The Attadale Scout Hall and Baden Powell Girl Guides Hall have been assessed to present safety and health risks. The Scout Hall has structural issues, including corrosion and a non-compliant roof, while the Girl Guide Hall contains extensive asbestos and has been largely vacant for over 12 months.
- Demolishing both facilities is the safest and most cost-effective option.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION****That the Council:**

- 1. Approve the demolition of the Attadale Scout Hall; and**
- 2. Approve the demolition of the Baden Powell Girl Guide Hall.**

**E26/91      Response to Notice of Motion – Bus Shelter Lighting**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 7:59pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

**SUMMARY**

- Council requested an investigation into installing motion-activated, low-voltage, solar-powered lighting in bus shelters, prompted by concerns about low visibility at night and limited existing lighting.
- Consultation with Transperth found very few complaints about visibility, none in Melville, and identified operational, technical, safety-perception, and neighbourhood-impact issues that limit the effectiveness of such lighting.
- Investigations confirmed several constraints, inadequate space for solar components, high maintenance demands, nuisance activation risks, and potential disturbance to nearby residents.
- A high-level cost estimate found installation would total approximately \$400,500 for 178 shelters, with approximately \$20,000 per year in ongoing maintenance. The project is not included in the Long-Term Financial Plan, meaning new funding or removal of existing priorities would be required.
- It is recommended that no further action be taken on the installation of motion-activated, low voltage, solar powered lighting in bus shelters throughout the City and instead, continue improving public-realm lighting through the LED Streetlight Upgrade and Targeted Underground Power Program, which provide broader and more effective safety and visibility benefits.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council notes the findings of the report and that no further action be taken on the installation of motion-activated, low voltage, solar powered lighting in bus shelters throughout the City.**

**E26/92 Response to Notice of Motion - Additional Green Waste Bins**

<b>Deputations</b>	Nil.
<b>Officer Presentation</b>	At 8:00pm, Mr P Molony, Manager Resource Recovery & Fleet Services gave a short officer presentation, which concluded at 8:06pm. At 8:06pm, Mr P Molony responded to questions which concluded at 8:14pm.
<b>Disclosure of Interest</b>	Nil.
<b>Notes from Forum</b>	<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>How many properties currently pay for an additional FOGO bin?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>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, 17 March 2026.</p> <p><u>Questions 2:</u></p> <p><i>So a resident, for the additional bin \$213 per year, they could elect to have an additional bin for three months of the year, is that correct?</i></p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>And they can have it just for that shorter duration?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Questions 2 &amp; 3:</u></p> <p>If somebody gets the additional bin they get it for the 12 months of the year, and they pay that \$213 and it is permanently at their property.</p> <p><u>Question 4:</u></p> <p><i>For the residents that take this opportunity of getting an additional FOGO bin, could a condition of it be that they have to keep it at their property for the whole duration?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 4:</u></p> <p>That potentially would be an option if Council wanted to do that. Sometimes we find that when empty bins are stored on property for a year they can get lost or be vandalised, and people do not particularly like them taking up additional space.</p> <p><u>Question 5:</u></p> <p><i>What is the alternative then to assist residents with regard to the huge amount of leaves they have to deal with annually, is there another option that could be provided for them?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 5:</u></p> <p>People do have the option of paying for another FOGO bin and using it. We also have programs where increased leaf drop areas get increased street sweeping at the times of the year which align with that leaf drop, so there are other mechanisms in place.</p>

Question 6:

*A number of years ago residents were required to just put fallen leaves in a bag and they were then left on the kerbside and collected. Could the City perhaps return to that service they once provided?*

Response to Question 6:

That service stopped in 2018 on the premise of two things, one being that FOGO was coming in 2019 and secondly it was deemed an unsafe practice. We had issues with traffic congestion and manual handling issues due to not knowing the weight of the bags – there was all different types of bags they used to split. They also had workers exposed to traffic, so after discussions with a number of safety agencies it was deemed we needed to try something different.

Question 7:

*How much more frequently does the City run the sweeping service during winter compared to the other seasons, and what additional cost does that involve?*

Response to Question 7:

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, 17 March 2026.

Question 8:

*Do we have any indicative numbers of people requesting these extra FOGO bins?*

Response to Question 8:

While we do not currently have an exact figure, we receive a number of complaints throughout the year with regard to leaf fall. We estimate it to be in the small hundreds, perhaps 75-100 per year.

Question 9:

*Do we have any idea what it would cost to pay additional staff to do the verges?*

Response to Question 9:

We could work out an hourly rate or something like that and inform Council to give you some information.

**SUMMARY**

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) held on Tuesday, 19 August 2025, the Council resolved to request the CEO to prepare a report to the December 2025 OMC, detailing the resources and implications to implement an annual program to provide one additional Food Organics Green Organics (FOGO) bin to residents who reside in any area of the City, impacted by the leaves falling from deciduous trees during the fall-winter period. The FOGO bins to be delivered by the City on request, free of charge to affected residents and to be picked up by the City at the end of the fall period. At the OMC held on 9 December 2025, it was resolved to defer this report to March 2026.
- Such a service would have significant impacts on cost and operational efficiency.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council not provide additional temporary FOGO bins, due to substantial operational, financial and service delivery impacts, and noting that an existing user-pays additional bin service is already available.**

At 8:02pm, Mr M Yildiz left the meeting.

At 8:05pm, Mr M Yildiz returned to the meeting.

At 8:14pm, Cr G Panayotou left the meeting.

At 8:14pm, Mr P Molony left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:17pm, Cr G Panayotou returned to the meeting.

**Planning****UP26/104 Local Planning Scheme 6 Amendment: Additional Use Medical Centre - 729 Canning Highway, Applecross**

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 12.

**UP25/95 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.7 - Telecommunications Facilities and Communications Equipment**

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 14.

**UP25/96 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.10 – Amenity**

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 15.

**UP25/97 Review of Local Planning Policy 3.3 - Exhibition and Display Homes**

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 18.

**UP26/102 Review of Local Planning Policy 1.2 - Design Review (Minor Administrative Changes)**

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 19.

**15 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE**

At 8:14pm, the Presiding Member advised that a motion had been received from Cr C Ross and if proceeding would be included in the Agenda for the March 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council to be distributed on Friday, 13 March 2026.

**16 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)**

Nil.

**17 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC****Procedural Motion****COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

At 8:15pm Cr M Woodall moved, seconded Cr C Yorke

**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:**

**C26/368 Update - Disposal 410 Canning Highway, Attadale**

**This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 5.23(2) - (e) 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 8:15pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)**

**Procedural Motion****COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

At 8:23pm Cr K Wheatland moved, seconded Cr S Hong

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

At 8:23pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)**

**18 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**

At 8:24pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that Item C26/368 Update – Disposal 410 Canning Highway, Attadale was discussed behind closed doors.

**109 CLOSURE**

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member confirmed Cr J Spanbroek was still in attendance electronically and declared the meeting closed at 8:24pm.