



City of  
**Melville**

# **MINUTES**

## **ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS**

**6:00pm, Monday, 2 February 2026**

Held in the Kambarang (Conference), 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.

**Minutes to be confirmed at the next Annual General Meeting of Electors**

These minutes were received by Council

Presiding Member

Date



**OFFICIAL****Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Official Opening .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Attendance and Apologies .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Introduction of Elected Members and Officers .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Disclosure of Interest .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conduct of Meeting .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>5.1 Notice of Annual General Meeting of Electors .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>5.2 Manner of Conduct.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Business.....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>6.1 Presentation of the City of Melville Annual Report 2024-2025.....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>6.2 Public Question Time.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>6.2.1 Questions with Notice.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>6.2.1.1 Dr G Mahony, Attadale.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>6.2.1.2 Mr M McLerie, Bicton .....</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>6.2.1.3 Mr C Halliday, Myaree .....</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>6.2.1.4 Ms E Nicholson, Applecross .....</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>6.2.1.5 City of Melville Residents &amp; Ratepayers Association.....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>6.2.2 Questions without Notice .....</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>6.2.2.1 Ms J Curtis, Bicton.....</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>6.2.2.2 Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>6.2.2.3 Mr M Charlton, Ardross .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>6.2.2.4 Dr G Mahony, Attadale.....</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>6.2.2.5 Mr M Charlton, Ardross .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	<b>6.2.2.6 Mr C Catucci, Ardross.....</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>6.2.2.7 Ms E Nicholson, Applecross .....</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>6.3 Motions .....</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>6.3.1 Motions with Notice .....</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Motion 1 – National Risk Climate Assessment .....</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Motion 2 – Local Planning Scheme 6 (Canning Highway) .....</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Motion 3 – Local Planning Scheme 6 (Applecross Senior High School) .....</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Motion 4 – WALGA Tree Retention Policy.....</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>Motion 5 – City of Melville Tree Canopy.....</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>Motion 6 – City of Melville Verge Treatment Policy.....</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>6.3.2 Motions without Notice.....</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>6.4 General Business .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Closure .....</b>	<b>33</b>

**OFFICIAL****1 OFFICIAL OPENING**

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, officially declared the meeting open at 6:00pm, and invited Chief Executive Officer, Ms G Bowman to read the Acknowledgement of Country and advised those present of the Purpose of the Annual General Meeting of Electors, the Disclaimer, the Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility and the Audio Recording Advice.

**2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES****In Attendance**

Mayor K Mair

Mayor

CouncillorsWard

Cr G Barber

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Cr S Green

Central Ward

Cr C Yorke

Central Ward

Cr D Lim

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Cr C Ross

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Cr N Robins

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Cr S Hong

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Cr J Spanbroek

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Cr K Wheatland

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

**Officers**

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Ms M Pickering

Director Community Development

Mr J Coten

Director Environment &amp; Infrastructure

Mr P Varelis

Director Planning

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance &amp; Risk

Ms A Ferreira

Acting Director Corporate Services

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Ms M Smith Poulton

Lead Governance

Mr S Curulli

Governance Officer (Council Support)

Mr O Pugh (*from 6:30pm*)

Governance Officer (Council Support)

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery

30

---

**OFFICIAL****Apologies**

Cr M Woodall	Bull Creek - Leeming Ward
Cr G Panayotou	Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

**On Approved Leave of Absence**

Nil.

**3 INTRODUCTION OF ELECTED MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

At 6:01pm, the Presiding Member welcomed the following Elected Members to the meeting:

- Cr G Barber
- Cr S Green
- Cr C Yorke
- Cr D Lim
- Cr C Ross
- Cr N Robins
- Cr S Hong
- Cr J Spanbroek
- Cr K Wheatland

At 6:02pm, the Presiding Member welcomed the City of Melville staff in attendance, including:

- Chief Executive Officer, Ms G Bowman
- Acting Director Corporate Services, Ms A Ferreira
- Director Planning, Mr P Varelis
- Director Environment & Infrastructure, Mr J Coten
- Director Legal, Governance & Risk, Mr M Yildiz
- Director Community Development, Ms M Pickering

**OFFICIAL****4 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

At 6:03pm, the Presiding Member reminded officers and Elected Members that should they wish to disclose an interest in any matter during the meeting, to let the Presiding Member or Governance team know.

**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 CONDUCT OF MEETING****5.1 Notice of Annual General Meeting of Electors**

At 6:03pm, the Presiding Member advised of the purpose of the meeting, to receive the Annual Report for the 2024-2025 period, and advised of the public notice, which was advertised:

- On the City of Melville website page [Local and Statewide Public Notice](#) and website banner (from Wednesday, 14 January to Monday, 2 February); and
- On public notice boards at the City of Melville Civic Centre, City of Melville libraries and LeisureFit centres (from Wednesday, 14 January to Monday, 2 February); and
- Via the Melville Matters eNews (Wednesday, 14 January 2026); and
- Via the City's social media platforms; and
- Via the Herald newspaper (Saturday, 17 January 2026).

The public notice reads as follows:

***“Annual General Meeting of Electors (AGM)***

*We invite City of Melville residents to the City of Melville Annual General Meeting of Electors (AGM) to receive the Community Annual Report 2024-2025.*

***Date:*** Monday, 2 February 2025

***Time:*** 6.00pm,

***Venue:*** Conference Room, City of Melville Civic Centre, 10 Almondbury Road, Booragoon.  
*You can also watch via YouTube.*

*In line with the City of Melville's sustainability policy, limited printed copies of the report will be available at the meeting. Copies will be available to view from the City of Melville Civic Centre and libraries, or read it online at [melvillecity.com.au/annualreport](http://melvillecity.com.au/annualreport)*

*We welcome your questions on the Community Annual Report 2024-2025. Questions must be submitted by **12noon Wednesday, 28 January.***

*For more information and to register your attendance or submit a question, visit [melvillecity.com.au/AGM](http://melvillecity.com.au/AGM)”*

---

**OFFICIAL****5.2 Manner of Conduct**

At 6:04pm, the Presiding Member invited the Chief Executive Officer, Ms G Bowman to advise the meeting of the following rules of conduct:

1. In the event of an emergency, everyone should take direction from officers who will guide you to the exit points of the building.
2. Toilets are located immediately before the entry to the Council Chambers.
3. All physically present are required to sign the attendance register prior to entering the meeting.
4. Each person who participates in a vote or speaks must be an elector of the City of Melville (the City).
5. The proceedings are being livestreamed and recorded for the production of the Minutes all speakers are requested to use the microphone each time they speak. The Minutes will include a summary of any questions asked and a summary of the responses provided.
6. Speakers are asked to clearly give their name and suburb each time they speak and are required to address the Mayor as chair of the meeting.
7. Only electors of the City may move or second a motion. Motions are to be submitted in writing prior to the commencement of the meeting.
8. All addresses are limited to a maximum of five (5) minutes. Extensions of time are only permissible with the agreement of a simple majority vote of Electors present (*Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 Regulation 17*).
9. The community are welcome to participate in the meeting. To ensure the efficient conduct of the meeting, please participate in a concise and respectful manner.
10. All Elected Members and officers attend this meeting to observe the proceedings and hear comments from electors. All questions and comments should be directed to the Mayor who may invite a response from the Chief Executive Officer, Presiding Members of Committees, or Elected Members.

**6 BUSINESS****6.1 Presentation of the City of Melville Annual Report 2024-2025**

At 6:07pm, the Presiding Member presented the City of Melville Annual Report for 2024-2025. [Presentation - Annual Report 2024-2025](#)

A copy of the Annual Report for 2024-2025 is available to members of the public on the City's website page [Annual Reports](#). Limited hardcopies are also available at the City of Melville Civic Centre and Libraries.

**OFFICIAL****6.2 Public Question Time**

At 6:12pm, the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

**6.2.1 Questions with Notice****6.2.1.1 Dr G Mahony, Attadale**Preamble to Questions 1 to 4:

*With the unprecedented high-rise building construction in the Canning Bridge Precinct considerably more traffic will be concentrated in/through this area.*

Question 1

*What is the projected traffic flow to/from/ through this area on Canning Highway:*

*2026-2027*

*2027-2028*

*2028-2029*

*2029-2030*

Response 1:

Canning Highway is a designated Primary Regional Road so is under the care and control of Main Roads WA (MRWA), and therefore, this data is best obtained through MRWA.

The Structure Planning for this area was undertaken with traffic modelling considering the dwelling yields proposed within the structure plan. Whilst some of the developments have exceeded height controls, each individual development which comprises an increase of 10 or more dwellings are required to be accompanied by a Traffic Impact Statement and, for larger developments, a more thorough Traffic Impact Assessment.

These reports are required to be prepared using the Western Australian Planning Commission's guidance document which sets minimum content requirements and preparation methodology. These reports are required to demonstrate that the development can be accommodated within the existing traffic network and not create failures within the system. These reports are also required to be prepared by qualified persons in traffic/transport planning.

The Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan and associated Canning Bridge Infrastructure Transport Strategy seek to manage future traffic by shifting the precinct away from car-dependence, improving the public transport hub, prioritising walking and cycling, maintaining a clear movement hierarchy, and delivering targeted infrastructure upgrades so the area can handle substantial new development without escalating congestion.

**OFFICIAL**Question 2:

*What measures are currently in place to control to/from/Traffic through this area during peak hours (morning and evening)*

Response 2:

The following measures are currently in place:

- Signalised intersections along Canning Highway
- Smart Freeway integration immediately north, smoothing northbound AM peak flow
- Bus priority lanes near the station (existing) that separate bus movements from general traffic

Question 3:

*What measures are planned to control Traffic to/from/through this area during peak hours (morning and evening) as the population/vehicle density in this area increases substantially?*

Response 3:

Smart Freeway – Ramp Metering Upgrades

- Northbound ramp metering on Canning Highway and Manning Road Designed to optimise flow, reduce peak hour delays, and minimise queuing.

Canning Bridge Bus Interchange Upgrade

- Increasing to 12 active bus stands and 8 layover stands
- Removing buses from the road lanes to improve traffic flow
- Grade-separated pedestrian access
- Direct bus train transfers to reduce car dependence

New Southern Principal Shared Path (PSP) pedestrian and cycle bridge connecting Como to Canning Bridge Station to eastern PSPs.

Canning Highway Dedicated Eastbound Bus Lane

- A Main Roads WA/ Public Transport Authority project.
- Design is complete but there is currently no timeframe for delivery

These align directly with the City's Canning Bridge-Integrated Transport Strategy's objective of "local movement hierarchy prioritising walking, cycling and public transport over private vehicles".

---

**OFFICIAL**Question 4:

*Are any road construction/modifications planned to address the traffic flow and if so what does this comprise, what is the proposed schedule and the budgeted cost? Does this involve upgrade/modifications to Canning Bridge, and if so what is the predicted impact on traffic flow through this area during this construction activity?*

Response 4:

The Canning Bridge Bus Interchange Upgrade is planned to help address traffic flow. This project includes a larger bus interchange facility (12 active stands and 8 layover stands), new entries to Canning Bridge Station, improved pedestrian and cyclist access and Smart Freeways ramp metering to Canning Highway and Manning Road northbound on-ramps.

The project has received \$200 million in funding from the Commonwealth and State Governments comprising:

- \$150 million for new bus interchange
- \$30 million for a southern Principal Shared Path (PSP) bridge
- \$20 million for northbound onramp ramp metering

## Timeline

2022/23 – Planning

2024/25 – Development

2025/26 – Procurement for a contractor to design and construct

Late 2026 – Construction commencement

The City does not currently have information on the predicted traffic flow during construction.

Preamble to Question 5:

*The Bus stop on Canning Highway about 20 m (travelling towards Canning Bridge) on from the intersection of Canning Highway and Sleat Road stops the traffic flow on Canning Highway on the left lane. This creates an unacceptable public safety risk in conjunction with a traffic bottleneck.*

*Putting this in context there is another bus stop some 100m further down Canning highway, with a bus turn-in safety lane accommodating two busses which does not block traffic flow.*

*Please note: Any argument about convenience and people having to walk to catch busses needs to be seen in context – people in Attadale for example walk up to 500-700 m to a bus stop.*

---

**OFFICIAL**Question 5:

*That the City of Melville please request, as a public safety issue, that the Department of Transport to remove this bus stop from Canning Highway? And if not, why not?*

Response 5:

This question was responded to in November 2020 by the Public Transport Authority (PTA) who is the authority that locates bus stops - with approval from Main Roads WA. See the PTA's 2020 response below:

*"When the Canning Hwy upgrades took place, bus stops were relocated taking into account the potential for future bus priority as this is a strategic bus route with a high level of service provision. For bus priority to benefit public transport services, bus stops are placed on the downstream of traffic signals. This explains why this bus stop was relocated across the Sleat Road intersection towards Canning Bridge Station.*

*Importantly, bus stops are also placed close to intersecting roads so that walking distances between the nearby passenger catchment and a bus stop are reduced to a minimal level. Locating bus stops close to intersections also increases the safe access to bus stops as there is usually a formalised crossing as is the case at Sleat Road where there are pedestrian stages at the signalised intersection with Canning Highway. There has also been recent intensification of residential density in the nearby area and locating the bus stop at the present position encourages use of public transport by an increased number of people living in the wider community."*

The City has forwarded this request to the PTA again and is awaiting a response.

**6.2.1.2 Mr M McLerie, Bicton**

As the questioner or a representative was not in attendance, the Presiding Member ruled that the questions and responses would be included in the minutes of the meeting and not read out, in accordance with clause 6.7(7)(d) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*.

Preamble to Question 1:

*The CEO is directly accountable for the City's performance of its Freedom of Information (FOI) functions as the Principal Officers as defined in the FOI Act 1992.*

*FOI Act obligates the City to provide information to ensure transparency of the City's affairs and performance. For example section 4 states:*

*That the City is "to give effect to this Act in a way that —*

- a) assists the public to obtain access to documents; and*
- b) allows access to documents to be obtained promptly and at the lowest reasonable cost; and*
- c) assists the public to ensure that personal information contained in documents is accurate, complete, up to date and not misleading."*

---

**OFFICIAL**

*The CEO has considerable power to release information to members in the interest of transparency and the public's interest. The CEO has full authority to intervene in the City's FOI application process at any time to promote release of information to ensure the full intent and provisions of the FOI Act are fully complied with.*

*Community members have long-term ongoing concerns with the City's FOI function performance. Several FOI applications have taken well over 12 month to get finally resolved after the Information Commissioner's officer intervention into complaints made.*

*Council and the CEO should be aware that the Information Commissioner's (IC) 2024/25 annual report (page 113) shows that the IC has received by far the most complaints against the City of Melville vs all other Local Governments (Melville = 25% of all local government complaints), only exceed by the Department of Communities and the WA Police Force. This poor FOI performance indicator does not appear to have been reflected in Council's 2024 /2025 report (page 113).*

**Question 1:**

*For each of the years provided in this table as given on page 81 of the 2024/25 annual report (below) (<https://www.melvillecity.com.au/our-city/publications-and-forms/corporate-services/annual-report-2024-2025>) the:*

- a. # of complaints made to the Information Commissioner each year,*
- b. # of complaints resolved each year,*
- c. balance of complaints that remain to be resolved at each year end, and*
- d. the dates the initial FOI application submitted to the City for each of the complaints still unresolved, and*
- e. since 2019, how many resolved complaints were more than 12 months from the initial date of application, and how many were over 36 months.*
- f. Since 2019, what is the worst age of the resolved complaint (from application to dates of complaint resolution).*

**Response 1:**

The management of the external review process and any complaints made to the Office of the Information Commissioner resides with the Office of the Information Commissioner. Statistical data on external reviews can be found in the Office of the Information Commissioner's annual reports on their website. The City does not maintain any statistical data on external reviews as they are not legislatively required to do so.

In relation to current external reviews the City is a party to, we confirm the following:

- The City is aware of 17 external review applications currently in progress.
- There is one external review outstanding from 2022.
- There are 12 external reviews whereby the City has heard nothing further from the Office of the Information Commissioner since we received notification of the external review application.
- The City is a party to the external reviews but the management of them resides with the Office of the Information Commissioner, and the City has no control over the time taken to resolve external reviews.

**OFFICIAL**Preamble to Question 2:

*On page 13 of the 2024/25 annual report it states “The FMARC is an audit committee tasked with aiding the Council in fulfilling its duties related to risk management, internal controls, legislative compliance, and both internal and external audit reporting. In 2024–2025, the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee convened four times to review and receive reports on the following matters:… Freedom of information activities update”. However, a lawful request to the City to access the relevant FMARC committee meeting minutes (to see the reports) has been refused.*

Question 2:

*Please confirm:*

- a. On what statutory basis would council or committee member close the public out of any meeting that discusses matters relating to the City’s FOI obligations, processes, improvement initiative, performance or the like.*
- b. Exactly why the information mentioned in the annual report is not otherwise publicly available on the City’s website on in response to such requests.*
- c. What were the dates of the referenced FMARC committee meetings and exactly who attended.*

Response 2:

The FMARC (now renamed to the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC) is a committee of Council that assists Council with oversight over audits, risk, improvement and financials. The ARIC and the City’s Governance Committee have no delegated authority, nor are they decision-making bodies and therefore meet on a confidential basis behind closed doors.

The information relevant to the City’s FOI function that was presented to the FMARC (ARIC) and now presented to the Governance Committee, sets out statistical information regarding the:

- number of FOI applications received, processed, closed during the period
- number of internal and external reviews received and closed during the period
- number of FOI applicants v the number of FOI applications
- average processing time for FOI applications and internal reviews
- overview of the current applications, that may include personal information.

The FMARC (ARIC) met on:

- 5 August 2024 with Mayor K Mair, Cr G Barber, Cr N Robins, Cr J Spanbroek, Cr T Fitzgerald, Cr D Lim, Cr S Green, Mr L Hay (Members) Cr T Lee & Cr M Woodall (Observers) in attendance
- 25 November 2024 with Mayor K Mair, Cr G Barber, Cr D Lim, Cr N Robins, Mr L Hay (Members)

**OFFICIAL**

The Governance Committee met on:

- 5 May 2025 with Mayor K Mair, Cr J Edinger, Cr S Hong, Cr N Robins, Cr C Ross (Members) Cr M Woodall & Cr J Spanbroek (Observers) in attendance
- 8 September 2025 with Mayor K Mair, Cr J Edinger, Cr T Lee, Cr K Wheatland (Members)

The Annual Report is a publicly available document and is uploaded to the City's website.

Preamble to Question 3:

*The a/CEO has recently indicated FOI function performance improvement initiatives have been done and are still underway.*

Question 3:

*Please confirm:*

- When each of the initiatives started, ended, or expected to be completed.*
- What performance measures you been adopted to track the implementation and outcomes of each of mentioned initiatives.*
- What is the planned date for the Information Commissioner's meeting with Elected Members.*
- Since 2019, what are the dates of previous Information Commissioner (or their officers) meeting with Elected Members.*
- Confirm if you would invite me to the briefing to provide Elected Members a customer's perspective.*
- Would the CEO be open to running focus group sessions to properly engage concerned, experienced or interested community members to obtain feedback of past FOI experiences to assist the CEO in improving the City's FOI function processes and performance: if not why not?*

Response 3:

The City's FOI team undertakes ongoing education across all service areas to reinforce their statutory responsibilities under the FOI Act, with this program continuing throughout 2026. The City has also developed a formal FOI eLearning package, which will be issued to all relevant staff to ensure a consistent organisational understanding of FOI requirements. In addition, the City is engaging with the Office of the Information Commissioner to facilitate a further briefing to Elected Members and the Executive Team on FOI rights, statutory obligations and contemporary best practice that the City is seeking to schedule in 2026.

The City engages with the Office of the Information Commissioner regarding any issues with the City's compliance with statutory obligations under the FOI Act. Any FOI applicant who is not satisfied with the City's decision regarding a FOI application may seek an internal or subsequent external review as stipulated under the FOI Act.

As the City engages with the Office of the Information Commissioner regularly, and continues to do so, any improvements to the City's FOI processes will be guided by the Office of the Information Commissioner as the oversight agency for the FOI Act. Any interested community members can engage directly with the Office of the Information Commissioner.

---

**OFFICIAL**Preamble to Question 4:

*The State Government is progressing “Open Government Principles” which involves the opening-up of government processes, proceedings, documents and data for public scrutiny and involvement, and is now considered a fundamental element of a democratic society. <https://www.wa.gov.au/organisation/office-of-the-information-commissioner/open-government-principles>.*

Question 4:

*Please confirm:*

- a. *What initiatives has the City progressed, or plans to progress, to embed the “Open Government Principles” at the City.*
- b. *What s the scope and cost of each of the initiatives.*
- c. *What are the start and end dates of the initiatives.*
- d. *When was a detailed implementation plan put to Council for review.*
- e. *Has, or will, there be 2-way community engagement in designing and implementing “Open Government Principles” at the City.*

Response 4:

The City is aware of the Open Government Principles and it is a consideration in all FOI training and presentations made to service areas across the City.

The City is considering the Open by Design Principles in line with the review of the City’s policies and processes currently underway as part of the preparation for the implementation of the *Privacy and Responsible Information Sharing Act 2024*.

Preamble to Question 5:

*The a/CEO recently stated the CEO/the City does not have any annual performance assessment KPI’s in relation to the City FOI functions performance.*

Question 5:

*Please confirm:*

- a. *Why Council has not included KPI’s in relation to the City’s FOI functions compliance and enforcement (which is a significant tool to improve public transparency to the City’s affairs) in the CEO and City annual performance perspective.*
- b. *Why hasn’t Council ensured effective and meaningful FOI performance KPIs are in place and the CEO’s quarterly FOI reports to FMARC published routinely.*

Response 5:

The CEO KPIs set by Council extend across the performance of the entire organisation, reflecting the CEO’s overarching responsibility for strategic leadership, service delivery and organisational outcomes. While broad in scope, they do not include a specific KPI relating to the City’s FOI function taking into consideration that the FOI Act provides specific guidance as to how FOI applications are to be considered and the legislative process for the Information Commissioner to conduct external reviews of the City’s decisions.

**OFFICIAL****6.2.1.3 Mr C Halliday, Myaree**

As the questioner or a representative was not in attendance, the Presiding Member ruled that the questions and responses would be included in the minutes of the meeting and not read out, in accordance with clause 6.7(7)(d) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*.

Preamble to Questions 1 to 3:

*I have one question related to the 2025 Annual Report and two questions related to being a City of Melville rates payer:*

Question 1:

*What are the KPI's/metrics to which MelSafe effectiveness is measured? At face value, there appears to be a big outlay of costs (new Tesla's) for this program. Per page 32 of the Annual Report I can see multiple stats related to 'Safe' of the Melville Community, however, my concern is that I regularly see MelSafe cars sitting idly at my local park for extended periods of time.*

Response 1:

MelSafe performance is not measured by vehicle movement alone. It is measured against a defined set of operational, staff, and community outcome indicators:

- Operational KPIs
- Response times  
We measure the average time taken to respond to incidents across multiple categories, including suspicious behaviour, noise complaints, parking compliance, and other community safety matters.

Our target is to maintain or improve response times for security related tasks compared to the former Community Safety Service, and to lift traditional Ranger related response times to align with those first response standards.

- Incident resolution rates  
We track the proportion of matters resolved on first attendance versus those requiring follow-up or escalation.

Our target is a 90 percent first-response resolution rate for crime-related community safety matters.

- Staff performance KPIs
- Training completion  
All officers are required to complete mandated training before undertaking expanded MelSafe duties.

Our target is 100 percent training completion, which is monitored and reported internally.

---

**OFFICIAL**

- Community impact KPIs
- Community satisfaction  
Overall satisfaction with MelSafe is measured through periodic community surveys, including the City's MARKYT Scorecard.

Our target is to meet or exceed industry benchmarks for security and community safety services.

- In relation to the MelSafe vehicles, the Tesla fleet was procured through two separate public tender processes and assessed as best value for money over the vehicle lifecycle. The vehicles provide substantial boot capacity, allowing officers to carry equipment and animal pods that would otherwise require larger and more expensive dual-cab or four-wheel-drive vehicles. They also deliver a significant reduction in fuel and maintenance costs compared to traditional patrol vehicles.
- Regarding visibility and vehicles parked in public spaces, MelSafe officers are required to complete incident reports, intelligence notes, and compliance records as part of every patrol and response. Officers are encouraged to complete this work in public locations across the City rather than returning to an office environment. This approach improves response times, maintains visibility in the community and ensures officers remain close to their patrol areas should they be required to respond to an incident.

Question 2:

*Can the City of Melville consider giving all registered dog owners in the area organic poo bag tokens akin to the FOGO tokens we receive around rates time? Having a roll of bags at home similar to what is dispensed at our local parks would be big help.*

Response 2:

The City currently provides dog waste bag dispensers across a wide range of public open spaces and dog exercise areas. These dispensers are positioned in locations with high dog walking activity and are routinely checked and refilled to ensure bags are available for community convenience.

Providing rolls of bags directly to all registered dog owners, similar to FOGO kitchen caddy liners, is not considered a sustainable or cost-effective approach at this time. Dog waste bags would require frequent replacement, ongoing distribution, and additional administrative and environmental costs. There is also a higher risk of overuse or unintended use once bags are distributed for private storage.

By locating dispensers in commonly used walking routes and park entrances, the City is able to provide access at the point of need, including in situations where a dog owner may have forgotten to bring bags from home. This approach allows the City to better manage supply, reduce waste, and focus resources on maintaining availability in high-use areas.

The City continues to monitor dispenser locations and usage patterns and will adjust placement where needed to support responsible dog ownership and cleanliness across public spaces.

---

**OFFICIAL**Question 3:

*How do you request a traffic management inspection to be performed on residential City of Melville roads? Having lived on Mullings Way for the last 6 years, I have seen and increase in the number and speed that motor vehicles drive on this road and in particular take the corner. I am increasingly worried that a car will lose control one day taking the corner at unacceptable speeds. Mulling Way, is also accessed by a number of young families walking with children and I believe that speed bumps, chicanes etc could mitigate the speed that motorists are driving down this road.*

Response 3:

A request can be made through the City's website <https://www.melvillecity.com.au/our-city/online-services/request-a-service-or-report-an-issue> or via customer service emailing [melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au](mailto:melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au) or calling (08) 9364 0666 or 1300 635 845. However, in this case, as this has now been reported, the request will be investigated by the City's Traffic and Road Safety Team.

**6.2.1.4 Ms E Nicholson, Applecross**Preamble to Question 1:

*I refer to the independent auditor's report page 86, last paragraph, of the Annual Report 2024/25. It states: "I did not receive the other information prior to the date of this auditor's report."*

Question 1:

*Why wasn't the other information supplied to the auditor in time for his report?*

Response 1:

Section 5.53 of the *Local Government Act 1995* sets out the matters that are to be included in a local government's annual report which includes:

- a report from the mayor or president;
- a report from the CEO;
- an overview of the plan for the future of the district made in accordance with section 5.56 of the Local Government Act, including major initiatives that are proposed to commence or to continue in the next financial year;
- the financial report for the financial year;
- such information as may be prescribed in relation to the payments made to employees;
- the auditor's report prepared under section 7.12AD(1) of the Local Government Act for the financial year

The independent auditor is responsible for expressing an opinion on the Annual Financial Statements. The Annual Report consists of two main components: the front-end section, which provides contextual and supplementary information, and the Annual Financial Statements, which appear in the latter part of the report.

**OFFICIAL**

In accordance with auditing standards, the auditor is not required to provide an opinion on the front-end section of the Annual Report. This section is therefore referred to as “other information” in the auditor’s report.

The auditor’s responsibility regarding this “other information” is limited to considering whether it is materially inconsistent with the Annual Financial Statements. Should the auditor identify any contradictions or material inconsistencies, these must be formally reported to the CEO and Council.

It is common practice for auditors to prioritise the audit of the Annual Financial Statements and to receive the “other information” at a later stage. As a result, their review of this portion of the report may occur after substantial progress has been made on the financial audit itself. Hence, the standard paragraphs included in many independent auditor’s reports.

Preamble to Question 2:

*Also, if the auditor locates a material mis-statement in the report, he states that he will report it to the CEO & to the Council and request a correction to be made to that report.*

Question 2:

*Will that material mis-statement be made public and if so in what manner eg on the council website, at a council meeting, etc?*

Response 2:

The auditor received the full annual report subsequent to providing the audit opinion. Upon the review of the full annual report there were no misstatements found, hence no need to report anything to the CEO and Council.

Preamble to Question 3:

*I also refer to page 117 of the Annual Report 2024/25 under the sub heading: Possible Contaminated Sites. It cites Booragoon Lake, a nationally accredited Wetland, as being one of those said sites. There have been multiple studies done on the lake water quality and contamination over many years by various universities and others,*

Question 3:

*why hasn't the city conducted an investigation by now in order to determine the extent of this contamination and the cost of remediation that will be required? What would remediation entail?*

Response 3:

The City commissioned a detailed site investigation in 2019, which included surface inspections, targeted removal of asbestos-containing material, and subsurface testing in identified hotspot areas. This investigation informed the current management approach for the site.

The area in question is a bushland that appears to have been subject to historical asbestos dumping from surrounding housing demolition and renovation. Approximately 120 kg of asbestos-

**OFFICIAL**

containing material was removed from the site as part of earlier works, with surface fragments subsequently managed through ongoing monitoring and targeted removal. The bushland site undergoes little disturbance and is not subject to regular soil excavation or mechanical works.

Remediation involving the excavation and removal of any remaining buried material would be a significant cost, and the City faces many competing funding priorities with finite resources. Importantly, such works would also require extensive clearing and disturbance of established native vegetation, resulting in a substantial environmental impact. On balance, the environmental cost and ecological disturbance associated with large-scale remediation is considered likely to outweigh the very low risk posed by leaving a small number of buried asbestos fragments in situ, particularly where the site is managed through access controls, routine monitoring, and appropriate safety procedures.

**6.2.1.5 City of Melville Residents & Ratepayers Association**

As the questioner or a representative was not in attendance, the Presiding Member ruled that the questions and responses would be included in the minutes of the meeting and not read out, in accordance with clause 6.7(7)(d) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*.

Preamble to Questions 1 to 5:

*On 29/11/2025 the Mayor was emailed complaints over the Administration's handling of 18/11/2025 OMC public questions with notice. An adequate response has not been received from the Mayor.*

Question 1:

*Is the Mayor responsible for handling public questions at OMCs?*

Response 1:

In accordance with the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1995*, section (1)(1), the Procedure for asking of and responding to questions raised by members of the public at a meeting referred to in regulation 6 (1) are to be determined by the Presiding Member. The Presiding Member in fulfilling this role, gives consideration to the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*, which sets out the conduct and procedure to be followed for public question time.

Question 2:

*How does the Mayor and Council ensure the administrative officers act with reasonable care, diligence, honesty, integrity, openness and accountability in the event the Mayor assigns administrative officers to respond to public questions?*

Response 2:

Under 20.2 of the Meeting Procedures, the Presiding Member is to use all reasonable endeavours to ensure compliance with the meeting procedures. Additionally, where questions are received with notice, responses are prepared prior to the Council meeting and reviewed by both the Chief Executive Officer and the Mayor.

**OFFICIAL**Question 3:

*Is the CEO ultimately accountable to Council for ensuring public questions are properly handled and answered, once the Mayor assigns the questions to the administration?*

Response 3:

The management of Public Question Time is undertaken in accordance with the requirement of the *Local Government Act 1995* and the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*.

Question 4:

*What KPIs are in place to measure the CEO and the administration's performance of handling and properly answering public questions?*

Response 4:

The CEO does not have a specific KPI in relation to Public Question Time responses, however there is an obligation to ensure compliance with legislative requirements, including those under the *Local Government Act 1995* and the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*.

Question 5:

*Why are the 18/11/2025 meeting minutes on the website still unconfirmed as of 27/1/2026?*

Response 5:

This matter is noted and has been rectified.

Preamble to Questions 6 to 14:

*Specific questions submitted to the 18/11/2025 OMC were about street tree protection particularly, amongst other polices, when land is under development per CP 029 (part 5, <https://www.melvillecity.com.au/our-city/publications-and-forms/technical-services/tree-policy>) and the relevant administrative procedures to enforce Council policy.*

*Building permits for 278 Preston Point Road Bicton (BA-2025-1600/1733) were issued on 8/10/25 and 10/10/25. No planning approval was issued in 2025, and no Materials on Verge permit has been issued. The street trees were not protected before building work started, they were then protected from early November, but then before 1/1/2026 the tree facing Fifth Street had gone.*

Question 6:

*Where did the street tree go? Where any Elected Members consulted or notified, if so, when?*

Response 6:

The City approved a request to remove the verge tree for development in accordance with City Policy CP-029 Trees on City Managed Land. Elected Members were not notified as this was managed as an operational matter.

OFFICIAL

Question 7:

*What tree protection conditions were included in the building permits?*

Response 7:

This is not relevant noting the response to the previous question that the City approved the removal of the verge tree.

Question 8:

*What will Council do to ensure the tree policy, and any relevant laws, are properly enforced?*

Response 8:

The City will respond to compliance matters in accordance with the City's Compliance and Enforcement Policy and any relevant legislation.

Question 9:

*How many complaints were made about work on this site, if so, what were they about?*

Response 9:

The City is unable to comment on individual properties or compliance matters. Any release of information is managed in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 1992 and relevant legislative requirements.

Question 10:

*Did work on site start before City issuance of building permits.*

Response 10:

The City has not received any information to indicate work started before the issuance of a building permit.

Question 11:

*What compliance and enforcement action has the administration taken and what does it intend to take?*

Response 11:

The City is unable to comment on individual properties or compliance matters. Any release of information is managed in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 1992 and relevant legislative requirements.

---

**OFFICIAL**Question 12:

*Which administration officers are responsible for policing compliance and enforcing street tree protection for building and development activities and what are the frequencies of routine inspections?*

Response 12:

The City is aware of and aligns all aspects of the City's strategic (Council) and executive operations (Administration through the CEO) roles in accordance with division 2, Part 2 of the Local Government Act and section 5.41 of the Local Government Act. The City generally deals with compliance matters on a complaints basis or when non-compliances are identified.

Question 13:

*Since 1/1/2023 how many a) complaints the administration received due to non-compliant street tree protection, b) street tree protection issue were identified by administration itself, c) how many tree protection incidents were identified by Rangers, CSS and MeISafe?*

Response 13:

Since 1/1/2023, the City is aware of 38 non-compliant Tree Protection Zones. This is a combination of reports from the community and administrative staff. Any reports of tree protection zone breaches reported to MeISafe, or the former CSS and Ranger services, were referred to the Natural Areas Team. To date, there have been no proactively identified incidents observed by MeISafe.

Question 14:

*Will the CEO freely provide copies of the administration's procedures relating to enforcement of tree policy CP-029, complete with identification of who developed and revised them, who approved them and when?*

Response 14:

CP-029 Trees on City Managed Land Policy includes options that the City may pursue following damage to City trees. These options include infringement, prosecution, or initiation of court proceedings. This policy is publicly available on the City's website and was approved by Council at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 9 December 2025.

**OFFICIAL****6.2.2 Questions without Notice****6.2.2.1 Ms J Curtis, Bicton**

These questions were received without notice, in accordance with the City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022 sections 6.8(1)(b) & 6.9 (c), and were taken on notice at the meeting, the Minutes have been updated to include the responses.

Preamble to Questions 1 to 3:

*On page 24 of the report, under your clean and green outcomes, you state that the council is seeking to increase urban forest tree canopy on city managed land. The City has also previously committed to achieving a minimum total canopy cover of 15% in each suburb. Progress against this target has not yet been reported.*

Question 1:

*Can you please advise what percentage increase or decrease in tree canopy on public land was achieved for the 2024-2025 reporting year?*

Question 2:

*What was the percentage gain or loss for tree canopy on private land?*

Question 3:

*What specific measurable strategies will be reported on in the 2025-2026 reporting period to demonstrate how council is actively managing and controlling progress towards improving canopy cover on both private and public land?*

Response to Questions 1 to 3

At present, the City is tracking canopy cover based on the number of trees it is planting. To enable the City to understand this detail and respond more quickly to changes in tree canopy, the City has increased its aerial flyovers from every five years to annually.

To obtain the best data and enable accurate comparison, these flyovers are programmed for summer, with the first annual flyover only just completed in January 2026. Moving forward, this data will be compared to previous data, enabling the City to provide a yearly tree canopy gain/loss analysis.

Improving tree canopy across both public and private land is a key focus of the City's urban forest program. Through the implementation of the Urban Forest Strategy, the City will continue to report on planting numbers, canopy trends and progress on initiatives such as verge tree programs and the development of a draft Local Planning Policy for trees on private land.

**OFFICIAL****6.2.2.2 Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek**Preamble to Question 1:

*With 113,000 residents in the district and so few in attendance at the electors meeting...*

Question 1:

*Is Council happy with the effort that has been made to engage with the community?*

Response 1:

The Presiding Member responded to the question to advise that generally people are happy with the City, and our surveys typically show that residents are happy with the work by the City. However, the Council is unable to comment on the personal views of the public unless shared with us. The meeting was advertised in a number of places as indicated in section 5.1 of these minutes, and the Presiding Member welcomed feedback on further opportunities to engage with the community.

**6.2.2.3 Mr M Charlton, Ardross**Question 1:

*Has the City of Melville Road Safety and TravelSmart Working Group been disbanded or dissolved? If so why hasn't any of the representatives been informed?*

Question 2:

*If it has not been disbanded, then how come there's been no communication to notify the community representatives?*

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

The City of Melville Road Safety and TravelSmart Working Group is no longer operating. Over time, the group encountered a few challenges that made it difficult to continue in its previous format, including:

- Difficulty maintaining consistent membership and attendance.
- Challenges in securing regular participation from key stakeholders from state government agencies, whose input is essential for road safety initiatives.
- Community members raising important concerns but not always having the time or capacity to participate more actively.
- Limited availability of volunteers, leading to reduced momentum and fewer contributions to ongoing projects.
- A natural winding down as long-standing members moved on, and no new participants stepped in to take their place.
- Feedback from one of the groups stakeholders highlighting opportunities to explore more effective ways of engaging on road safety matters.

The group was previously advised that meetings were placed on hold while the status and framework of the group were reviewed. This review took some time, as there was a need to fully assess whether the working group was achieving the objectives outlined in its Terms of Reference, including:

**OFFICIAL**

- Supporting local implementation of the State Road Safety Strategy
- Formulating, reviewing, and promoting TravelSmart initiatives
- Actively engaging in initiatives that improve road safety and TravelSmart behaviour among City of Melville residents

Through this review, it gradually became clear that the working group, in its existing format, was no longer able to meet these objectives effectively.

Unfortunately, it was an oversight that the final decision to discontinue the group was not formally communicated to community representatives. We acknowledge this and appreciate the commitment and interest shown by those who participated.

While the working group has ceased meeting, the City remains strongly committed to road safety and sustainable travel. As the City's priorities and community engagement needs evolve, there may be an opportunity in the future to revisit and re-establish a working group or similar advisory structure, should it prove beneficial and well-supported by stakeholders.

**6.2.2.4 Dr G Mahony, Attadale**

This question was received without notice, in accordance with the City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022 sections 6.8(1)(b) & 6.9 (c), and was taken on notice at the meeting, the Minutes have been updated to include the response.

Preamble to Question 1:

*The City of Melville has many solar cells on domestic residences, they are increasing.*

Question 1:

*What is the City's strategy for disposal of solar cells?*

Response 1:**End-of-Life Management of Solar Panels in the Community**

The City recognises that the rapid uptake of rooftop solar across the community will result in a growing volume of end-of-life solar panels over coming decades, and that appropriate disposal, reuse and recycling pathways are essential to avoid future environmental and waste impacts.

This issue is being addressed through a combination of State and Commonwealth regulatory reform, infrastructure investment, and emerging recycling markets, rather than through local government acting alone.

**State-level controls already in place (Western Australia)**

Western Australia implemented a landfill ban on all e-waste, including solar panels, from 1 July 2024, under the State's Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Strategy 2030. This ensures that solar panels cannot legally be disposed of to landfill and must instead be directed to approved reuse or recycling pathways.

To support this transition, the WA Government—through the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation—has committed more than \$10 million in grant funding to expand e-waste collection, storage and recycling capacity across the State. This funding is specifically

**OFFICIAL**

intended to enable the infrastructure and market capability needed to manage growing volumes of regulated e-waste such as solar panels.

**National recycling and product stewardship reform underway**

At a national level, the Commonwealth has committed \$24.7 million over three years (from January 2026) to establish a national pilot solar panel recycling program, including up to 100 pilot collection sites nationwide. This initiative is designed to test scalable recycling models and build a nationally consistent approach to managing end-of-life photovoltaic panels.

In parallel, Commonwealth, state and territory governments have agreed to progress work toward a mandatory national product stewardship scheme for solar panels, ensuring responsibility for panels is shared across their full lifecycle—from manufacture and sale through to reuse, recycling and safe disposal. NSW is currently leading development of a Regulatory Impact Statement to inform this scheme, building on recent legislative reforms already introduced in that state.

Once implemented, a national product stewardship framework would significantly reduce reliance on local government for end-of-life management by placing obligations on suppliers and manufacturers, similar to existing schemes for TVs, computers and other regulated products.

**Research and market development**

Significant Commonwealth-backed research is also underway to improve solar panel recycling technology and commercial viability. Australian Renewable Energy Agency has funded multiple R&D projects, including university-led work to recover high-value materials such as silicon and metals from end-of-life panels, supporting the development of a domestic recycling industry.

**Current options available to the community**

In the interim, there are already licensed recyclers servicing the Perth metropolitan area, including facilities that accept solar panels via drop-off or collection services. While costs and availability vary, panels are not permitted to go to landfill and viable recycling pathways do exist for residents replacing or decommissioning older systems.

**6.2.2.5 Mr M Charlton, Ardross**

This question was received without notice, in accordance with the City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022 sections 6.8(1)(b) & 6.9 (c), and was taken on notice at the meeting, the Minutes have been updated to include the response.

**Preamble to Question 1:**

*The new City of Melville verge collection system includes separation of different waste types, specifically e-waste and bulk cardboard recyclables. On the 18 December, a single waste truck collected various waste types in the same truck, all of which were compacted or crushed together.*

**OFFICIAL**Question 1:

*With all the information on verge collection and separation of waste types, why was only one waste truck there to collect the separated items?*

Response 1:

In relation to Mr Charlton's observation, we investigated the matter and confirmed on that occasion, some materials were placed into the rear loader when they should have been left for collection by the flatbed truck for recycling. This occurred during a peak collection period leading into Christmas when the crew was short staffed and was an operational error rather than standard practice.

The matter has been addressed directly with staff, and short-term resourcing measures have been put in place ready for the end of year peak period to reduce the likelihood of this occurring again.

**6.2.2.6 Mr C Catucci, Ardross**Preamble to Question 1:

*LPS6 proposal has been around for almost 2 years, and there has been a lot of discussion.*

Question 1:

*With regards to the initial proposal in terms of zoning and density. What are the main changes which have been considered as of today, with consideration to the feedback received from the public and community engagement.*

Question 2:

*Can we be provided the technical variance analysis?*

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

The City has undertaken a number of technical studies to inform the next phase of the local planning scheme 6 review process. The City is not in a position to provide any details on the changes to members of the public as we are still working through those changes with a workshops scheduled with Elected Members over the coming months prior to a report being presented to the Council with further information, approximately in June 2026.

**6.2.2.7 Ms E Nicholson, Applecross**

This question was received without notice, in accordance with the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022* sections 6.8(1)(b) & 6.9 (c), and was taken on notice at the meeting, the Minutes have been updated to include the response.

Preamble to Question 1:

*I was actually referring to the water quality at Booragoon Lake, as opposed to the asbestos that's been dumped there. That is why I thought it was a considered a contaminated site, from all the high arsenic levels and various other dangerous chemicals that are in that water, as we see in the water quality testing results that eventually come out.*

**OFFICIAL**

Question 1:

*Could you comment on the water quality please?*

Response to Question 1:

The item listed in the Annual Report referred specifically to the asbestos at the site on the land. The possible contamination does not relate to the water quality.

At 6:49pm, the Presiding Member closed Public Question Time.

**OFFICIAL****6.3 Motions****6.3.1 Motions with Notice****Motion 1 – National Risk Climate Assessment****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M1)**

At 6:49pm, Mr D Morley, Willagee moved, seconded Ms E Cole, Melville

**That the Council:**

1. **Recognises that the National Climate Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Plan identify extreme heat, heat-island effects, and infrastructure vulnerability as foreseeable risks requiring local government action.**
2. **Acknowledges relevant Australian legal precedents — including Bushfire Survivors v NSW EPA (2021), Sharma v Minister for the Environment (2021), and WHS heat-exposure cases — which show governments may be liable when foreseeable climate risks are not addressed.**
3. **Accepts that urban tree canopy is a low-cost, high-impact adaptation measure that reduces heat, protects public health, and strengthens the City’s legal defensibility.**
4. **Commits to aligning City planning, asset management, and risk management with the National Climate Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Plan by:**
  - a. **adopting stronger, measurable canopy-growth targets (currently 15% by 2036);**
  - b. **implementing proactive canopy-protection measures on public and private land (including reconsidering recent Melville City Council decisions not to amend policy - and to draft Local Planning Policy in 2026 that prioritises the retention of mature trees on private land over clearing land for development;**
  - c. **embedding canopy and heat-mitigation into all planning, development, and asset-management frameworks;**
  - d. **reporting annually on canopy protection and expansion.**
5. **Resolves to treat tree-canopy expansion and protection as a core governance and risk-mitigation responsibility to safeguard the City, its workforce, its residents, and its long-term financial position.**

At 6:54pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (27/1)**

**OFFICIAL****Motion 2 – Local Planning Scheme 6 (Canning Highway)****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M2)**

At 7:03pm, Ms K Horn, Ardross moved, seconded Mr S French, Ardross

**That the Council due to proven capacity issues with Canning Highway, and before the draft LPS6 is presented to Council:**

- 1. Replaces Canning Highway as the Primary transport corridor with Leach Highway,**
- 2. Increases residential density along Leach Highway and between Leach Highway and South Street to provide urgent, equitable, reasonable, sustainable and affordable housing opportunities.**
- 3. Postpones density increases along Canning Highway and in feeder suburbs between Stock Road and Reynolds Road and reconsiders when appropriate infrastructure capacity is available.**

At 7:06pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (21/1)**

**Motion 3 – Local Planning Scheme 6 (Applecross Senior High School)****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M3)**

At 7:06pm, Mr S French, Ardross moved, seconded Ms K Horn, Ardross

**That the Council:**

- 1. Recognise ongoing, capacity issues at Applecross Senior High School (SHS), to which currently proposed Local Planning Scheme 6 density increases will add significant additional pressure. In particular:**
  - A. Recognise that Applecross SHS enrolments have grown significantly year on year with the school now operating well beyond its built capacity of 1,563 students (i.e. more than 25% with 1,962 student enrolments by Semester 2, last year; a 14% increase over the past 5 years and over 400 students since 2018).**
  - B. Recognise that the Applecross SHS site is now severely constrained - now reliant on 24 temporary transportable classrooms to try to alleviate overcrowding, but has now exhausted remaining space - no more is available.**
  - C. Recognise that Applecross SHS student enrolments have consistently been underestimated by the Department of Education (DoE).**
  - D. Recognise that although the DoE is progressing a major upgrade plan for built capacity of 2500 students in the medium term, the current trend of rising enrolments (an average increase of 61 enrolments per year) will consume all of this extra capacity within 10 years.**
  - E. Recognise that Applecross SHS also faces additional demand from developments either already zoned, approved or underway in its intake area, such as at Canning Bridge and R100 high density zoning, along Almondbury Road - including the recent DAP-2024-13 (for 57 apartments) which was rejected by the City but then overruled and approved by the Department of Planning at 7 storeys (instead of the precinct 4 storey limit).**

**OFFICIAL**

**F. Recognise that due to such ongoing pressures, there is little to no capacity currently or in planned future Applecross SHS upgrades to accommodate proposed LPS6 density increases; 51% of which are, at this time, within the Applecross SHS intake area.**

**2. RECONSIDER proposed LPS6 density increases with the Applecross SHS catchment including:**

**A. Conduct robust and detailed assessment of future ASHS capacity to support any proposed LPS6 density increases.**

**B. Provide a detailed report on such assessment supported by credible, robust and reliable lines of evidence. This shall include:**

**i. A cautious review of predictions concerning student numbers and any other advice provided by the DoE. This shall include specific assessment of uncertainty concerning any predictions and any other advice provided by the DoE.**

**ii. For any LPS6 density increases which are proposed within the Applecross SHS intake area, provide credible, robust and reliable evidence which demonstrates beyond reasonable**

**iii. doubt that Applecross SHS will have capacity to accommodate them.**

**iv. Recommend removal of proposed density increases for which future Applecross SHS capacity cannot be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt.**

**C. Provide this detailed report to elected members and to the community for review, resolution of questions/concerns and where required, revision prior to Council endorsement.**

**3. Revise LPS6 proposed density changes so that any proposed density increases within the ASHS intake area are matched to Applecross SHS capacity which has been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt to actually exist.**

At 7:14pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (24/1)**

At 7:16pm, Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek withdrew his motion.

**OFFICIAL****Motion 4 – WALGA Tree Retention Policy****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M4)**

At 7:16pm, Mr D Seggie, Leeming moved, seconded Ms E Cole, Melville

**That the Council use the WALGA Tree Retention Policy as the minimum standard of tree retention policy on private land, to create its own tree policy.**

At 7:27pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (26/0)**

**Motion 5 – City of Melville Tree Canopy****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M5)**

At 7:29pm, Ms V Moore, Applecross moved, seconded Ms E Cole, Melville

**That the Council:**

- 1. Increase its target canopy to 30% by 2040, in alignment with the Western Australian government's urban greening strategy; and**
- 2. Engage a suitably qualified specialist organization, such as Arbor Carbon, to investigate and advise on practical mechanisms, programs and policy options the city can implement to achieve this revised canopy target.**

At 7:34pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (26/0)**

**Motion 6 – City of Melville Verge Treatment Policy****MEETING RESOLUTION (AGME/M6)**

At 7:35pm, Ms E Charlton, Melville moved, seconded Ms E Cole, Melville

**That the Council amend the verge treatment policy to remove artificial turf from the list of approved or permissible hard surface treatments, in recognition of its negative impacts on urban heat, stormwater infiltration, biodiversity and long-term environmental sustainability.**

At 7:40pm, the Presiding Member declared the motion.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (25/0)**

**OFFICIAL**

**6.3.2 Motions without Notice**

Nil.

**6.4 General Business**

Nil.

**7 CLOSURE**

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7:44pm.