



City of
Melville

NOTES
AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30pm Tuesday, 11 November 2025

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

18/11/2025



Vision

Vibrant, Sustainable, Inclusive Melville

Mission

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

Values

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

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

Our Approach

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



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

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

1	Official Opening	7
2	Attendance and Apologies	7
3	Declarations by Members	9
	3.1 Declarations by Members who have not read and given due consideration to all matters contained in the business papers presented before the Meeting	9
	3.2 Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin	9
4	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	9
	Approved Deputations	9
	Approved Written Submission	9
5	Disclosure of Interest	10
	5.1 Financial or Proximity Interests	10
	5.2 Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict	10
6	Public Question Time	10
	6.1 Questions Received with Notice	10
	6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting	13
	6.3 Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting	14
7	Awards and Presentations	14
8	Applications for New Leave of Absence	14
9	Confirmation of Minutes	14
10	New Business of an Urgent Nature	14
11	Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed	15
12	Petitions	16
	12.1 Receipt of Petition – Hulme Court & McCoy Street Streetscapes	16
13	Adoption of Recommendations En Bloc	16
14	Reports	16
	14.1 Reports from Committees	16
	14.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer	17
	Items Brought Forward	17
	UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans	17
	CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club - Turf and Mowing Reimbursement.....	23
	UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy.....	27
	15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees	29
	UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39 - 43B) Canning Beach Road Applecross R12.5 to R40.....	32

Management Services	35
M25/58 Local Government Extraordinary Election 2026	35
Corporate Services	36
C25/328 Investment Statements for September 2025	36
C25/329 Election of Representatives - City of Melville Advisory Groups & Committees & External Advisory Groups	37
C25/330 Schedule of Accounts Paid for September 2025	39
C25/331 Statements of Financial Activity for September 2025	39
C25/332 Common Seal Item for November 2025	41
C25/335 RFQ242531 Supply of Resource Recovery Commercial Waste Truck 24m2 Rear Loader	41
C25/334 Development Assessment Panels - City of Melville Representation	42
Community Development.....	43
CD25/50 Deferral of Community Safety Technology Plan	43
CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club - Turf and Mowing Reimbursement.....	43
Environment and Infrastructure.....	43
Planning	44
UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39 - 43B) Canning Beach Road Applecross R12.5 to R40.....	44
UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy.....	44
UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans	44
15 Motions with Previous Notice	45
15.1 Notice of Motion - General Liability Insurance Premium	45
15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees	47
16 Motions without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority)	47
17 Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public.....	47
18 Decisions Made While meeting was Closed to the Public	48
19 Closure	48

1 OFFICIAL OPENING

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

2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

In Attendance

K Mair

Mayor

Councillors

Cr M Woodall, Deputy Mayor (*until 10:00pm*)

Cr J Spanbroek

Cr G Barber

Cr G Panayotou

Cr N Robins

Cr K Wheatland (*from 6:31pm until 10:48pm*)

Cr C Ross

Cr D Lim

Cr C Yorke

Cr S Green

Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant 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 P Varelis

Director Planning

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance and Risk

Mr D Burton (*until 9:06pm*)

Manager Healthy Melville

Mr G Ponton (*from 7:19pm*)

Manager Strategic Urban Planning

Mr A Melville (*until 9:50pm*)

Manager Health & Compliance

Mr P Molony (*from 10:43pm*)

Manager Resource Recovery & Fleet Services

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Ms M Smith Poulton

Lead Governance

Ms T Wright

Governance Officer

3 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS

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

Nil.

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

Nil.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Approved Deputations

CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club – Turf and Mowing Reimbursement

- Mr M Herbert, Kensington on behalf of Melville Cricket Club
- Mr M Hullett, Booragoon on behalf of Applecross Cricket Club

UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

- Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek

UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans

- Mr J Meotti, Leeming
- Ms K Horn, Ardross

15.2 Motion with Notice – John Connell Mature Trees

- Mr J Meotti, Leeming

UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment – Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39-43b) Canning Bridge Road, Applecross R12 to R40 plans

- Mr F Mansour, Applecross

Approved Written Submission

CD25/51 request from Melville Premier Cricket Club – Turf and Mowing Reimbursement

- Mr B Green on behalf of WA Cricket

UP25/90 CP-114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

- City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers' Association

5 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

5.1 Financial or Proximity Interests

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

E25/82 Waste Supply Agreement

Name	Cr M Woodall
Nature of interest	Financial Interest
Item description	Leave the meeting

15.1 General Liability Insurance Premium

Name	Cr S Green
Nature of interest	Financial Interest
Item description	Leave the meeting

5.2 Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict

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

Nil.

6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

At 6:37pm the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

6.1 Questions Received with Notice

6.1.1 Ms E Cole, Melville

Preamble to Questions 1 to 4:

My question relates to accountability and transparency, using the bushland at John Connell Oval as an example.

In June 2022, I first raised concerns about the decision to allow a community group to seek environmental approval to remove bushland at John Connell Oval.

Fast forward to the Councillor elections in October 2025 — the public page I administer, Melville Tree Canopy Advocates, provided a platform for both candidates and residents to engage. The future of the John Connell bushland generated significant community interest.

When I asked one candidate, who was a sitting councillor, why they had voted the way they did in 2022, their response, in part, was that:

“Council was misinformed about the trees. I only became aware of the number of trees when I became aware of the environmental approval and went to the site myself.”

Another councillor, in response to a resident’s letter, made statements to the effect that “no fauna would be harmed,” despite the initial environmental report identifying the area as Carnaby’s feeding habitat.

Over that time, depending on who I spoke to, I was told varying figures for the number of trees to be lost — from as few as six, through to 100, and eventually over 200 (the latter now being on public record). Until October 2025, there appeared to be no single, authoritative source of truth.

The resulting plan states:

“The Master Plan has been designed to encourage a net increase in canopy cover.

Consideration will be given with any development of recreational spaces to minimise additional pressure on existing endangered vegetation communities, habitat, and resources. The Master Plan will aim to provide a restorative landscape that delivers greater environmental value.”

Language is very important when it comes to government accountability. The Master Plan uses words such as “encourage” rather than “ensure”, and “aim” rather than “guarantee” — and notably, it provides no specific numbers, percentages, or species information.

It is also relevant that last year the Council adopted a defined canopy cover target.

Question 1:

To avoid future confusion for councillors and to ensure the public is properly informed and able to provide considered feedback, can the City commit to including in all current and future development proposals:

The number of trees to be removed?

Response 1:

The final design of the oval extension is currently being investigated and will form part of the report which is being presented to the Council in April 2026.

If the maximum allowable area is cleared as per the Clearing Permit there would be loss of 209 trees.

Question 2:

The approximate age and species of those trees?

Response 2:

There is a mixture of predominately Banksia and Eucalyptus species. It is difficult to determine the age of those trees, however the City has utilised the heights of the trees as a reference. There are:

- 2 trees above 15 meters
- 18 trees between 10-15meters
- 82 trees between 5-10 meters
- 107 trees between 0-5 meters

Question 3:

The percentage of canopy cover that will be lost on the site under each proposed option?

Response 3:

The final design of the oval extension is currently being investigated, and the City has yet to determine the total amount of canopy cover that would be lost.

Question 4:

Where trees are to be replaced, a statement showing the immediate percentage of canopy loss, followed by the projected canopy recovery in the medium term (10 years) and long term (20 years)?

Response 4:

The final design of the oval extension is currently being investigated, and the City has yet to determine if or how many replacement trees would be planted as part of the design.

6.1.2 City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association

As a representative from the City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association was not in attendance, the Mayor ruled that the questions and responses would be included in the notes of the meeting and not read out, in accordance with clause 6.7(7) of the City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022.

Preamble to Question 1 & Question 2:

Council has progressed the Fencing and Cat Local Laws at meetings publicly in the past.

Further, the MRRA states that it:

- *Does not think Elected Members should agree to these items relating to local laws, that are very relevant to the community, should be dealt with behind closed doors as we can not envisage any valid reasons for Council to deal with these matters behind closed doors.*
- *Reminds you of the [MRRA's Written Submission on the Fencing Local Law](#) as presented to the [July 15, 2025 OMC](#). This demonstrate these matters are of significant public interest; and should be dealt with in the public domain.*

Question 1:

Exactly why is Council considering these items are to be done behind closed doors, significantly reducing the transparency of the local governments affairs?

Question 2:

Is there a chance the matters could cause negative reflections about Council or the Administration?

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

The City follows the procedure for making, amending and repealing Local Laws as outlined in section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. This includes a review by other parties, which may result in confidential advice. The Council will consider the confidential reports relating to the Cat Local Law and the Fencing Local Law and as outlined, the resolution, if adopted by the Council, will be made public.

6.1.3 Mr D Morley, WillageeQuestion 1:

Given the postponement of the extraordinary by-election to March twenty-sixth in 2026, what measures does the council have in place to address the under-representation of the Palmyra-Melville-Willagee Ward until then?

Response 1:

Section 2.10(1)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995* establishes that all Elected Members have a statutory obligation to represent the interests of the electors, ratepayers and residents of the district and take into account the interests of other persons who work in or visit the district. This defines the importance of impartiality and community-wide representation rather than focusing solely on ward-specific concerns.

Where matters arise that are specific to a particular ward, the Mayor is available to provide guidance and support to ensure these issues are addressed appropriately within the broader governance framework.

6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting**6.2.1 Mr D Morley, Willagee**Question 1:

What interim strategies could the council consider to ensure fair representation for Palmyra – Melville – Willagee residents until the bi-election of 26 March 2026?

Response 1:

As per the previous response, all residents of the City of Melville are represented by all Elected Members of the City of Melville. So, where the current Elected Member for that ward feels they need support, they have the support of all of their colleagues.

Question 2:

Given that the concern among many of my fellow Willagee residents, who don't fully understand the electoral processes, is the Council able to identify who was responsible for selecting 26 March 2026 as the date for the extra-ordinary election, and what was the rationale behind closing that specific date?

Response 2:

In accordance with section 6.8(1)(b) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*, as the question was received without notice, the Presiding Member advised that the question would be taken on notice and a response provided in the Agenda for 9 December 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council, to be distributed on Friday, 21 November 2025.

6.3 Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting

This item is detailed in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025.

At 6:47pm the Presiding Member closed Public Question Time.

7 AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025.

8 APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVE OF ABSENCE

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

This item is detailed in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025.

10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

That the meeting may close to members of the public, if required, to allow for items with attachments deemed confidential in accordance with Section 5.23(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995* to be discussed behind closed doors.

At 6:47pm, the Presiding Member advised that the following items have been identified as confidential and will be considered behind closed doors:

- C25/336 City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025 – undertakings; and
- C25/337 City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025 – undertakings; and
- E25/82 Waste Services Agreement

At 6:48pm, the Presiding Member advised that the following items have identified as containing confidential attachments:

- CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club – Turf and Mowing Reimbursement; and
- C25/335 RFQ24531 Supply of Resource Recovery Commercial Waste Truck 24m2 Rear Loader.

12 PETITIONS

12.1 Receipt of Petition – Hulme Court & McCoy Street Streetscapes

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 6:49pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

Notes from Forum No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

13 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS EN BLOC

This item is detailed in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025.

14 REPORTS

14.1 Reports from Committees

Nil.

14.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer

Items Brought Forward

At 6:50pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

At 7:19pm, Mr G Ponton entered the meeting.

At 7:19pm, Mr R Haeron entered the meeting.

UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans

Deputations

At 6:50pm, Mr J Meotti gave a deputation which concluded at 6:55pm.
At 6:59pm, Mr J Meotti returned to the Public Gallery.

At 6:59pm, Ms K Horn gave a deputation which concluded at 7:07pm.
At 7:18pm, Ms K Horn returned to the Public Gallery. [Deputation – Ms K Horn](#)

Officer Presentation

At 7:19pm, Mr G Ponton, Manager Strategic Urban Planning and Mr R Haeron, Haeron Urban Planning and Policy (External Consultant) provided an officer presentation which concluded at 7:30pm. At 7:31pm, Mr R Haeron responded to questions which concluded at 8:04pm. [UP25/91 – Officer & External Presentation](#)

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 there not a plan to address affordable housing around the precincts?

Response 1:

The issue of affordable housing has not been addressed specifically through this report. Affordable housing provision and policy provisions associated with it are being looked at across the board there are things being done for instance through the federal government in terms of providing opportunities for the community housing providers. There are other avenues for action, but if leaving it to the market and expecting the market to deliver affordable housing even in these locations, I don't feel that that is going to deliver what may be expected or intended. With regard the other precincts in City, provisions which already exist have not been reviewed in detail.

Question 2:

If we were to let this run its course and cast a strategic lens rather than a precinct lens then, can we address affordable housing through advocacy to state and federal government, in other precincts not only in the City of Melville but across Perth?

Response 2:

From a broad planning policy perspective there is not a universally agreed proposition to address this. One of the things that that has been

talked about is getting more supply. And affordability is also a relative term, there are projects for instance in Claremont where affordable products meant you could get a one bedroom apartment for under a million dollars. There is also the notion of majority of apartments that are developed in particular locations, that the biggest buyers will tend to be downsizers. So affordability and providing of housing is one thing. The allocation and provision of housing choice is also another.

Where government owns land, it will have a requirement for a proportion, in these particular locations there's not significant government land holdings which they could use to leverage but then Murdoch University may be a different story.

It's difficult to provide a precise answer as there are many factors at play. Simply zoning for greater density won't in itself provide for affordability because in the most affordable locations unfortunately that development is not occurring because it just simply isn't financially feasible.

Question 3:

Mr Haeron, do you work for Urbis?

Response 3:

I formerly worked for Urbis, and was a partner with them for a number of years.

There's a couple of reports that were referred to, one in terms of the work done for Garden City, which I was not personally involved in. However, I am aware that obviously that work has been done. That was a retail economics report which is quite distinct in itself.

The 2015 report that was referred to was actually looking at the station precinct on behalf of Development WA and I would also say that significant things have changed since 2015. COVID threw a spanner in the works, issues around apartment delivery and density have significantly changed and the issue around housing affordability has definitely ramped up. I can't speak to the 2015 report but I would stand by the fact there is the issue around the detail on how it can be delivered.

Question 4:

Should we not be getting prepared for the State Government so that if we have that increased zoning, we can show the state government that we are ready?

Response: 4

My advice is to engage with the State Government to secure their support in order to achieve that outcome. The question is around the timing and way in which it is undertaken, and if you draw upon the experience of the City of Joondalup where is you change the density without addressing those other components you can have lots of unforeseen circumstances. Having density in the right locations is something I would openly advocate for. Making a change in order to give an appearance of getting an outcome without understanding the full consequences would be the danger in my view, and if it is done well it should actually be to the benefit of all residents across the City as a

whole.

I don't think it needs to be one or the other and I do think there are some existing opportunities and I again point to that existing area in the southwest Murdoch. What should go in there should be part of the discussion. At the moment there is silence on that so it is not being factored into the planning as a whole but could be in part at least addressing some of the targets that are being sort from the state government as well.

Question 5:

If the City were to go it alone and rezone the area R30 or R40 or for higher density is there another precinct within the metro area where this has occurred, and the State Government have come in and overruled or overturned it?

Response 5:

There are examples where precinct plans have been prepared and ones that I have been personally involved in would include the Oat Street Station Precinct. The process obviously requires in that instance was more dealing with density change and land use because the grid structure etc was already in place. There are instances that I am aware of although I couldn't site specifics. I sit on the WA Planning Commission, which has had to knock back rezoning proposals which were seen to compromise the longer term outcome. Going to an R40 type density would fall into that category, unless there had been significant examination and dialogue suggesting that that was the most appropriate form in that location. I couldn't say categorically that it would be a no but I would be saying that there would need to be that understanding as to what the opportunity was and the upfront cost of it. So the cost of doing a plan at an estimate is two million dollars per quadrant as a ballpark figure, but that does not include land acquisitions or upfront capital work. That is where the likes of Development WA and others have been involved, the example would be Bentley which is not a station precinct but a redevelopment area and Shenton Park Hospital redevelopment, which I was involved in because that was required to have that upfront investment to secure the outcome.

Question 6:

With Murdoch as it is on its way was there a missed opportunity by the State Government for value uplift where the developers of the land pay for it, like a form of tax?

Question 7:

When you consider Bull Creek and Murdoch and the other quadrants you have spoken about is there also an opportunity there for value capture for the uplift of the property values?

Response to Question 6 & 7:

The notion of value capture has previously explored by the State Government, but has been rejected based on legal and other technical concerns as well as concerns it would result in reduced feasibility in some precincts.

The Murdoch land wouldn't have been applicable for value capture as it was government development on government land. The land that it sold to Development WA was how it sought to capture. So its sale value was part of how it sought to do that. In terms of its merits or not would be for me to say. The notion of having infrastructure developer contributions is definitely well established and I'm suggesting it would definitely need to be required in this instance. The issue with these contributions, is that you need to have development to happen to gain the income.

Question 8:

Why would you advocate for the City take the risk to delay?

Response 8:

In terms of 20-30 years there are many factors at play which will determine feasibility. My key advice is that the first port of call needs to be securing engagement with the State Government, and for it to be done as a partnership. That is on the basis that I talked about some of the infrastructure challenges associated with this particular area as well as the fact that there would need to be works done to both the main roads and the station in order to make them station precincts. At the moment what could be done is to have high density development being facilitated, which is close as the crow flies to a station, but if you can't actually physically walk there, if there's not that connection, it wouldn't have the desired outcome.

Question 9:

I think that Building Standards around Australia would result in proper buildings being built and we're not talking about things being thrown up in terms of time frame again given that putting a plan together will involve discussions with the community and discussions with State Government and given the time it would take to prepare this plan why shouldn't we be starting now?

Response 9:

In terms of urgency, that is dependent on the desired outcome is. My advice is that there are many locations within the City that may benefit from planning processes, if the objective is to increase housing within the City. There are ways in which you can do that by targeting these particular locations. I'm not saying don't do anything, but what I am saying is to do the strategic planning. Don't commence the precinct planning until you have greater clarity on the position of the State Government.

Question 10:

Are the issues we've got at Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan, what we are trying to avoid at Murdoch?

Response 10:

I can't speak in terms of what the staff position is. I can talk to the benefit that Canning Bridge had, which doesn't exist in these areas, is it had a grid structure and an urban form. The increases in density is

going to have changed and that will include congestion and the discussion that you're having in relation to the CBACP is no different to discussions I have heard around Rivervale and the apartment development that's happening there. Planning is supposed to be about mitigating and managing the challenge of change as much as possible. This is the intention of my advice.

Question 11:

If the decision is made not to proceed imminently with rezoning around the train station precincts, are there other opportunities that could be looked at in the southern suburbs of the City to take some of the pressure off those northern suburbs?

Response 11:

The engagement with the Department and the Commission around housing targets is a discussion. All local government have housing targets attached to them, Claremont is the only one who has actually achieved it. It's not an absolute, it's an objective. Already identifying the station precincts and saying that there will be a process is a start. The City has a strong reputation as a local government that has been proactive in delivering. The issue around housing delivery is universal in WA, in Perth, and in Australia and it will be an ongoing pressure point.

The Local Planning Scheme Review is in the early stages. The City is hearing the feedback in relation to the first round of proposals, and is doing work to see if there are other opportunities throughout the City that can accommodate additional density. The City has an awareness of the targets so we need to respond to that. The City needs to identify land that can be developed within the required time frames. However, we are looking now at other areas to see if there are other areas in the City that can deliver in the required time frame.

Question 12:

You said the City has a strong reputation for hitting density and housing targets, on what timeframe do you base saying that?

Response 12:

The City has been progressive with the planning and dealing with the delivery of housing and density for at least 30 years. The nature of that housing and the way in which it's being delivered is varied. The initial work at Willagee for instance was seen as being very progressive at that particular point in time.

Question 13:

Do you see Bull Creek and Murdoch relieving the pressure of Canning Bridge which is very market driven?

Response 13:

From a market point of view they are clearly different. It would not be fair to say that delivery of one would take the pressure off from a market perspective on the other. From a planning perspective in terms of taking pressure off from having to increase densities I would hope that the

department would take a more holistic view in terms of the overall proposition as opposed to a sheer mathematical equation. This is why acknowledging those precincts and saying that it needs to be done, and needs to be done right, demonstrates the intentions of the City. Fundamentally it would be difficult, from a State Government perspective, to not say that you need to be doing whatever is feasible and logical for development to occur.

SUMMARY

- In March 2025 Council requested a report be prepared on the resource implications, timing and feasibility associated with preparing Precinct Structure Plans for land in and around the Murdoch and Bull Creek train stations.
- Delays in procuring a suitable consultant ultimately delayed the original reporting deadline in August 2025, where the matter was deferred. The work has now been completed and is being presented to Council for consideration.
- The report notes the strategic opportunity for high intensity development in the vicinity of the rail stations. Significantly, the report recognises land economic, governance and infrastructure factors which determine that pursuit of such development is not realistic in the short term. Accordingly, the report responds to the Notice of Motion and recommends that the current planning controls in the areas around the two train stations be maintained, with a view to engaging with State Government regarding future precinct planning opportunities. A City-led approach in the short term would require significant financial outlay, and investment of resources that is not likely to lead to meaningful private sector investment in the subject areas for the foreseeable future.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- 1. Notes the challenges identified in the report and acknowledges that delivery of high-density housing in the areas surrounding the Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Stations is a long-term strategic opportunity.**
- 2. Accepts the following report recommendations:**
 - (a) Retain current zoning within the Bull Creek station and Murdoch station Further Information Areas, with a view to preserving future opportunity for redevelopment when appropriate and feasible, with the areas identified for future planning within the City's Local Housing Strategy.**
 - (b) Determine not to pursue redevelopment opportunities within the Bull Creek and Murdoch Station precincts in the short term, with the exception of continued development of the Murdoch Specialised Precinct.**
 - (c) Seek dialogue with the Chair of the WA Planning Commission and Minister for Planning and Lands regarding potential joint planning, funding and delivery of Bull Creek and Murdoch station precincts.**
 - (d) Seek alignment with the State Government and WAPC on appropriate delivery vehicle for the precincts.**
- 3. Requests the CEO to initiate discussions with the WAPC Chair and the Minister for Planning and Lands to specify the City's interest in the planned growth of the residential areas around the two train stations, and to discuss appropriate mechanisms to realise this goal, as per 2(c) & 1(d) above.**

At 8:04pm, Mr G Ponton left the meeting.

At 8:04pm, Mr R Haeron left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:04pm, Mr P Varelis left the meeting.

At 8:04pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

At 8:04pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting.

At 8:04pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club - Turf and Mowing Reimbursement for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

At 8:05pm, the Presiding Member advised that a written submission had been received in relation to the item from Mr B Green on behalf of WA Cricket. [Written Submission – Mr B Green](#).

CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club - Turf and Mowing Reimbursement

Deputations At 8:05pm, Mr M Herbert gave a deputation which concluded at 8:12pm. At 8:34pm, Mr M Herbert returned to the Public Gallery.

At 8:35pm, Mr M Hullet gave a deputation which concluded at 8:43pm. At 8:50pm, Mr M Hullet returned to the Public Gallery.

Officer Presentation At 8:50pm, Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development and Mr D Burton, Manager Healthy Melville provided an officer presentation which concluded at 8:59pm. At 8:59pm, Mr D Burton responded to questions which concluded at 9:06pm. [Officer Presentation – Item CD25/51](#)

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 there any capacity within the rules for the Tompkins Park Community and Recreational Association to allocate funding towards one of its members to help revitalise the precinct of that area?

Response 1:

There is an opportunity for the board to make a decision around what dividend they provide to the clubs, the board over previous years has provided certain amounts which is detailed in the report, this financial year they have determined there is no dividend to the clubs.

Question 2:

Is that due to the operating costs of the association and the surplus they make?

Response 2:

That is correct.

Question 3:

Can we have a comparison of the fees that are paid. The clubs pay for the use of the ground etc. and how much those fees are in comparison to what the City is contributing?

Response 3:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

Question 4:

Have you also done a comparison of the membership fees against other local government fees and charges for the different premier clubs?

Response 4:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

Question 5:

Will there be a review every year is there some mechanism to monitor this?

Response 5:

The officer recommendation discusses a sliding scale and a review after a three year period.

Question 6:

Does WA Cricket provide funding to any local governments for maintaining cricket facilities?

Response 6:

Not to maintain but to support capital replacement of infrastructure.

Question 7:

Has the City lobbied WA Cricket to provide additional support to the Club given it's somewhat unique situation with the Tompkins Park Sports Association? Is the City aware of any other premier clubs that have become insolvent without the WA Cricket Association stepping in?

Response 7:

The City hasn't advocated specifically to them to support funding. However they have been supporting the Club in their endeavours to seek funding from the City. The City is unaware of the any other premier clubs that have become insolvent without them stepping in.

SUMMARY

- The City has received a formal request from the Melville (Premier) Cricket Club – known as the Melville Cricket Club Inc. (MCC) to provide annual financial support to maintain Turf Wicket Cricket Pitches and mow the grassed cricket area to the required standards to play Premier Grade Cricket.
- The City and the MCC have been performing these works since 1967, when the MCC moved to Tompkins Park.
- The MCC have undertaken these works since 1995 and from 2005 the City ceased contributing towards the works financially for reasons detailed in the report.
- The MCC cites the following main reasons for seeking financial support:
 - The City's previous financial support;
 - All other Premier Grade Cricket Clubs in the Perth Metropolitan area receive financial support from the respective Local Government Authority (LGA) or the LGA undertakes the maintenance works required;
 - The MCC's business model is restricted in increasing revenue streams due to the level of competition played, but also the facility management model of the Tompkins Park Recreation and Community Association (TPRCA); and
 - Due to the current financial performance of the TPRCA, annual dividends from the TPRCA are unlikely to be provided that underpins the operating costs of the maintenance works.
- Applecross Cricket Club (ACC) plays in the grade below the MCC and also requires a specialised playing surface, albeit at a lower level of service.
- All other sporting clubs (except for the MCC and ACC) have an ability to generate revenue for the specialist surfaces they are required to maintain, with exception of BMX which the City provides maintenance support.
- In order to provide a financially equitable approach to supporting sporting clubs requiring specialist surfaces, the report recommends that Council support both the MCC and ACC financially through a funding agreement over a three-year period.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Support the request from the Melville Cricket Club Inc for a financial contribution to maintain turf wickets and outfield mowing for an amount of \$50,000 (ex GST) per annum, plus CPI each year commencing 2025-26 on the basis of a sliding scale contribution should Tompkins Park Recreation and Community Association provide a dividend as detailed in this report; and**
2. **Support the Applecross Cricket Club Inc with a financial contribution to maintain turf wickets for an amount of \$10,000 (ex GST) per annum, plus CPI each year commencing 2025-26; and**
3. **Approves the CEO to develop and execute a Funding Agreement that outlines the terms and conditions of the financial contribution to both clubs which includes appropriate recognition of the City of Melville; and**
4. **Reallocates \$45,000 (ex GST) in the 2025-26 operating budget as part of the mid-year budget review process from CW310.80046.7550 to GL310.29310.7935.**

At 8:06pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

At 8:08pm, Cr M Woodall returned to the meeting.

At 8:11pm, Mr P Varelis returned to the meeting.

At 8:28pm, Mr M Yildiz left the meeting.

At 8:30pm, Mr M Yildiz returned to the meeting.

At 8:35pm, Mr A Melville left the meeting.

At 8:42pm, Mr A Melville returned to the meeting.

At 8:43pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 8:45pm, Ms M Smith Poulton left the meeting.

At 8:45pm, Ms M Smith Poulton returned to the meeting.

At 8:49pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 8:50pm, Cr C Yorke left the meeting.

At 8:50pm, Cr G Barber left the meeting.

At 8:52pm, Cr G Barber returned to the meeting.

At 8:54pm, Cr C Yorke returned to the meeting.

At 8:55pm, Mr G Tuffin left the meeting.

At 8:56pm, Mr J Coten left the meeting.

At 8:58pm, Mr G Tuffin returned to the meeting.

At 8:59pm, Cr S Green left the meeting.

At 9:00pm, Mr J Coten returned to the meeting.

At 9:01pm, Cr S Green returned to the meeting.

At 9:06pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

At 9:06pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that a written submission was received in relation to the item from the the City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association. [Written Submission – MRRA](#)

At 9:06pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 9:06pm, Mr D Burton left the meeting and did not return.

UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

Deputations	At 9:06pm, Mr G Waugh gave a deputation which concluded at 9:14pm. At 9:14pm, Mr G Waugh returned to the Public Gallery. Hardcopy Deputation – Mr G Waugh
Officer Presentation	At 9:24pm, Mr A Melville, Manager Health & Compliance responded to questions which concluded at 9:28pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>At the beginning of the deputation the first paragraph actually states “that by adoption of policy CP-114 with no paired implementation procedure.” Can you please explain that or provide a bit more information with regard to that question?</i></p> <p><u>Response 1:</u></p> <p>In relation to policy, a policy needs to be adopted so that the relevant procedures can be put in place to support that policy. To develop procedures where the policy has yet to be adopted and may be modified by Council during that process would mean that those procedures would then need to be rewritten.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Was any of the feedback that the community offered to you incorporated into the policy?</i></p> <p><u>Response 2:</u></p> <p>Yes some of it was. There was a lot of feedback that wasn't, which was some feedback relating to other policy documents. There are some minor changes that were made and they are shown in the track changes of the policy attached to the report.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>One of the criticisms was that our policy lacked alignment with State regulatory principles and strategic planning documents and the City's response is this position acknowledged. Shouldn't we be doing more than just acknowledging this position?</i></p>

Response 3:

Yes generally where they apply. The City considers whether or not our policies are compliant with State Government legislation and regulations. If for some reason legislation changes and perhaps our policy may no longer be in alignment with that, then the legislation takes precedence over the policy.

SUMMARY

- The City of Melville (the City) continuously reviews and updates policies to ensure that best practice is enacted in relation to decision making.
- The Compliance and Enforcement has been released for public comment from 22 July to 26 August 2025 following the Special Meeting of Council resolution of 25 June 2025 UP25/71.
- There were 9 submissions that were received with 2 supporting the policy, 1 neither support or oppose, and 6 oppose.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council endorse the reviewed Council Policy CP-114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy (Attachment 1).

At 9:11pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 9:29pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item 15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

At 9:29pm, the Presiding Member reminded the Council of the officer advice note in relation to item 15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees, which was distributed on Friday, 7 November in the Agenda of the Ordinary Meeting of Council.

15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees

Deputations	At 9:29pm, Mr J Meotti gave a deputation which concluded at 9:36pm. At 9:49pm, Mr J Meotti returned to the Public Gallery. Deputation – Mr J Meotti
Officer Presentation	At 9:49pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 9:58pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>When officers met with Mr Meotti on-site, did they advise whether there were any concerns around toxicity in the materials in the area, that would cause concern for anyone in the area or for those using the site?</i></p> <p><u>Response 1:</u></p> <p>It has been an ongoing historical practice of the City for many years to place material there. Mr Meotti was advised that it appeared to be items such as excess material from road construction from aggregate, asphalt and piles of turf. The City does not have any evidence that it would be anything toxic that the City has been placing there, and it does appear to just be materials. The history of this practice and who made the decision to place the materials there is unclear, and to go back and find out as it has been going on for over twenty years. However, it is assumed that this was thought at the time to be a good idea as the City would have saved on disposal costs of the material. The City has \$75,000 allocated in the budget for consulting services which will be commencing in the next week or two to undertake an update of the site management plan for the old landfill. They will also test some of the areas where the material has been placed to determine the composition of the materials. The City has also been in consultation with DWER, and indications are that if the material underlying is not being disturbed then the risks are relatively low. However, one of the actions DWER has recommended is to update the site management plan.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Does this mean that if there were anything on the sites at all, the City would be notified?</i></p> <p><u>Response 2:</u></p> <p>The City cannot guarantee at this time that there is absolutely nothing there, but we are reasonably confident that there wouldn't be anything in the piles the City has placed there which would be toxic. However, this is the reason for undertaking the consultant study of the area, and</p>

the City will be notified following this.

Question 3:

Has there been any information or reporting which has come through of any contamination or health risks from players or any other users of the John Connell Reserve, who feel it is due to the tip site or materials?

Response 3:

There are no concerns of which the City is aware of.

Question 4:

Are there any examples across the City of any playing fields or grounds that have been former tip sites?

Response 4:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

Question 5:

Are you aware that trees have played a role in helping to remediate former waste sites?

Response 5:

Yes, there is a form of treatment remediation for landfill sites known as Phytocapping

Question 6:

Will the random sampling of the site include groundwater sampling as well?

Response 6:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

Question 7:

Why didn't the City plant trees on the site twenty years ago, when it looked like the site was flat and remediated?

Response 7:

I would assume that it was the site management plan at the time which potentially didn't prescribe the planting of trees, however as this would have been decision made twenty years ago, their reasoning is unclear.

MOTION

That the Council requests the CEO to obtain the following information and prepare a report, to be presented to the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be in April 2026:

- 1 The dollar valuation of the 209 trees on the 0.68 Hectare at John Connell Park, that is subject to the DWER clearance permit, from a professional arborist qualified to calculate the dollar value of each tree;
- 2 The number of mature trees in the area of 0.38 Hectare area, proposed by the Cricket Club as the reduced clearing area and the dollar value of the trees within that reduced area;
- 3 A Lidar (Light Detection and Ranging) measurement of the tree canopy cover in Hectares provided by the trees in the 0.68 Hectare area and the tree canopy cover in Hectares provided by the trees in the reduced 0.38 Hectare area.
- 4 An estimate of the costs of clearing the total area of 0.68 hectares and the costs of clearing the reduced area of 0.38 hectares;
- 5 An estimate of the costs of remediating and constructing a sports oval on the total area of 0.68 Hectare and the comparative cost of remediating and constructing a sports oval on the reduced area of 0.38 Hectare.
- 6 A health assessment on the dangers of children and adults playing sport on an oval that is immediately alongside an un-remediated tip site.
- 7 An order-of-magnitude cost estimate on remediating the tip site and constructing a suitable multi use sports oval without removing any existing trees.

At 9:50pm, Mr A Melville left the meeting and did not return.

At 9:51pm, Cr N Robins left the meeting.

At 9:53pm, Cr N Robins returned to the meeting.

At 9:59pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39 - 43B) Canning Beach Road Applecross R12.5 to R40 for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

At 9:59pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 10:00pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting and did not return.

UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39 - 43B) Canning Beach Road Applecross R12.5 to R40

Deputations At 10:00pm, Mr F Mansour gave a deputation which concluded at 10:10pm. At 10:21pm Mr F Mansour returned to the Public Gallery. [Deputation – Mr F Mansour](#)

Officer Presentation At 10:23pm, Mr G Ponton, Manager Strategic Urban Planning provided an officer presentation which concluded at 10:28pm. At 10:28pm, Mr G Ponton responded to questions which concluded at 10:37pm. [Officer Presentation – Item UP25/89](#)

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:

What was the officer recommendation with regards to 45 and 47 Canning Beach Road when that was considered back in 2021, and whether the Council made a decision consistent with the officer recommendation or a different decision?

Response 1:

The officer recommendation was not to proceed with the residential R30 coding and again to consider it more comprehensively as part of a wider review.

Question 2:

What's the officer's position with regards to R30 zoning on the subject site, and would it be supported?

Response 2:

The City is not in a position to talk about numbers, however what is clear is that R40 presents a mismatch. Equally concerning is the merit of the current boundary, and whether you would explore the whole street block. Once you're into that environment though, it needs to be explored comprehensively and considered whether the land is strategically enough located in comparison to some of the other sites that the City is considering as part of the local planning scheme review. There are relativities and fairly complex considerations to be made, which makes it difficult to say if R30 is right at this stage.

However, under the planning regulations there is opportunity for the City to advertise this proposal or an amended proposal should the proponents wish to put one forward informally to adjacent land owners so the City can understand the position of those people, and provide a report back to the Council with that feedback and more information around the expectation of landowners surrounding the site.

Question 3:

You've mentioned a ramp up of the number of dwellings you can have up to R40 if its apartments. Is there a similar ramp up for R30?

Response 3:

For building height limits, R40 is 10 metres and 2 stories. In terms of lot size, R40 minimum is 180m², or average of 220m². For multiple dwellings, which is the apartments, the average size is 115m².

Question 4:

So, for R30, is there a built form option for apartments?

Response 4:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

Question 5:

Is there an opportunity to explore the boundary change or is this too much of a deviation from the current draft?

Response 5:

If the City can get some kind of agreement to sound out the owners and residents within that area, the City might be in a better position to understand if there's an opportunity with R30, and what the best way forward is?

Question 6:

Is seeking community consultation part of a scheme review?

Response 6:

This would be a preliminary proposal to amend the scheme, not a scheme review. Under Planning Regulation, the City can undertake preliminary advertising that's non-statutory, to understand the views of the surrounding community, which would feed into an assessment for report back to the Council for the purpose of initiating the amendment and adopting it for advertising.

Noting that, when the Council adopts it, the ultimate decision maker for a scheme amendment is the Minister and not the Council. By undertaking non-statutory preliminary consultation before adopting the amendment, it places the Council in a good position to understand the proposal before it enters into the statutory process.

Question 7:

What option would be quicker, that or the LPS6 review?

Response 7:

The first option.

SUMMARY

- An application for an amendment to the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 6 has been received to rezone Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (No.39-43B) Canning Beach Road, Applecross (subject site) from Residential R12.5 to Residential R40.
- The applicant has referenced the site's proximity to the Canning Bridge Activity Centre, high frequency public transport, adjacent Residential R30 zoning and the existence of the 3 storey aged care facility as reasons to support the higher residential coding.
- The City is recommending that the amendment not be initiated, noting concerns about the inconsistency with the surrounding residential area, the preference to prioritise density in the Canning Bridge Activity Centre, and the risk of a precedent being set.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Having regard to Section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, refuse to initiate the amendment to Local Planning Scheme 6 requesting a higher density coding of residential R40 for 39 to 43B Canning Beach Road, Applecross.**
2. **Not support/initiate the requested change to the residential density coding from R12.5 to R40 for the following reasons:**
 - (a) **The proposed R40 density code is inconsistent with the surrounding residential densities and would result in an illogical density transition beyond the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Structure Plan (CBACP).**
 - (b) **Residential infill should be prioritised in the CBACP.**
 - (c) **The locational characteristics in favour of a density increase are not unique to the affected lots and could set a precedent for numerous other sites to pursue similar changes to their residential density.**
3. **Request that the Chief Executive Officer advise the applicant in writing of the Council's resolution.**

At 10:01pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 10:11pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

At 10:14pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

At 10:23pm, Mr G Ponton entered the meeting.

At 10:38pm, Mr P Varelis left the meeting.

Management Services

M25/58 Local Government Extraordinary Election 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:38pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- On 3 September 2025, a vacancy occurred in the Palmyra-Melville-Willagee Ward as a result of the resignation of former Councillor Tomas Fitzgerald, effective immediately.
- At the 16 September 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC), the Council resolved to conduct an Extraordinary Election to fill the vacancy in the Palmyra-Melville-Willagee Ward on Thursday, 26 March 2026.
- This report seeks to appoint the Western Australian Electoral Commission to conduct the March 2026 Extraordinary Election as a postal election.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council by absolute majority decision:

- 1. Declare, in accordance with section 4.20(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the 2025 ordinary election, together with any other elections or polls which may be required; and**
- 2. Decide, in accordance with section 4.61(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* that the method of conducting the election will be as a Postal election; and**
- 3. Note that a budget allocation of \$80,000 (exc GST) will be included in the 2025-2026 mid-year budget review for the conduct of the March 2026 Extraordinary Election.**

Corporate Services**C25/328 Investment Statements for September 2025****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 10:40pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.**Disclosure of Interest** Nil.**Notes from Forum** No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.**SUMMARY**

- This report presents the investment statements for the period ending 30 September 2025 and recommends that it be noted by the Council. It is important to highlight that the financial figures for the 2024–2025 financial year remain provisional. Year-end accounting processes are currently underway, and as such, the final accounts may differ materially from the figures presented in this report.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 30 September 2025.**

C25/329 Election of Representatives - City of Melville Advisory Groups & Committees & External Advisory Groups

- Deputations** Nil.
- Officer Presentation** At 10:41pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance responded to questions until 10:41pm.
- Disclosure of Interest** Nil.
- Notes from Forum** General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:
Question 1:
Can we review if Melville Cares needs a representative?
Response 1:
 This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 14 November 2025.

SUMMARY

- This report provides the Council with the opportunity to elect representatives for the period of time from November 2025 to October 2027 to:
 - City of Melville Advisory Groups & Committees; and
 - External Advisory Groups
- The report also provides Elected Members an overview of each meetings function, frequency and other important details.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council by absolute majority decision, makes the following appointments for the period of November 2025 to October 2027:

City of Melville Advisory Groups & Committees

1. Melville Local Emergency Management Committee:

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

2. Melville Citizens Relief Fund (Inc)

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

3. Safer Melville Advisory Committee (SMAC)

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

4. Youth Sports Scholarship Assessment Panel

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.
2.	
3.	

5. Climate Action Advisory Group

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	N/A
2.	N/A

External Advisory Groups

1. Beeliar Regional Park Community Advisory Committee

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	Nil.

2. Swan River Trust (Department of Biodiversity, Conservation & Attractions)

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

3. Jandakot Airport Community Aviation Consulting Group (JACACG)

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

4. Melville Cares Inc

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

5. Melville Cockburn Chamber of Commerce (MCCC)

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

6. Perth South West Metropolitan Alliance (PSWMA) Board

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1. Mayor	Nil.
2. CEO	

7. Perth South West Metropolitan Alliance – Environmental Reference Forum

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

8. Metropolitan Regional Road Group – South West Sub Group

Representatives	Deputy Representatives
1.	1.

C25/330 Schedule of Accounts Paid for September 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:41pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the details of payments made under delegated authority (DA-035) to suppliers for the period of September 2025 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts Paid be noted.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Schedule of Accounts paid for the period September 2025 as approved by the Director Corporate Services in accordance with delegated authority DA-035, and detailed in the attachments to this report; Payment Details September 2025 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details September 2025 (Attachment 2).

C25/331 Statements of Financial Activity for September 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:41pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the Statements of Financial Activity, Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position for the period ending 30 September are presented for noting by the Council.
- The financial statements and figures for the 2024–2025 financial year remain subject to change. Year-end accounting processes are currently underway, and the final figures may be different from those presented in this report.
- The draft financial statements for 2024-2025 reports a surplus of \$304,261. The Annual Audit for 2024–2025 and the end-of-financial-year processes are currently underway. The final draft annual financial report was presented to the KPMG/OAG auditors on 26 September before the statutory deadline of 30 September, in accordance with the Local Government Regulations.
- KPMG/OAG has scheduled the final audit fieldwork for three weeks commenced 9 October. The draft audit findings are expected to be presented to the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC) on 14 November, and the final audit report and opinion will be presented to Council and submitted to the Minister for Local Government by 31 December.

- The preliminary variances for the month ending 30 September are presented for noting by the Council.
- Presents the budget amendments required for the month of September 2025 and recommend adopted by the Council by Absolute Majority decision.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Notes to the statement of Financial Activity and Statement of Comprehensive Income for the month ending 30 September 2025 as detailed in the following attachments:**
 - **Statement of Financial Activity September 2025 (Attachment 1); and**
 - **Statement of Comprehensive Income September 2025 (Attachment 2); and**
 - **Net Working Capital September 2025 (Attachment 3); and**
 - **Reconciliation Net Working Capital as of 30 September 2025 (Attachment 4); and**
 - **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity September 2025 (Attachment 5); and**
 - **Statement of Financial Position as of 30 September 2025 (Attachment 6); and**
 - **Summary Rate Debtors September 2025 (Attachment 7); and**
 - **Rates Collections Graph September 2025 (Attachment 8); and**
 - **General Debtors Aged 90 Days September 2025 (Attachment 9).**
2. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the Budget Amendments, as detailed in the attached Budget Amendment Reports for September 2025 (Attachment 10).**

C25/332 Common Seal Item for November 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:41pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied for the period from Monday, 15 September 2025 up to and including Thursday, 23 October 2025 for the Council's noting. This is a standing report to the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the actions of the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer in executing the documents listed under the Common Seal of the City of Melville from Monday, 15 September 2025 up to and including Thursday, 23 October 2025 for the Council's noting.

C25/335 RFQ242531 Supply of Resource Recovery Commercial Waste Truck 24m2 Rear Loader

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:41pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFQ242531 (WALGA) Supply of Resource Recovery Commercial Waste Truck 24m² Rear Loader

CTAU RECOMMENDATION

- That the Council accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFQ242531 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes; and**
- Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

At 10:41pm, Mr P Varelis returned to the meeting.

C25/334 Development Assessment Panels - City of Melville Representation

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 10:42pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- Development Assessment Panels (DAPs), also known as Joint Development Assessment Panels (JDAPs) and Local Development Assessment Panels (LDAPs) commenced on 1 July 2011.
- Since 27 January 2023, the City has been represented by former Cr Woodall and Cr Lim, with former Cr Green and Cr Barber as the Alternate Members.
- Following the 2025 Local Government Elections, all representatives remain on the Council and will continue to represent the City of Melville, with their terms expiring 26 January 2026.
- Notification has been received from the Director General, Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage requesting nominations for the DAP Local Government Members for the period from 27 January 2026 to 26 January 2028.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council

1. **Nominates Councillor and Councillor as the City of Melville Development Assessment Panel Members for the term commencing on the 27 January 2026.**
2. **Nominates Councillor and Councillor as the City of Melville Development Assessment Panel Alternate Members for the term commencing on the 27 January 2026.**
3. **Confirms that Councillor is to be the Development Assessment Panel Alternative Member one and Councillor is the Development Assessment Panel Alternative Member two.**
4. **Requests the Chief Executive Officer to forward the confirmation of the City of Melville nominees for the Development Assessment Panel to the DAP Secretariat.**

Community Development**CD25/50 Deferral of Community Safety Technology Plan****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 10:42pm, Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development was available to answer questions on the matter.**Disclosure of Interest** Nil.**Notes from Forum** No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.**SUMMARY**

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) held on Tuesday, 15 April 2025, the Council resolved to approve the draft Community Safety Technology Plan for community consultation, subject to several conditions, and that the consultation findings be presented to the December 2025 OMC for further consideration.
- This report seeks to defer the community consultation findings report for an Elected Member Engagement Session to discuss the consultation findings in February 2026, with the item to be presented at the March 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council approve the deferral of the community consultation findings report to an Elected Member Engagement Session to discuss the consultation findings in February 2026, with the item to be presented at the March 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

CD25/51 Request from Melville Premier Cricket Club - Turf and Mowing Reimbursement

This item was bought forward earlier in the agenda for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 23.

Environment and Infrastructure

Nil.

Planning**UP25/89 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Lots 8, 100, 54 and 55 (39 - 43B) Canning Beach Road Applecross R12.5 to R40**

This item was bought forward earlier in the agenda for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 32.

UP25/90 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

This item was bought forward earlier in the agenda for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 27.

UP25/91 Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Station Precinct Plans

This item was bought forward earlier in the agenda for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 17.

At 10:43pm, Cr S Green, having declared a Financial Interest in the item (detailed in item 5), left the meeting.

At 10:43pm, Mr P Molony entered the meeting.

At 10:43pm, Ms M Smith Poulton left the meeting.

At 10:43pm, the Presiding Member reminded the Council of the officer advice note distributed in relation to item 15.1 Notice of Motion - General Liability Insurance Premium on Friday, 7 November in the Agenda of the Ordinary Meeting of Council.

15 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE

15.1 Notice of Motion - General Liability Insurance Premium

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 10:43pm Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk spoke to the officer advice note, and responded to questions which concluded at 10:49pm.

Disclosure of Interest Cr S Green – Financial Interest

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:

Where an action is commenced and the City is satisfied that there is no lack of duty of care, then they would simply move to a strikeout motion, which the person bringing the action would have to have very good evidence of a failure to comply with the duty of care before the judge would not allow the strikeout motion. So it's a fairly simple exercise to actually defend it where you've actually exercised the duty of care. Where you haven't exercised the duty of care then in any event, the protection doesn't apply, and the insurance policy doesn't apply. Is that correct?

Response 1:

That particular section of the Act talks about acting in good faith, not exercising a duty of care. There's a distinction between the two. An application to make a strikeout is quite high bar. In essence, you're telling the court that there's no prospects of success for this action, and therefore the court should not waste any time considering the claim. A judge would have to consider that, and it would have to be judicially considered. However, to get to that position you would need legal advice. It's not something that you'd be able to do and take that action yourself. To do so, you'd need to incur costs as part of that process. The insurance policy would consider the legal merits of the claim and whether there are any prospects of success before it activates as there's no point providing resources where there's no merit at all to the claim. This is how the policy would work, so in relation to the section of the act, you couldn't just be able to maintain that it provides protection straight away, you'd have to go through the process to have it judicially considered and then proven, and in essence a judge to make a ruling that yes that is how the process would work.

Question 2:

Where there is an insurance policy, a person is less likely to actually act in good faith. Whereas if there is no insurance policy, they're going to make quite sure that they act in good faith. Wouldn't it be more likely that they'd act in good faith when there's no insurance policy?

Response 2:

I can't comment on the considerations on someone determining whether or not they should act in good faith, whether or not there are policies in place. I don't want to assume that's a consideration that people go through. The expectation for any Elected Member or staff member of the City is that they would always undertake their duties to the best of their abilities and in good faith.

MOTION

That the Council requests the CEO to prepare a report on the following matter to be presented to the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on March 2026:

- 1 The City's current practice of paying a General Liability Insurance Premium of approximately \$663,505 per annum to provide Elected Members and City employees with legal representation for risks associated with defamation, public liability and professional indemnity and specifically in relation to the defamation cover, which provides an Elected Member or City Employee with legal representation and payment of settlement costs, judgment costs and legal costs that may be imposed for alleged defamatory statements made by the Elected Member or City Employee.**
- 2 Obtain legal Advice on what appears to be a direct conflict between the obligations placed on Elected Members and Employees under the Local Government Act 1995 and Code of Conduct provisions which prohibit Elected Members and City Employees from making derogatory remarks about any other individual or entity and the City using Community funds to provide legal representation in circumstances where the Elected Member or City Employee is being held accountable for making defamatory comments which effectively also breaches the Code of Conduct provisions.**
- 3 Requests Council to consider the Report and determine whether to continue maintaining an insurance policy that provides coverage and responds to claims for the matters identified above.**

At 10:44pm, Ms M Smith Poulton returned to the meeting.

At 10:47pm, Cr G Panayotou left the meeting.

At 10:48pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting and did not return.

15.2 Notice of Motion - John Connell Mature Trees

This item was bought forward earlier in the agenda, for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 29.

16 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)

Nil.

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

At 10:50pm Cr G Barber moved, seconded Cr D Lim

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:

C25/336 City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025 – Undertakings

This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 5.23(2) - (d) and (h) 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 legal advice obtained, or which may be obtained, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting and such other matters as may be prescribed (consider regulations).

C25/337 City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025 – Undertakings

This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 5.23(2) - (d) and (h) 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 legal advice obtained, or which may be obtained, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting and such other matters as may be prescribed (consider regulations).

E25/82 Waste Service Agreements

This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 5.23(2) - (c) 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 contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

At 10:50pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7/0)

At 10:51pm, Cr G Panayotou returned to the meeting.

At 10:51pm, Cr S Green returned to the meeting.

At 10:51pm, Ms G Bowman left the meeting.

At 10:52pm, Ms G Bowman returned to the meeting.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

At 11:06pm Cr G Barber moved, seconded Cr S Green

That the meeting be reopened to members of the public.

At 11:06pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (8/0)

18 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

At 11:07pm, the Presiding Member advised that the following items were discussed behind close doors:

- C25/33 RFQ242531 Supply of Resource Recovery Commercial Waste Truck 24m2 Rear Loader.
- C25/336 City of Melville Fencing Local Law 2025 – Undertakings
- C25/337 City of Melville Cat Local Law 2025 – Undertakings
- E25/82 Waste Service Agreements

19 CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 11:08pm.