



City of
Melville

NOTES

AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30pm Tuesday, 12 May 2026

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

The City of Melville acknowledges the Bibbulmun people as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which the City stands today and pays its respects to the Whadjuk people, and Elders past, present and future.

Notes to be confirmed at the next Ordinary Council Meeting

These minutes are hereby confirmed as true and accurate

Presiding Member

Date

19 May 2026.



OFFICIAL**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.



7

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

OFFICIAL

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.

OFFICIAL

Audio-Visual Recording and Live Streaming

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

Purpose of Agenda Briefing Forum

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

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL**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 Submissions	9
5	Disclosure of Interest	9
5.1	Financial or Proximity Interests	9
5.2	Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict.....	9
6	Public Question Time	10
6.1	Questions Received with Notice	10
6.2	Questions Received at the Meeting	10
6.3	Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting	10
7	Awards and Presentations	11
8	Applications for New Leave of Absence	11
9	Confirmation of Minutes.....	11
10	New Business of an Urgent Nature.....	11
11	Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed	11
12	Petitions	11
13	Adoption of Recommendations En Bloc	11
14	Reports	12
14.1	Reports from Committees	12
14.2	Items Brought Forward	13
E26/90	Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities	13
14.3	Reports of the Chief Executive Officer	22
	Management Services	22
M26/77	Common Seal April 2026	22
	Corporate Services	22
C26/377	Investment Statements for March 2026	22
C26/379	Statements of Financial Activity for March 2026	23
C26/378	Schedule of Accounts Paid for March 2026	24

	OFFICIAL	
C26/380	Alternative Revenue Plan.....	25
	Community Development.....	26
CD26/63	Leeming Recreation Centre - Pre-Feasibility Study	26
	Environment and Infrastructure.....	29
E26/100	Asset Management Strategy	29
E26/101	Deferral of Findings From Burke Drive Traffic Study Report.....	30
E26/90	Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities	33
	Planning	34
UP26/103	Draft Local Planning Policy 1.23 – Requirements for Local Planning Scheme Amendments.....	34
UP26/111	Review of the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan - RFQ (Gate 1: Scope Endorsement).....	35
UP26/110	Proposed Amendment to Local Planning Scheme 6 to Rezone Lot 40 Davies Crescent, Kardinya from "Residential R40" to "Residential R60"	36
15	Motions with Previous Notice	38
15.1	Notice of Motion - John Connell Reserve Transplanting Trees	38
16	Motions Without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority).....	38
17	Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public.....	39
18	Decisions Made While Meeting was Closed to the Public	39
19	Closure	39

OFFICIAL**1 OFFICIAL OPENING**

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, officially declared the meeting open at 6:36pm and invited Cr S Green to read the Acknowledgement of Country and advised those present of the Purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum, the Disclaimer, the Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility and the Audio Recording Advice.

2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES**In Attendance**

K Mair

Mayor

Councillors

Cr M Woodall

Cr J Spanbroek

Cr G Barber

Cr G Panayotou

Cr N Robins

Cr S Hong

Cr D Lim

Cr K Wheatland

Cr M McGoldrick

Cr S Green

Cr C Yorke

Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward (*electronic attendance*)

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Central Ward

Central Ward

Officers

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Mr G Tuffin

Director Corporate Services

Mr J Coten

Director Environment & Infrastructure

Ms M Pickering

Director Community Development

Mr P Varelis

Director Planning

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance & Risk

Ms R Ward (*until 8:07pm*)

Manager City Buildings & Projects

Mr D Burton (*until 8:29pm*)

Manager Healthy Melville

Mr D Anderson (*until 8:07pm*)

Facilities Coordinator

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Mr O Pugh

Governance Officer (Council Support)

OFFICIAL

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery 22

Apologies

Nil.

On Approved Leave of Absence

Cr C Ross Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL**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**

- Ms T Barrow, Mount Pleasant – Item E26/90 Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities
- Ms K Horn, Ardross – Item E26/90 Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities

Approved Written Submissions

- Mr G Smith, Kardinya – Item UP26/110 Proposed Amendment to Local Planning Scheme 6 to Rezone Lot 40 Davies Crescent, Kardinya from "Residential R40" to "Residential R60"

At 6:39pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

5 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**5.1 Financial or Proximity Interests**

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

Nil.

5.2 Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict

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

Nil.

OFFICIAL**6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

At 6:40pm the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

At 6:41pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

6.1 Questions Received with Notice

Nil.

6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting

Nil.

6.3 Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

At 6:42pm the Presiding Member closed Public Question Time.

OFFICIAL**7 AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS**

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

8 APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVE OF ABSENCE

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil.

12 PETITIONS

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

13 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS EN BLOC

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

OFFICIAL

14 REPORTS

14.1 Reports from Committees

Nil.

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL**14.2 Items Brought Forward**

At 6:43pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item E26/90 Approval to Demolish the Attadale Scout and Baden Powell Girl Guide Facilities for the convenience of those making a deputation and the officers providing a presentation.

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

At 6:44pm, Ms T Barrow gave a deputation which concluded at 6:52pm.
At 7:06pm, Ms T Barrow returned to the public gallery.

[Deputation – Ms T Barrow](#)

At 7:07pm, Ms S Pape and Ms K Horn gave a deputation which concluded at 7:17pm. At 7:31pm, Ms S Pape and Ms K Horn returned to the public gallery.

[Deputation – Ms S Pape](#)**Officer Presentation**

At 7:32pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure, Ms R Ward, Manager City Buildings & Projects and Mr D Anderson, Facilities Coordinator provided an officer presentation which concluded at 7:38pm.

At 7:38pm, Mr J Coten, Mr D Anderson, Ms R Ward, Mr M Yildiz, and Mr G Tuffin responded to questions which concluded at 8:06pm.

[Officer Presentation – E26/90](#)**Disclosure of Interest**

Nil.

At 6:53pm, Mr O Pugh left the meeting.

At 6:58pm, Mr O Pugh returned to the meeting.

At 7:02pm, Mr G Tuffin left the meeting.

At 7:06pm, Mr G Tuffin returned to the meeting.

At 7:31pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting.

At 7:35pm, Cr M Woodall returned to the meeting.

At 7:37pm, Mr P Varelis left the meeting.

At 7:49pm, Mr P Varelis returned to the meeting.

At 7:52pm, Mr M Yildiz left the meeting.

At 7:56pm, Mr M Yildiz returned to the meeting.

OFFICIAL**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:

Could you describe if there is a distinction between firm, intact asbestos and friable asbestos, and the extent of what has been regarded as friable in the building?

Response to Question 1:

The friable asbestos at Baden Powell is located within the distribution board and within the vinyl flooring in the kitchen, and it's a higher risk if it's disturbed. There is a much higher risk of the fibres becoming airborne where they can be inhaled.

Question 2:

Do you have any idea or ballpark figure as to what it might cost to repair those specific issues they've identified in the hall?

Response to Question 2:

The distribution board has been tested as recently as March with airborne monitoring, and that passed that test. We didn't undertake the repairs because the plan was to do the demolition. At an estimate, the repairs for the distribution board would be about \$15,000.

It should also be note with regard to the independent consultant's report, it was based on the QED report of 2021. There was a more recent study undertaken by the City in 2025.

Question 3:

If the Scout Hall is demolished, the Attadale Scout Hall we're talking about, and the land isn't sold and the land is not used by the Scouts to rebuild, where will their permanent home be? Will that be in Palmyra or will we find them a new home?

Response to Question 3:

That will be determined through the scout review. At the moment we're trying to find an adequate interim facility, which was the Palmyra Kindy, until we can undertake a study and at which stage then it will be determined what is the best location for Scouts.

Question 4:

If it's demolished and the land is not sold, what will the land be used for?

Response to Question 4:

A decision hasn't been made on that.

OFFICIALQuestion 5:

If it's demolished, will the land be sold to fund other projects within the City?

Response to Question 5:

No, that's not being proposed.

Question 6:

I'm just noticing in those photos that the internal walls' asbestos has aluminium cladding on the outside of the building to protect and keep the asbestos internal wall linings. Would that be achievable?

Response to Question 6:

The internal walls can be sealed with either fresh paint or with a PVA glue, but that would be considered a temporary option.

We haven't worked out a cost to remove the asbestos and rebuild it because it's just simply not practical. If we're removing the asbestos we have to remove the cladding, and the timbers are all contaminated so that would need to be sealed; we would still end up with a contaminated building.

Question 7:

The Girl Guides exited the building in about 2021, and is that when we found them the place on Kitchener Road? Is that right? Or what happened to those people when they exited?

Response to Question 7:

We aren't sure is the short answer. The closest Girl Guide facility is on Kitchener Road, but there are no records as to whether the Girl Guides were relocated to that. Our understanding is they simply disbanded.

Question 8:

Has the City given any thought to what is going to be done in replacement if we do remove the Girl Guide Hall?

Response to Question 8:

We had brief conversations with the Scout Group down at Waylen Bay, and they did indicate that toilet facilities were a high priority. At that stage, we said that we were happy and open to conversations around future facilities there.

Question 9:

In terms of the Attadale Scout Hall, apart from the roof which is obviously a serious issue, are there any other ongoing maintenance issues with that hall? And also given its age, if the roof were okay and not an issue, how much longer would we expect that hall to be able to remain in place and continue to be used before it had to be either refurbished or demolished and rebuilt?

OFFICIALResponse to Question 9:

In Australia, buildings generally have a design life of around 45 years, and in saying design life it means that when you go to refurbish there's a number of new codes that are introduced, which makes a refurbishment rather difficult.

It doesn't mean that the building has come to the end of its remaining life, it's generally a design life as opposed to a structural life. The building down at Attadale is in a fair condition, the brickwork is in a fair condition. If we were to put on a new roof, we would need to investigate whether that would trigger the National Construction Code and whether we would need to do further upgrades, which could be around disability access and the like.

We've come to Council quite a few times to say we could do a refurbishment and it will trigger all of these aspects that we need to upgrade, or we could demolish and rebuild. It is often more about the design life and how we could build a more efficient building for the same price as refurbishing.

Question 10:

Is there the same urgency with the Attadale Scout Hall compared to the Girl Guides where asbestos is a serious issue? Would it be an option to simply leave the Attadale Hall as is, not spend any money on maintenance until the scout review and asset review is complete, and then make a decision as to what is the best path forward?

Response to Question 10:

Yes, they do have different risks; certainly the Baden Powell Girl Guides is high risk as far as staff are concerned with the asbestos risk. Attadale Scouts has been assessed as medium risk and there are three options that have been prepared, which are in the report.

The first is demolition, which is what staff were recommending. The second one is to undertake further investigations into the cost of the renewal of the roof, and what that would trigger in terms of additional work, then bring that back to an EMES, and that will go before the staff recommendation. The third option was just to do nothing and leave it until the scout study has been done. As far as staff are concerned, all three options could be justified, and the urgency for the Attadale Scouts isn't as significant as the Baden Powell Girl Guides.

Question 11:

Based on the recent independent report submitted by the Waylen Bay Sea Scout Group, all areas apart from the electrical mounting board cabinet were assessed as low risk. However, the City still considers the site to be high risk. What is driving this significant discrepancy between the two assessments? Do you think it's simply because the independent report didn't consider the potential or unforeseen future risk scenarios, or is there any other factors involved?

OFFICIALResponse to Question 11:

Yes, that is spot on. When they go out and assess the asbestos components in isolation and the way in which it's managed, as in it's cladding or it's covered, it is a low risk. However, putting all of that asbestos together, we have over 400 square metres of asbestos in that facility, and our risk assessment looks at unforeseen circumstances: the age of the facility coupled with weather elements, vandalism, it is an isolated site.

We look at how it is managed, the oversight of it, its age and those unforeseen circumstances, and that's how it comes in. But individual components, because of the way in which it's been managed around the cladding and the protection, it is low at the moment, however combining that with the amount and the unforeseen circumstances is what kicks it into high risk.

Question 12:

My questions are around the Attadale Scout Hall. In relation to the three reports that you sent us, all three recommended roof replacement and identified that the structure is sound and in good condition. One of those reports, which was done two years ago, actually came out with a costing of \$126,000 for the roof replacement. Do you see that being pretty much where we're going to be heading with regard to cost of roof replacement?

Response to Question 12:

Yes, we would just need to look at escalation costs, but that is the roof in isolation; we would need to know whether that particular work triggers any other work. The structural engineer has looked at that in isolation of when we go through a building permit and whether it triggers further upgrades, but it wouldn't be far off. That escalation is around about 5% and then you need to add on project management costs, however we would need to go back and investigate that because we want to ensure Council receives a figure that we can actually implement with this project. We are concerned that the cost is in isolation of not looking at what those types of works trigger for the overall building.

When the project was progressing a number of years ago, the group also wanted other upgrades such as air conditioning which then required power upgrades and things like that, and the cost for that ended up being \$660,000. That's the sort of thing that can be triggered, so it may not be as simple as just replacing the roof.

Question 13:

My understanding was that the type of roof that's currently there has limited insulation. So of course, once a new roof has been identified there'll be better insulation properties. Would you see the requirement of adding three-phase for air conditioning as being non-essential, and then leave it pretty much as is with the new roof? Is that something you'd agree to or understand?

OFFICIALResponse to Question 13:

That's probably the sort of information that we need to get some costs on and bring back to Council. The air conditioning is a good example because it's quite common for a community group to be happy with a facility, but then if there's a change of committee or new people come in and things like that, then requests for upgrades come in down the track as well.

It could be a simple job, but there could be other things as well, and it's probably more appropriate for staff to go and investigate those things and bring it back to Council through an EMES, and then provide some clear direction to staff moving forward.

You are correct in saying the reports identified the roof replacement, but the consideration of staff was looking at all of the City's building infrastructure as well, and obviously a consultant is not aware of financial pressures facing the organisation and things like that. So, you know, balancing risk service levels and costs. That's some of the other considerations that staff have put into the recommendation.

Question 14:

If we decide to support the alternative motion, I'm just curious as to how that will impact rates. Will it go through this financial year, or can we put it off until next financial year?

Response to Question 14:

The intention of the motion is that some of the money proposed for the demolition of the Attadale Scouts would actually go towards an investigation to come up with some scoping and costs, and staff estimate that might be about \$10,000 to \$15,000 of a consultant's time, and that money is already available. It would then come back to an EMES which would inform future budget decisions, so the short answer is no, it wouldn't impact next year's rates, and then any decision in regard to future work or rates would be something that would come back through the budget process.

Question 15:

So then the building will just sit in situ until that report comes back and we make a call?

Response to Question 15:

Yes that's correct.

Question 16:

Could you just confirm, regarding the Attadale site, that it is state-owned land and there isn't any mechanism for the City to sell it and obtain a financial return?

OFFICIALResponse to Question 16:

Yes, our understanding is that it's Crown Reserve. There is a provision under section 152 to purchase land, but that would need to be a submission to the state government. At the moment, they're not looking fondly on those particular submissions. They need to be in line with the Public Open Space Strategy, and the money would need to be returned back into other public open space.

Question 17:

Just in relation to the potential cost for the roof replacement and looking at that in itself, presumably the report that comes back will look at whether the roof replacement will trigger the National Construction Code. If it did, I assume the cost escalation we'd be looking at would be disability access, toilet facilities, et cetera, potentially talking about over \$1,000,000 or more, or hundreds of thousands at least. Would officers present their opinion on whether it's even viable at that point? Would that all come back in the report to Council if we go down that path?

Response to Question 17:

Yes, that's all correct other than what's proposed is that we'll go to an EMES rather than bringing a report back to Council, and the EMES will then inform the budget process. So essentially it would come back to Council for a decision as part of any future budget process, but when we come back to the EMES we'll have all of those things in there. That's the work that we're not sure about – what it will trigger, what the exact scope will be – and so we don't want to give you a figure that it's going to be \$150,000 to replace a roof and then find out that it's a lot more for all the other things.

Question 18:

Does the City or the Council have a risk appetite framework or risk appetite statement that outlines the level of risk that we as an organisation are willing to take on with regards to asbestos?

Response to Question 18:

We do have an Enterprise Risk Management Framework, but a risk appetite statement is still work to be done with Council. So until such time we've done that, we haven't established that from a Council perspective.

Question 19:

Could you explain how officers, in the absence of a risk appetite statement, determined the level of risk that we're willing to accept with regard to asbestos in this situation?

Response to Question 19:

Our Enterprise Risk Management Framework does have a risk analysis matrix that allows us to determine the level of risk that is associated with any event that we're considering, but with the appetite itself, that's why it's come to Council for a Council decision; because there's no guidance in regards to what level of risk Council's appetite is willing to take on.

OFFICIALQuestion 20:

You made a statement earlier about the lifespan of buildings in Perth being around 40 to 45 years. Can we benchmark other similar facilities, for example, the Kelmscott Scout Hall which was built in 1920? It's well over 100 years old and still surviving, and it's an amazing attraction now that it's been kept.

Response to Question 20:

Yes, we can bring some information back with the EMES. When talking about the 45 years, that's the design life, and I've had some experience with scout halls that are very old where the building's still standing and the structure is still good, but they do require regular renewal and refurbishment for universal access requirements and those sorts of things. So there's the design life in terms of functionality, and things like that are different to the structural life, but we can certainly look at some other examples and bring them back to the EMES.

Question 21:

Instead of demolishing the Girl Guide Hall, could we move it and maybe put it at the end of one of our jetties so that it sits there like the University of WA boatshed? Is that possible?

Response to Question 21:

If the work that's required triggers those requirements, we are obliged to undertake them. It's not something that we've got discretion over.

Question 22:

Thinking about the fact that the Baden Powell Girl Guides Hall has come out of the lease arrangement in February, I was just wondering what that does to liability, both for the City but also perhaps for the Scouts, if the building continues to be used without a lease in place?

Response to Question 22:

Without lease, there's no tenure or access that is technically authorised to allow access to the building. On that basis, the user would take on all responsibility in regards to accessing the building because there's no legal terms or obligations that have been clearly articulated in regards to that use.

Question 23:

If it continues, I guess it's a purely City-owned asset with no responsibility for the tenant, so to speak?

Response to Question 23:

Without any authorisation or permission to use the building, there'll be a two-fold process to consider: why it is currently being used, under what sort of arrangements and whether there is any authorisation for that, and whether the City has done anything to be able to manage that. With the current situation where there is no lease or licence or authorisation provided, the expectation is that the City will still have to manage the building, but the people who are using the building are doing so without any particular authorisation or under any legal obligation or legal terms.

OFFICIALQuestion 24:

How does the revenue structure work when they're hiring out the hall, because as we just mentioned the lease ended in February 2026?

Response to Question 24:

Generally all of our community leases require Council's written permission to undertake other activities or to sublease community buildings as a general rule. In terms of who would have possession of those funds, I assume it would remain with the Scouts Group at this point in time.

SUMMARY

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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Approve the demolition of the Attadale Scout Hall;**
2. **Approve the demolition of the Baden Powell Girl Guide Hall; and**
3. **Request the CEO to continue working with the groups to provide alternative accommodation to meet their needs.**

At 8:02pm, Cr M McGoldrick left the meeting.

At 8:05pm, Cr M McGoldrick returned to the meeting.

At 8:07pm, Cr G Panayotou left the meeting.

At 8:07pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 8:07pm, Mr J Coten left the meeting.

At 8:07pm, Mr D Anderson left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:07pm, Ms R Ward left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:07pm, Cr C Yorke left the meeting.

At 8:07pm, Cr G Barber left the meeting.

At 8:07pm, the Presiding Member adjourned the meeting.

Mr J Coten, Cr K Wheatland, Cr C Yorke and Cr G Barber returned to the meeting during the adjournment.

At 8:21pm, the Presiding Member resumed the meeting.

OFFICIAL**14.3 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer****Management Services****M26/77 Common Seal April 2026**

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:21pm, Mr M Yildiz 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 24 January 2026 up to and including 23 April 2026 for the Council's noting. This is a standing report to the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

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

Corporate Services**C26/377 Investment Statements for March 2026**

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:21pm, 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 31 March 2026 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

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

OFFICIAL**C26/379 Statements of Financial Activity for March 2026****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:21pm, 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 31 March 2026; and
- Presents the variances for the month of March 2026 and recommends that they be noted by the Council; and
- Presents the budget amendments required for the month of March 2026 and recommends that they be adopted by the Council by Absolute Majority decision.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Notes the statement of financial activity and statement of comprehensive income for the month ending 31 March 2026 as detailed in the following attachments:**
 - **Statement of Financial Activity March 2026 (Attachment 1); and**
 - **Statement of Comprehensive Income March 2026 (Attachment 2); and**
 - **Net Working Capital March 2026 (Attachment 3); and**
 - **Reconciliation Net Working Capital as of 31 March 2026 (Attachment 4); and**
 - **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity March 2026 (Attachment 5); and**
 - **Statement of Financial Position as of 31 March 2026 (Attachment 6); and**
 - **Summary Rate Debtors March 2026 (Attachment 7); and**
 - **Rates Collections Graph March 2026 (Attachment 8); and**
 - **General Debtors Aged 90 Days March 2026 (Attachment 9).**
2. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the Budget Amendments, as detailed in the attached Budget Amendment Reports for March 2026 (Attachment 10).**

OFFICIAL**C26/378 Schedule of Accounts Paid for March 2026****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:21pm, 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 March 2026 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts Paid be noted.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

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

OFFICIAL**C26/380 Alternative Revenue Plan****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:21pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 8:23pm.**Disclosure of Interest** Nil.**Notes from Forum** General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:Question 1:

I've noted that a couple of other local governments have a similar document to this one, or it might be slightly different, but some of them set a numerical target for the amount of money they're going to spend on, say, purchasing property. Was any consideration given to that kind of thing for the City?

Response to Question 1:

No it wasn't, and that was a deliberate thing. We currently have \$18.5 million in reserves for land and property investment. As you're aware, the decision to transfer in and out of reserves is an annual decision of Council, and also a longer term proposition in terms of our Long Term Financial Plan. One of the recommendations in this document is to look at our reserves and actually develop a reserve strategy, so we can look at where we should be allocating funds to which area of need more strategically than perhaps in the past.

SUMMARY

- The Alternative Revenue Plan (ARP) provides a strategic framework to improve the City's long-term financial sustainability by diversifying revenue sources beyond rates.
- The Plan responds to the City's high reliance on rates (75%), identifying practical opportunities to strengthen financial resilience over time.
- It focuses on optimising existing assets and revenue streams, including land and asset utilisation, investment returns, fees and charges, and parking revenue.
- The ARP is a high-level strategy, not an implementation plan, individual initiatives will be subject to future business cases and Council decisions.
- Implementation will be staged over time and integrated into the Long Term Financial Plan, Corporate Business Plan and annual budget processes.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Adopts the Alternative Revenue Plan (Attachment 1).**
2. **Notes that the Plan is a strategic document and that implementation of individual initiatives will be subject to future Council reports, budget processes and detailed business cases.**

OFFICIAL**Community Development****CD26/63 Leeming Recreation Centre - Pre-Feasibility Study****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:23pm, Mr D Burton, Manager Healthy Melville responded to questions which concluded at 8:29pm.**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:

My question is about the arrangement with the Department of Education and their use of the facility. Has any discussion been had with the department about a financial contribution towards their use of the City's facility, whether that be currently or in the future? We need to make sure that they can keep using it continually and that there's no gap in that time frame because it costs the City more to do it that way, so are they providing a financial contribution to cater for that?

Response to Question 1:

Early discussions have occurred. They're undertaking a business case on their own in regards to future facilities and whether or not they can develop them on their land, so we're looking to do this process in parallel with that. They're unsure whether there's something that's buildable on their land. As a result, if they align with our option and there's that shared use arrangement, then yes, there would be an expectation that they would contribute, but it would also have to go through their business case process as well, through the Department of Treasury.

Question 2:

Following this pre-feasibility study, what is the duration that the City is expecting that will come back to Council?

Response to Question 2:

Should the officer recommendation be approved, we're anticipating we would start the feasibility process around the beginning of July 2026, and the expectation is that it will probably take around 12 months, which includes the community engagement process.

Question 3:

I know following a few workshops and discussions we had, we've actually discussed a few different forms of community engagement. So you anticipate that will take place within the 12 months, and then once that's all collated you'll come back to Council following that, is that correct?

Response to Question 3:

Yes that is correct. The community engagement is inclusive of that overall estimated 12-month timeframe.

OFFICIALQuestion 4:

What involvement will Elected Members have with regard to how broad it is or the types of engagement considering what the community is preferring?

Response to Question 4:

The officer recommendation outlines the proposed methods at a high level of engagement activities. There is an opportunity for Council to have an overview of the more detailed community engagement plan, or we could ultimately work with Council in an EMES or through the Ward Councillors process as well.

Question 5:

I understand from feedback I've received that there are people who have worked during the day, so whether it be online, letterbox drops, or even a town hall meeting or perhaps meeting in groups during the day and evenings, is it possible for something like this to take place so we can get everyone who has an interest involved?

Response to Question 5:

We would obviously look at a range of engagement methods to collect that information. But yes, a town hall type activity or one or two of those is proposed. We would need to work out the detail to make sure we can capture as many people as possible through the engagement process.

SUMMARY

- At the December 2024 Ordinary Meeting of Council, the Council requested investigations into the future of the Leeming Recreation Centre (LRC), including a Needs Analysis and a Pre-Feasibility Study.
- The Draft Needs Analysis was presented to Council in June 2025 (CD25/45) and identified significant demand for a contemporary, accessible, multi-purpose recreation facility integrated with complementary commercial uses and shared school facilities.
- At the June 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council, Council resolved to undertake a Pre-Feasibility Study for future options for the LRC.
- A Pre-Feasibility Study has now been completed to investigate future options for the LRC, including review of available information regarding asset condition, functional suitability, indicative capital and lifecycle costs, funding opportunities, management models, planning considerations and risks.
- The Pre-Feasibility Study identified that maintaining or partially redeveloping the existing facility is a lesser preferred option given the advanced age of the asset, compliance issues, estimated cost in comparison to a demolish and rebuild, and limited functional improvement achieved.
- The preferred option identified is Option 4 – Demolish and Rebuild.
- Option 4 provides the greatest opportunity to meet identified community needs, improve accessibility and sustainability, and attract external State and Federal funding.
- The report seeks Council's endorsement to proceed to a detailed Feasibility Study for Option 4 and seeks an allocation of \$100,000 in the 2026/2027 Annual Budget to progress these works.

OFFICIAL**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council:

- 1. Receives the Leeming Recreation Centre – Pre-Feasibility Study (Attachment 1);**
- 2. Notes the Leeming Recreation Centre – Needs Analysis (Attachment 2); and**
- 3. Allocates \$100,000 in the draft 2026/27 Annual Budget to undertake a detailed Feasibility Study focused on Option 4 – Demolish and Rebuild, including further investigation of redevelopment on the existing site or an alternative location within the precinct;**
- 4. Notes that the detailed Feasibility Study is to include (but not be limited to):**
 - **Wider community engagement and consultation;**
 - **Ongoing collaboration with the Department of Education and Leeming Senior High School in parallel with their business case process;**
 - **Confirmation of the preferred location within the precinct;**
 - **Confirmation of the facility scope and required supporting works;**
 - **Preparation of a concept design and site master plan;**
 - **Detailed capital, lifecycle and operational cost modelling;**
 - **Financial sustainability and funding pathway assessment;**
- 5. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to update the relevant State and Federal Members of Parliament on the project.**

At 8:29pm, Mr D Burton left the meeting and did not return.

OFFICIAL**Environment and Infrastructure****E26/100 Asset Management Strategy****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:29pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 8:31pm.**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:

Regarding the total annual life cycle gap of approximately \$8.18 million, how is it proposed that this gap is closed? Will that be through work done in the Long Term Financial Plan or will we just be putting rates up to close that gap?

Response to Question 1:

It'll be a combination of things that will be decisions of Council. The information is based on the previous Long Term Financial Plan that went to Council a while ago, and a fair bit more work has been occurring on that which has been mentioned at briefings on the asset management strategy. It is a process of continual improvement and refinement. We're getting better information through our asset management plans in terms of the whole of life costs of our infrastructure, and that's informing the Long Term Financial Plan.

A number of Councillors here have undertaken the asset management training, and mentioned in the briefings, it's a matter of Council balancing level of service, risk and cost, so all of those decisions input into that. It would be a combination of perhaps increasing rates, it may be deferring some capital projects, it may be changing levels of service, but they will all be decisions that will come through Council in future.

Question 2:

The strategy states that budgeting priority will be given to the maintenance and renewal of existing assets over new projects. With regard to the Leeming Recreation Centre item on the agenda, the proposal there is to knock it down and rebuild. Is that an example of renewal or is that considered a new project?

Response to Question 2:

That would be what we consider a replacement. There is an existing piece of infrastructure there and it's more economical to demolish it and rebuild it than it is to actually renew it. It provides better whole of life costs and better value.

At 8:31pm, the Presiding Member allowed Elected Members to send further questions to officers via email. The questions and responses will be available in the Agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026.

OFFICIAL**SUMMARY**

- Asset Management planning is recognised as a key part of the City's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework, ensuring that asset management is integrated with the Council Plan for the Future.
- The Asset Management Strategy is prepared to assist the City in improving the management and delivery of services associated with infrastructure assets including roads, paths, stormwater drainage, buildings, parks, natural areas, jetties and marine infrastructure.
- The Asset Management Strategy contains information on the City's asset management planning process, levels of service, state of the assets, lifecycle costs, asset management maturity and an improvement plan.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council adopt the Asset Management Strategy 2026-2036 and authorise the CEO to make minor amendments to the Strategy on an annual basis, based on updated Long Term Financial Plan information.

E26/101 Deferral of Findings From Burke Drive Traffic Study Report

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 8:32pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 8:37pm.

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:

As the officers have said, this is going to be quite a polarising topic for the residents who use Burke Drive in Attadale, and therefore I'm concerned – are we allowing enough time?

Question 2:

There's a two-week opportunity for people to express an interest to register for a community workshop, then there's a community workshop on a day. My question is, where is that workshop?

Response to Questions 1 & 2:

Yes, it will be a combination of letter drops to people and other mechanisms such as social media to alert people to the opportunity of the workshop. It's proposed to be in this building. We do take on board your comments that people may need longer to register, but the intent is that people will register and if they're unable to attend the workshop, they'll have an opportunity to provide feedback outside of that. But as pointed out, there are diverse views from people in the community, so we do want to make sure we capture them all. We can certainly take on

OFFICIAL

board your comment about a longer time period.

Question 3:

With this deferral, do we have any indication of timeline with regard to deferring?

Response to Question 3:

We'll get it back to Council as soon as we can. We deliberately didn't put in a time when we would bring it back in the event that the consultation and engagement took longer than planned. We don't want to make promises, but we'd probably be aiming for September or October.

Question 4:

If Council didn't want to see any changes to Burke Drive, would it be open to us to simply not defer the item, rather than have it continually roll on just to say the matter's dealt with and no change is required?

Response to Question 4:

We wouldn't recommend that. Some work has gone into the analysis to date. There is also money on the draft 26-27 capital budget for some design work to occur as an outcome of this, so that wouldn't be a course of action we would recommend. It'll probably end up causing us more problems than it solved.

It does appear that there was a petition associated with this, so we would need to address the concerns raised in the petition through this process.

SUMMARY

- Council previously resolved to undertake a comprehensive traffic study, including community engagement, to inform appropriate traffic calming measures and viable speed reduction options for Burke Drive.
- Completion of the Burke Drive Traffic Study has been delayed due to staff resourcing constraints and an expanded stakeholder engagement approach.
- Consultants have completed analysis of existing traffic data and a site visit. Stakeholder engagement is now being finalised.
- Differing resident views on potential traffic calming measures have been identified, requiring careful and inclusive engagement.
- To align with the City's Stakeholder Engagement Policy, engagement has been expanded to include a workshop, online information and a survey, with the workshop anticipated in late May or June (subject to confirmation).
- As engagement is not yet complete, the study findings cannot be finalised and consideration of the report is recommended to be deferred to a future Ordinary Council Meeting.

OFFICIAL

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council defer consideration of the report on the findings of the Burke Drive Traffic Study to a future Ordinary Meeting of Council, and request that a report be presented as soon as practicable once the Traffic Study is complete.

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL

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

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 13.

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL**Planning****UP26/103 Draft Local Planning Policy 1.23 – Requirements for Local Planning Scheme Amendments****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:37pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 8:39pm.**Disclosure of Interest** Nil.**Notes from Forum** General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:Question 1:*Could officers please outline the expected cost of additional consultation that will be required as a result of the new policy?*Response to Question 1:

The primary additional cost would be letters to affected and considered appropriate residents for consultation. The process itself could readily be absorbed within the City's operating budget.

Question 2:*Why was it deemed that a policy was necessary and not just an internal operational process?*Response to Question 2:

It was considered appropriate to encapsulate this process within a policy for a number of reasons. One of those is to provide certainty to applicants and stakeholders to understand what the City's process would be for scheme amendments, but also should staff change within the City ensuring that this process is captured. It's important that consultation occurs on a preliminary basis before Council enters statutory processes for significant scheme amendments that could result in major built form or land use changes, so that the process retains control at the Council level and isn't necessarily always handed over to the Minister for Planning by entering a statutory process.

SUMMARY

- A new policy is proposed to provide clear guidance on information requirements for Standard and Complex Scheme Amendments.
- The policy aims to guide preliminary (non-statutory) community consultation, where considered necessary, allowing issues to be identified early in the process.
- It is intended to improve transparency, consistency, and ensure alignment with the City's strategic planning frameworks.
- The policy will also help proponents and the City prepare well-informed Scheme Amendments and support efficient, consistent decision-making.
- The Council is being asked to consider endorsing draft Local Planning Policy (LPP) 1.23 for public advertising. Should submissions of objection be received, the LPP would be presented to Council for consideration. If no submissions of objection are received it is recommended that final adoption of the LPP be authorised by the Chief Executive Officer.

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

1. In accordance with Clause 4 of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 endorse draft Local Planning Policy LPP 1.23 – Requirements for Local Planning Scheme Amendments for the purpose of public advertising for a period of not less than 21 days; and
2. Resolve that where no submissions in objection are received in response to the consultation undertaken, that the final adoption of Local Planning Policy 1.23 shall be authorised by the Chief Executive Officer; and
3. In the event of Local Planning Policy 1.23 being granted final approval that the Council endorse associated administrative changes to Clause 7 of Local Planning Policy LPP1.1 Planning Process and Decision Making to reflect the content of Local Planning Policy 1.23.

UP26/111 Review of the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan - RFQ (Gate 1: Scope Endorsement)

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:39pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning 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 its Ordinary Meeting on 17 February 2026, Council resolved to adopt a staged, evidence-led governance framework for the review of the Melville City Centre Structure Plan (Item UP26/99, Attachment 1). That resolved approach established four decision gates to ensure clear Council involvement and oversight of the project direction.
- This report seeks Council endorsement of Gate 1 of the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan (BMCCSP) Review process, being approval of the scope and methodology for the review (Attachment 2).
- The draft project scope expands upon the approach resolved by Council in February 2026. The scope maps out the key steps required, the level of investigation, stakeholder engagement and project deliverables. Importantly, the scope includes the decision gates outlined in the agreed approach.
- Endorsement of the project scope (Gate 1) is recommended. Subject to Council approval, an RFQ will be released to assist in progressing the next stage of the review.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

endorse the proposed Scope of Works for the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan Review as outlined in Attachment 2.

OFFICIAL

A written submission from Mr G Smith of Kardinya was received in relation to this matter and circulated to Elected Members - [Written Submission – Mr G Smith](#)

UP26/110 Proposed Amendment to Local Planning Scheme 6 to Rezone Lot 40 Davies Crescent, Kardinya from "Residential R40" to "Residential R60"

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:40pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning 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

- The Kardinya District Centre Precinct Structure Plan (the PSP) was approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in November 2025. A scheme amendment to Local Planning Scheme 6 (Amendment 15) was prepared in conjunction with the PSP to give operational effect to the PSP. Amendment 15 was approved by the Minister for Planning in November 2024.
- The Scheme Amendment, prepared under direction of the WAPC was intended to reflect a series of changes to the PSP required by the WAPC. An anomaly has since been identified whereby the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) instructions relating to Amendment 15 did not correctly respond to the intended zonings shown in the PSP. In particular Lot 40 (52) Davies Crescent, Kardinya is shown as Residential R60 in the PSP but has progressed with an R40 coding in Amendment 15.
- This proposed Scheme Amendment is proposed to address this anomaly by modifying the density code for Lot 40 (No. 52) Davies Crescent, Kardinya from "Residential R40" to "Residential R60". This change is supported by both the subject property owner and the DPLH.
- As the amendment is proposed to correct an administrative error and make the scheme consistent with the adopted Precinct Structure Plan, it is considered to be a "Basic" amendment. This classification has been supported by the DPLH.
- While there is no requirement for formal engagement under a "Basic" amendment classification, the City has contacted the abutting property owner affected by the proposal, informing them of the proposed amendment and inviting them to provide comment should they wish. No comment/submission has been received.
- No other properties are materially impacted by the proposal and given the unique circumstances applicable the proposed amendment will not establish a precedent for any further amendments.

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

1. Pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, resolves to adopt Scheme Amendment No. 20 to Local Planning Scheme No. 6 to rezone Lot 40 (52) Davies Crescent, Kardinya from “Residential R40” zone to “Residential R60” zone and amend the Scheme Map accordingly.
2. Resolve that the amendment is a “basic” amendment under the provisions of the regulations for the following reasons:
 - (a) The amendment is proposed to correct an inconsistency between the City’s Local Planning Scheme and the approved Kardinya District Centre Precinct Structure Plan;
 - (b) The amendment therefore satisfies the definition of a basic amendment and does not reflect the characteristics of a complex or standard amendment.

CONFIRMED

OFFICIAL**15 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE****15.1 Notice of Motion - John Connell Reserve Transplanting Trees**

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 8:40pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 8:42pm.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

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

Question 1:

I just want to check with the DEWA communication – is that in addition to what the existing clearing permit is?

Response to Question 1:

Referring to the second last paragraph it says:

“This motion does not seek an immediate amendment to the clearing permit, as officers have advised this would likely cause delays at this stage.”

So it's just preparing ourselves for potentially needing to talk with DEWA about possible amendments should there be an issue with things like failure rates of the tree planting and those sorts of things.

At 8:43pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that a Notice of Motion had been received from Cr K Wheatland which would be distributed to Elected Members as soon as possible.

16 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)

Nil.

OFFICIAL

17 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil.

18 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil.

19 CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member confirmed Cr J Spanbroek was still in attendance electronically and declared the meeting closed at 8:44pm.

CONFIRMED