NOTES
AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30pm Tuesday, 11 August 2026

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

The Agenda Briefing Forum held 11 August 2026 was not live streamed to the community due to a technical issue.

An audio visual recording of the meeting was published on the City's website on Wednesday 12 August 2026.

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

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.

- **E**xcellence - Striving for the best possible outcomes.
- **P**articipation – **I**nvolving, collaborating and partnering.
- **I**ntegrity - Acting with honesty, openness and with good intent.
- **C**aring – Demonstrating empathy, kindness and genuine concern.

Our Approach

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

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

OFFICIAL

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.

AI Use Disclosure

This agenda, including any attachments, may have been prepared with assistance from the City's authorised AI tool. All content has been reviewed by an appropriate person to ensure it is accurate, complete, and suitable in for its intended purpose.

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

OFFICIAL

1 OFFICIAL OPENING

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, officially declared the meeting open at 6:38pm and invited Cr M McGoldrick to read the Acknowledgement of Country and advised those present of the Purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum, the Disclaimer, the Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility, the Audio Recording Advice and the *Privacy and Responsible Information Sharing Act 2024* Collection Notice.

2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

In Attendance

K Mair	Mayor
Councillors	Ward
Cr M Woodall *(until 6:38pm)*	Bull Creek - Leeming Ward
Cr J Spanbroek	Bull Creek - Leeming Ward
Cr G Barber	Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward
Cr G Panayotou	Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward
Cr N Robins	Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward
Cr S Hong	Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward
Cr C Ross	Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward
Cr D Lim *(until 6:38pm)*	Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward
Cr K Wheatland	Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward
Cr M McGoldrick	Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward
Cr S Green	Central Ward
Cr C Yorke	Central Ward

Officers

Ms G Bowman	Chief Executive Officer
Ms M Pickering	Director Community Development *(electronic attendance)*
Mr G Tuffin	Director Corporate Services
Mr J Coten	Director Environment & Infrastructure
Mr P Varelis	Director Planning
Mr M Yildiz	Director Legal, Governance & Risk
Mr G Ponton *(until 8:17pm)*	Manager Strategic Urban Planning
Ms K Bainbridge *(until 8:17pm)*	Manager Development Approvals
Mr D Burton *(until 7:58pm)*	Manager Healthy Melville
Mr G Edwards *(until 8:00pm)*	Coordinator Sport & Recreation Infrastructure Planning
Ms L Reid *(until 7:58pm)*	Manager Cultural Services
Ms C Newman	Head of Governance
Mr O Pugh	Governance Officer (Council Support)

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery 8

Apologies

Nil.

On Approved Leave of Absence

Nil.

At 6:38pm, the Head of Governance advised the Council of technical difficulties which resulted in the live broadcasting of the meeting being unavailable to members of the public. An audio-visual recording of the meeting was subsequently uploaded to the City of Melville Council Meetings YouTube Channel, which can now be watched. Agenda Briefing Forum - 11 August 2026

At 6:38pm, Cr M Woodall entered the meeting.

At 6:38pm, Cr D Lim entered the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS

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

Nil.

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

Nil.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Approved Deputations

CD26/73 Morris Buzacott Reserve Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project

- Mr D Ewart, Kardinya
- Ms M Magdy, Burswood

Approved Written Submissions

Nil.

5 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

5.1 Financial or Proximity Interests

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

Nil.

5.2 Disclosure of Interest That May Cause a Conflict

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

Nil.

6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

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 is detailed in the agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 August 2026.

At 6:42pm, 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 August 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, 18 August 2026.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

This item is detailed in the agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 August 2026.

10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

At 6:43pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that the following items had been identified as containing confidential attachments, and may be considered behind closed doors:

- C26/406 RFT252636 Construction of Canning Bridge Town Centre, Moreau Mews Applecross;
- C26/407 RFT252644 Supply of Canning Bridge Playspace, Moreau Mews Applecross; and
- C26/411 RFQ252661 – Supply of Security Infrastructure & Maintenance (WALGA)

12 PETITIONS

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 August 2026.

13 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS EN BLOC

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 18 August 2026.

OFFICIAL

14 REPORTS

14.1 Reports from Committees

Nil.

14.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer

Items Brought Forward

At 6:44pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item CD26/73 Morris Buzacott Reserve Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project for the convenience of those providing a deputation.

CD26/73 Morris Buzacott Reserve Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project

Deputations

At 6:44pm, Mr D Ewart gave a deputation which concluded at 6:55pm. At 7:09pm, Mr D Eward returned to the Public Gallery.

Deputation – Mr D Ewart

At 7:09pm, Ms M Magdy gave a deputation which concluded at 7:19pm. At 7:25pm, Ms M Magdy returned to the Public Gallery.

Officer Presentation

At 7:25pm, Mr D Burton, Manager Healthy Melville, Mr G Edwards, Coordinator Sport & Recreation Infrastructure Planning and Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 7:39pm.

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:

Elected Members requested a copy of Ms M Magdy's deputation notes, however this information can be found in the audio/visual recording of the meeting.

City of Melville Agenda Briefing Forum – 11 August 2026

Question 1:

When Council passed the Tennis Strategy there was a particular noting about these tennis courts needing immediate resurfacing and remediation works, yet for whatever reason that wasn't supported. I also find it unusual that it's not in the Long Term Financial Plan, and that we've already approved a $50,000 budget item for design. Can someone give me some answers about that, please?

Response 1:

There were changes in our approach following the Tennis Strategy and unsuccessful grant applications, and City officers could see where the courts had deteriorated, particularly with the lighting where we had to step in and do some further work.

OFFICIAL

In late 2024, we had a budget amendment put through to Council to get that $50,000 to undertake the design work, but at that point the roles and responsibilities were unclear. It was also unknown whether or not an investment from the City into this infrastructure would be financially sustainable for the club.

We've done financial modelling and also worked with the club around ensuring governance structures are in place and management licences were on the same page in order to set them up for success, hence there wasn't a specific allocation for this project. With that being said, we have had allocations in the Long Term Financial Plan for sports infrastructure renewal as a program.

The City has a range of strategies, and not everything that is on the strategy is able to be afforded and programmed in the year that it is identified. Notwithstanding, we have been doing a lot of work on refining capital planning and this project has been identified during the process, as such it is in the draft program for the 2027-2028 financial year. This identification means it will be coming to Council as part of adopting the budget for 2027-2028; the planning has been done for it, and staff are aware and have been working towards it.

Question 2:

If we approved the design work in 2024 and the City has been working on this both internally and externally with the club, why wasn't it included in last year's budget? How is a project with such immediate need like this overlooked?

Response 2:

It ultimately comes down to timing. Between doing the design process, working through costings and financial modelling and taking it to the City's Executive Leadership Team before being brought to Council's attention, we didn't have the information in time for the annual budget process. Effectively, the timing didn't line up because we had to be confident with the design, which we engaged the club on in particular, and costs. Additionally, we also needed to have confidence in the sustainability element surrounding the draft management licence and financial modelling, and that work wasn't complete until around May of this year due to various other challenges, including staff changeovers which naturally pushed progress back. We also had to work with the club who, whilst being hard-working volunteers, have full-time jobs as well, and this made trying to meet with them challenging at times.

Question 3:

Having regard to future proofing the lighting, does the design include a minimum level of lux it's trying to achieve?

Response 3:

Yes. The minimum standards within the Tennis Infrastructure Facilities Guidelines are 350 lux for club competition, so that is the standard that we'll be looking to achieve as part of this redevelopment.

<u>Question 4:</u>

Should this budget amendment decision be successful and start in 2026/2027, when will construction start and how long will construction be?

<u>Response 4:</u>

If Council approve the budget amendment at next week's meeting we will need to finalise the tender documentation, even though detailed design has occurred. Given the expected cost, the tender itself needs to come to Council, and we expect that this would hopefully line up between now and the end of the year with a view of starting construction at the beginning of 2027, which we estimate would take anywhere from four to six months.

<u>Question 5:</u>

Could a link to the PowerPoint presentation on this item which was presented at the Elected Members Engagement Session held on 28 July 2026 be sent to Elected Members prior to next week's Ordinary Meeting of Council?

<u>Response 5:</u>

A link to this presentation will be distributed via email to all Elected Members this Friday, 14 August 2026.

<u>Question 6:</u>

With regard to price setting for court hire in particular, will the new facility be consistent with other clubs throughout Melville, and in terms of monitoring the level of court hire that we've had in the past, do you foresee any impacts surrounding an increase in pricing?

<u>Response 6:</u>

The court hire fee itself was an assessment of other local like clubs, with the best example within our municipality being Bull Creek Tennis Club. We sought advice from them as well as other clubs in the broader metropolitan area which aligned to the similar model of Kardinya Tennis Club – that being they also had hard courts – and that's where we started setting that price. We have spoken with stakeholders including Tennis West at length about how pricing can be gently increased over time as opposed to doing so with one major increase, so as to not dissuade members of the public from using the courts moving forward.

<u>Question 7:</u>

There has been concern that approving this project could affect our other ones. Can officers confirm that proceeding with this project will not delay, cancel or otherwise impact any other projects scheduled for this financial year?

<u>Response 7:</u>

We will endeavour to give other projects that are already on tight timeframes a priority over this project. There will certainly be some staff working on this project whilst also working on others, but we will instruct them to prioritise the ones that are already on the program if that pleases Council.

OFFICIAL

Question 8:

Is there a court resurfacing budget that already exists for courts across the City that could be used to help fund the resurfacing and remediation of these ones?

Response 8:

We have allocations within our Long Term Financial Plan at the moment. As mentioned earlier, we are currently reviewing this and trying to get more specific in regards to certain sites and projects so we can then undertake the relevant planning that's required and get a more accurate figure.

What's different here is that this is not solely a resurfacing project, it's a full renewal. The resurfacing is generally just the top acrylic layer, whereas with this project we're looking at bringing out the sub-base, realigning courts, netting, drainage and all of those sorts of things. Those allocations become somewhat relevant when we actually work through preparing the draft budget, where we either keep those allocations in or sometimes use them to go to specific projects.

Question 9:

Could we get some information on how much of that budget per year has been spent on court resurfacing, and then whether there's anything left over from each year that could be allocated directly to this project?

Response 9:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final August 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda to be distributed on Friday, 14 August 2026.

SUMMARY

- The Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project is a priority action identified in the City's Tennis Strategy (2023), which confirmed the ongoing need for tennis infrastructure at Morris Buzacott Reserve and identified the Kardinya Tennis Club courts as requiring renewal.
- The project has progressed to a point where design is complete, a preferred management model has been developed and a draft management agreement prepared. Subject to budget approval, the project is ready to proceed to tender documentation and construction.
- The proposed scope includes the renewal of eight tennis courts, LED sports lighting, drainage upgrades, fencing, accessibility improvements and supporting infrastructure.
- The existing courts have significantly deteriorated and Pennant tennis can no longer be played at the site. Deferring the project would risk further asset deterioration, continued membership decline, loss of secured grant funding and increased construction costs, while leaving a geographical gap in tennis provision across the City's southern suburbs.
- The total project cost for delivery in 2026/27 is estimated at $1,393,217. The project has secured $104,953 in external grant funding, comprising $58,953 through the CITS Club Night Lights Program and $46,000 through the Tennis Australia National Court Rebate Program. Kardinya Tennis Club has also committed a $45,000 contribution, resulting in a City contribution of $1,243,264.
- Officers recommend a City-funded and club-operated model supported by a management agreement that establishes clear governance, reporting, maintenance and sinking fund obligations. Financial modelling undertaken with Kardinya Tennis Club and Tennis West indicates the arrangement is financially viable over a 20-year period.

OFFICIAL

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **In accordance with section 6.8(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, authorises by Absolute Majority the following new capital expenditure;**
    - **$1,393,217 Kardinya Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project**
2. **Amends the 2026/27 Annual Budget accordingly;**
    - **$1,243,264 transfer from the Community Facilities Reserve**
    - **$104,953 Kardinya Tennis Club external grants (CITS Club Night Lights Program and Tennis Australia National Court Rebate)**
    - **$45,000 cash contribution from the Kardinya Tennis Club**
3. **Supports the Kardinya Tennis Club to hold a management licence for the tennis infrastructure, subject to the execution of the drafted Management Agreement; and**
4. **Requests the CEO to execute the draft management agreement with the Kardinya Tennis Club, prior to advertisement of works tender for the Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project in 2026/2027.**

At 7:13pm, Mr P Varelis left the meeting.

At 7:20pm, Mr P Varelis returned to the meeting.

At 7:39pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

OFFICIAL

C26/406 RFT252636 Construction of Canning Bridge Town Centre, Moreau Mews Applecross

At 7:40pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item C26/406 RFT252636 Construction of Canning Bridge Town Centre, Moreau Mews Applecross for the convenience of those in the public gallery.

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:40pm, 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 is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252636 Construction of Canning Bridge Town Centre, Moreau Mews Applecross.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252636 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes (extract); and**
2. **Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

OFFICIAL

C26/407 RFT252644 Supply of Canning Bridge Playspace, Moreau Mews Applecross

At 7:40pm, the Presiding Member brought forward item C26/407 RFT252644 Supply of Canning Bridge Playspace, Moreau Mews Applecross for the convenience of those in the public gallery.

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:41pm, 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 is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252644 Supply of Canning Bridge Playspace, Moreau Mews Applecross.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252644 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes (extract); and**
2. **Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

OFFICIAL

Management Services

M26/96 Adoption of Proposed Cat Amendment Local Law 2026

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:41pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

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

SUMMARY

- At the November 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) the Council resolved to address undertakings requested by the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) within 12 months to amend the *Cat Local Law 2025.*
- At the April 2026 OMC, the Council resolved to commence a public consultation period from Wednesday, 20 May 2026 to 4.00pm on Thursday, 30 July 2026 (inclusive) for the proposed Cat Amendment Local Law, in accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- Subsequently, the City of Melville (the City) provided copies of the amendment local law to Director General (Departmental CEO) of the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety (DLGIRS) and invited public submissions. Copies of the amendment local law were available on the City's website during the submission period and could be viewed in a hard copy format at the City's libraries and Civic Centre.
- In total 6 submissions were received in relation to the City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026.
- Most submissions were not related to amendments proposed but instead raised broader community interest in stronger cat containment legislation. Noting this, the report recommends adopting the amendment local law without any further changes.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council by Absolute Majority Decision:

1. **Considers the public submissions (Attachment 1) received on the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026,* as required by section 3.12(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and**
2. **Resolves to make the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2); and**
3. **Authorises the affixing of the common seal to the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2); and**
4. **Authorises the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with section 3.12(5) & (6) of the *Local Government Act 1995* to:**
   - **(a) Publish the *City of Melville Cat Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2) in the Government Gazette; and**
   - **(b) Give a copy of the amendment local law to the Departmental CEO's as required; and**
   - **(c) Give local public notice of the publication of the local law; and**
   - **(d) In accordance with the Minister's directions, provide a copy of the local law and required explanatory materials to the Western Australian Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.**

OFFICIAL

M26/97 Adoption of Proposed Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:42pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- At the November 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) the Council resolved to address undertakings requested by the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) within 12 months to amend the *Fencing Local Law 2025*.
- At the April 2026 OMC, the Council resolved to commence a public consultation period from Wednesday, 20 May 2026 to 4.00pm on Thursday, 30 July 2026 (inclusive) for the proposed Fencing Amendment Local Law, in accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- Subsequently, the City of Melville (the City) provided copies of the amendment local laws to Director General (Departmental CEO) of the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety (DLGIRS) and invited public submissions. Copies of the amendment local law were available on the City's website during the submission period and could be viewed in a hard copy format at the City's libraries and Civic Centre.
- In total 4 submissions were received in relation to the City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026.
- Most submissions were not related to the specific amendments proposed. Noting this, the report recommends adopting the Amendment Local Law without any further changes.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council by Absolute Majority Decision:

1. **Considers the public submissions (Attachment 1) received on the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026,* as required by section 3.12(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*; and**
2. **Resolves to make the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2); and**
3. **Authorises the affixing of the common seal to the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2); and**
4. **Authorises the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with section 3.12(5) & (6) of the *Local Government Act 1995* to:**
   - **(a) Publish the *City of Melville Fencing Amendment Local Law 2026* (Attachment 2) in the Government Gazette; and**
   - **(b) Give a copy of the amendment local law to the Departmental CEO's as required; and**
   - **(c) Give local public notice of the publication of the local law; and**
   - **(d) In accordance with the Minister's directions, provide a copy of the local law and required explanatory materials to the Western Australian Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.**

At 7:42pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

M26/94 Common Seal July 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:42pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk responded to questions which concluded at 7:43pm.
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 I please have some more information about the appointment of a proxy for the Men's Shed?

Response 1:

This question was taken on notice and a response will be provided in the final August 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda to be distributed on Friday, 14 August 2026.

SUMMARY

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied for the period from 25 May 2026 up to and including 23 July 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 25 May 2026 up to and including 23 July 2026 for the Council's noting.

OFFICIAL

M26/95 Attendance at Perth South West Metropolitan Alliance Delegation to Adelaide

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:43pm, Mr M Yildiz, Director Legal, Governance & Risk was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- The Perth South West Metropolitan Alliance is planning a delegation to Adelaide from 16 the September until the 18th of September 2026 inclusive.
- The delegation will examine selected projects relating to innovation precincts, adaptive reuse, housing diversity, urban greening, river and riparian management, port renewal and heritage interpretation.
- The Alliance will cover the cost of up to two participants from each member local government.
- The cost of participation is covered through the membership fees paid by the City of Melville to the Alliance.
- Council approval is sought in accordance with the requirements of Council Policy CP-113 Attendance at Events Policy.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Approves the attendance of the Mayor and CEO as the City of Melville's representatives at the Perth South West Metropolitan Alliance delegation to Adelaide.**
2. **Notes that no further cost for participation is required from the City of Melville.**
3. **Notes that a report will be prepared following the delegation to summarise key learnings and matters of relevance to participating member local governments.**

OFFICIAL

Corporate Services

C26/410 Policy Review: CP-096 Naming of Roads, Parks, Buildings and Infrastructure

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:43pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 7:52pm.

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:

Do duel names need Council approval?

Question 2:

Is it the intent that all naming proposals come to Council for a final decision? If so can that be made more clear in the wording of the policy?

Response 1 & 2:

Yes, in both situations they would be required to come to Council. If you refer to the diagram on page 30 of the agenda, there's a decision tree there that shows the process. If it relates to a park or road, there is a more formal process through Landgate, whereas if it's a community building that Council would wish to name, then it would require a formal decision from Council.

Question 3:

Is this going to hold up the process if we want to name something?

Response 3:

No, it isn't expected to create any delays, it's a review of the existing policy.

Question 4:

Has our naming register been updated as well with this policy?

Response 4:

The Schedule of Names has now been removed from the policy on the basis that it was quite restrictive, and that there's more flexibility and opportunity for Council to come up with a list of names.

To reiterate what was said earlier however, if it were for a road or park it would then be required to go to Landgate for their approval. We generally come up with around four or five preferred names which then go to Landgate, after which they advise the City whether or not those names are available for use.

Question 5:

Regarding the Policy Procedures section of this policy, point one covers topographical features such as roads and parks, point three is other City assets such as buildings and infrastructure, and point four is internal spaces. Between points one and three there is a point two which covers instances where there is First Nations language or First Nations-derived names proposed. Does point two only apply to assets being named in point one, or does it apply to points one, three and four?

Response 5:

If we were to use First Nations naming, we would undertake consultation in line with relevant State and Landgate requirements. If it was just a building that the City owned and controlled, it would be up to the City to decide on the naming and the Landgate requirements do not apply.

Question 6:

So for the City's assets mentioned in points three and four, even if a First Nations language-derived name was proposed, there wouldn't be any consultation with First Nations groups?

Response 6:

No, there generally would be. If it's outside of a City asset, Landgate have their own guidelines in relation to that, but we have our own process for assets owned by the City.

Question 7:

If I wanted to get a park named I would have to get four names and take them to a City officer, who would then take those names to Landgate. Is that right?

Response 7:

No, that was just an example. We could have ten names, but what it ultimately comes down to is the names' availability. There are various reasons and criteria that Landgate uses to assess applications for naming of parks or roads.

Question 8:

The policy doesn't seem to include much of a process as to how these things take place. Could I have an explanation about why that is? Would it be appropriate to include more guidance about how the process takes place?

Response 8:

Generally the process is dictated by Landgate. Point three under the Policy Procedures section essentially states that naming activities which fall out of the Landgate framework are really an internal process which would be run by the City's administration and subsequently reported to Council.

SUMMARY

- The City of Melville (City) continuously reviews and improves policies to ensure they remain current with efficient best practices.
- This report is provided to repeal and replace CP:096 Naming of Roads, Parks, Buildings and Infrastructure which was last reviewed in December 2025 however, the Policy and Legislation Committee requested a revised version. The policy will also move to the Head of Property from the Executive Manager Governance and Legal Services.
- The Policy is proceeding directly to Council as the draft Policy has been presented to EMES in May 2026.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council repeal the existing CP-096 Naming of Roads, Parks, Buildings and Infrastructure Policy (Attachment 1) and adopt the updated Naming of City Assets Policy (Attachment 2).

At 7:52pm, Mr D Burton left the meeting.

C26/406 RFT252636 Construction of Canning Bridge Town Centre, Moreau Mews Applecross

This item was brought forward in the agenda – please see page 17.

C26/407 RFT252644 Supply of Canning Bridge Playspace, Moreau Mews Applecross

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

C26/411 RFQ252661 – Supply of Security Infrastructure & Maintenance (WALGA)

This item was held until the end of the meeting to be discussed behind closed doors.

OFFICIAL

C26/409 Investment Statements - June 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:52pm, 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 June 2026 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 30 June 2026.

C26/414 Schedule of Accounts Paid - June 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:53pm, 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 June 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 June 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 June 2026 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details June 2026 (Attachment 2).

At 7:53pm, the Presiding Member returned to item C26/409 Investment Statements - June 2026 to allow Elected Members to raise questions.

C26/409 Investment Statements - June 2026

Officer Presentation

At 7:53pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 7:56pm.

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:

All of our investments are pretty low risk, with many of them being in term deposits which leads me to think that we're trying to keep rates down. Why do we not increase our level of risk and get a better return on our investments?

Response 1:

We are restricted under legislation in terms of the type of investments we're allowed to undertake as well as the length of investments, with the maximum term being three years. Additionally, we are restricted to state treasury bonds and bank bonds.

Question 2:

So they have to be in low risk term deposits with banks?

Response 2:

Correct, we're excluded from any activities in equity market. You may recall the incident involving Grange Securities which prompted amendments to the legislation, resulting in it becoming quite prescriptive in the type of investments local governments can make.

Question 3:

Does that mean instead of putting our money in term deposits we could utilise the same money for alternate revenue plan for property?

Response 3:

That's correct, in terms of the Alternative Revenue Strategy we are looking at other available options where those funds could be used. As Council is aware, we have the Land and Property Reserve which currently has a balance of around $18.5 million and is set up specifically for that purpose. We are currently scanning the markets and looking for available opportunities.

At 7:54pm, Mr D Burton returned to the meeting.

OFFICIAL

C26/415 Statements of Financial Activity - June 2026

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:53pm, 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 unadjusted draft Statements of Financial Activity, Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position for the period ending 30 June 2026; and
- Presents the draft variances for the month of 30 June 2026 and recommends that they be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Notes the Rate Setting Statement and Statements of Financial Activity for the month ending 30 June 2026 as detailed in the following attachments:**
    - **Statement of Financial Activity June 2026 (Attachment 1); and**
    - **Statement of Comprehensive Income June 2026 (Attachment 2); and**
    - **Net Working Capital June 2026 (Attachment 3); and**
    - **Reconciliation Net Working Capital as of 30 June 2026 (Attachment 4); and**
    - **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity June 2026 (Attachment 5); and**
    - **Statement of Financial Position as of 30 June 2026 (Attachment 6); and**
    - **Summary Rate Debtors June 2026 (Attachment 7); and**
    - **Rates Collections Graph June 2026 (Attachment 8); and**
    - **General Debtors Aged 90 Days June 2026 (Attachment 9).**
    - **By Absolute Majority Decision approve the amendments to parking fees, as detailed in the Amendment to Fees and Charges 2026-2027 (Attachment 10).**
2. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the Budget Amendments, as detailed in the attached Budget Amendment Reports for June 2026 (Attachment 11).**

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

OFFICIAL

Community Development

CD26/72 Preliminary Scoping Report – Bon Scott Civic Tribute Feasibility Assessment

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:56pm, Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held in July 2025, Council approved Item 15.2 – Notice of Motion Honouring Bon Scott's Connection to Palmyra and Celebrating Local Cultural Identity, requesting a report outlining costs and resources associated with undertaking a feasibility assessment for a Bon Scott civic tribute.
- Estimated costs associated with a feasibility assessment include both internal staff time and external consultant support.
- No targeted community engagement on this proposal has been undertaken to date; however, limited unsolicited feedback has been received via the Customer Relations team.
- Alignment with the City's Discover Melville Plan has been a key consideration in assessing the proposal's strategic merit.
- The findings of the preliminary assessment have informed the officer recommendation regarding whether a feasibility assessment should proceed.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Notes the information in the Preliminary Scoping Report, and does not proceed with the feasibility assessment for a Bon Scott civic tribute; and**
2. **Requests the Chief Executive Officer to write to AC/DC's representatives and Bon Scott's estate manager advising of Council's decision and acknowledging their engagement with the City in relation to the proposal.**

At 7:57pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

OFFICIAL

CD26/71 Draft Morris Buzacott Reserve Site Development Plan

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:58pm, 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

- The City's Active Reserve Infrastructure Strategy (2020) identified the need for a master plan to guide the future development of Morris Buzacott Reserve, recognising the scale, complexity and importance of the reserve as a district-level sporting and community facility.
- In response to increasing infrastructure requests, planned City works and renewal pressures, the City prepared a Site Development Plan (SDP) instead of a full master plan, providing a more timely and targeted way to spatially coordinate future works across the reserve.
- The Draft SDP identifies current and future infrastructure proposals for the reserve, including some already progressing over the next 12 to 24 months.
- User groups were consulted through workshops and further review rounds, with feedback incorporated into the Draft SDP.
- The proposals have been assessed and ranked at a site level using the City's Draft Proposal Assessment Matrix, but this does not guarantee delivery.
- Several infrastructure proposals are already in development for realisation over the next 12-24 months, with most other proposals to be funded through various future capital works programs, subject to City-wide priorities.
- Council endorsement is being sought to advertise the Draft SDP for public consultation before it is finalised and returned to Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Endorse the Draft Morris Buzacott Reserve Site Development Plan (Attachment 1) for public consultation.**
2. **Requests the CEO to present a finalised Morris Buzacott Reserve Site Development Plan, having regard to the outcomes from public consultation to a future Ordinary Meeting of Council.**

CD26/73 Morris Buzacott Reserve Tennis Infrastructure Renewal Project

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

OFFICIAL

Environment and Infrastructure

Nil.

Planning

UP26/109 Myaree Business Area Master Plan - Consideration of Submissions and Final Adoption

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:58pm, 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 Myaree Business Area (MBA) is a major commercial and industrial area within the City of Melville (the City) and plays an important role in local employment and economic activity. The area, however, has not previously been the subject of a strategic planning framework.
- The preparation of a Master Plan for the MBA recognises the strategic importance of the area and identifies a range of opportunities and initiatives to guide its future function, accessibility, public realm and overall amenity.
- The preparation of the Master Plan has been undertaken in alignment with the City's Strategic Community Plan 2024 – 2030, including the outcome of supporting economic prosperity and resilient local businesses and communities.
- The MBA Master Plan is intended to provide a strategic framework to guide future planning and identify opportunities to improve the function, presentation and long-term future of the area.
- Draft recommendations were presented to Elected Members at an Elected Members Engagement Session (EMES) in July 2025, and the Master Plan proceeded to community engagement in November 2025. A progress presentation was provided at the EMES on 28 July 2026.
- Modifications to the Master Plan have been undertaken in response to community engagement, and the Master Plan is now presented to Council for consideration as a non-statutory strategic planning framework.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Adopts the Myaree Business Area Master Plan as a non-statutory strategic planning document.**
2. **Notes that the Master Plan has been updated having regard for community feedback.**

OFFICIAL

At 7:58pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

At 7:58pm, Mr G Edwards left the meeting.

At 7:58pm, Ms L Reid left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:58pm, Mr D Burton left the meeting and did not return.

UP25/94 Review of Local Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Development

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:59pm, Ms K Bainbridge, Manager Development Approvals provided an officer presentation which concluded at 8:03pm. At 8:03pm, Ms K Bainbridge and Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 8:07pm.

Officer Presentation – Item UP25/94

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

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

Question 1:

Are we deferring Local Planning Policy 1.9 or are we revoking that now?

Response 1:

With regard to Local Planning Policy 1.9, the City has advertised the revocation of that even though technically we're not required to, and we have maintained consisting application of that throughout this time. This route will just require a Council resolution to formally revoke the policy.

Question 2:

In the advice note from officers in relation to the review of Local Planning Scheme 6, Council has been told to not defer because establishing a position now will make us stronger in the event that changes are introduced which the City wouldn't agree with. Why are we not doing the same in this particular case? Why are we having two different approaches?

Response 2:

The aspects of the R Codes review relevant to Local Planning Scheme 6 in comparison to Local Planning Policy 3.1 are quite different. Local Planning Scheme 6 is in relation to widespread density changes across the City and alignment with the City's Local Planning Strategy, whereas the Local Planning Policy modifications relate specifically to sight lines for low density residential development within driveways and property boundaries. The R Codes announcement has specifically cited sight lines as an area for review, and as such the City has recommended that this item be deferred until we have clarity on that. The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage released the information on what aspects of the R Codes, aside from density, would be reviewed so that local governments would be aware in undertaking policy modifications. The Department of Planning has provided advice around that consistency to the City as well.

Further information was requested by Elected Members in relation to this matter - please see page 37.

SUMMARY

- At the May 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council, the Council resolved to advertise proposed changes to Local Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Development (LPP 3.1) and revoke Local Planning Policy 1.9 – Building Heights (LPP 1.9).
- Advertising was undertaken between 15th July and 15th September 2025 for the new Local Planning Policy 3.1. This period and the methods use exceed the requirements within Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015,* which only require notice published on website and locally circulating newspaper for 21 days.
- 22 valid submissions were received during the public consultation period, some which supported the changes to LPP 3.1 and others which objected to the changes to LPP 3.1. The summarised submissions and officer comments to those submissions are contained within Attachment 3 of this report.
- In response to submissions received during the consultation period, the City elected to make the following modifications to proposed LPP3.1;
    - Retention of modified deemed-to-comply street setback and setback of garages and carports provisions contained in the current LPP3.1;
    - Retention of modified deemed-to-comply primary street fencing provisions contained in the current LPP3.1, namely the retention of development standards for “gatehouses”;
    - Further modification of the garage width provisions to reflect sentiment;
    - Modification of additional housing objective P6.2 to include consideration of environmental considerations of development sites in response to concerns raised regarding the developability of sites within the Swan and Canning River Floodplain’s;
    - Modification to simplify the proposed building height; and
    - Other administrative changes to ensure alignment with the R-Codes Volume 1 Part B for all provisions
- LPP 3.1 (Attachment 2) is now being presented to the Council with recommendation for final adoption.
- The changes proposed from the advertised version do not introduce new content or provisions – namely to keep provisions which were proposed to be removed as part of the advertised version and minor administrative changes to align with the R-Codes. This means that re-advertising is not required.
- In May 2025, LPP 1.9 was approved by Council to be revoked, however implementation of the revoking resolution was not specifically listed within the resolution to allow for delay to so that appropriate building height provisions could be adopted by LPP3.1. If the officer recommendation is adopted, this will be finalised accordingly as per point 2 of the officer recommendation. Alternate options have been provided to provide status-quo option for Council.
- A notice to advise of the changes to the policy will be published on the City website and along with all submitters receiving notification of the final adoption.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Pursuant to Clause 5, Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* adopts the changes to Local Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Development (as detailed in Attachment 2); and**
2. **Endorses the publication of a notification of the changes to LPP 3.1 and revoking of LPP 1.9 as required by the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.***

At 7:59pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting.

At 8:00pm, Mr G Edwards returned to the meeting.

At 8:00pm, Mr G Edwards left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:01pm, Cr S Hong left the meeting.

At 8:02pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 8:02pm, Cr M Woodall returned to the meeting.

At 8:03pm, Cr S Hong returned to the meeting.

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

15 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE

15.1 Notice of Motion - Impact of Proposed State Planning Reforms on Local Planning Scheme No. 6

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 8:07pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 8:16pm

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 anything in this motion that the City isn't already doing, or anything that perhaps the City needs to give attention to?

Response 1:

A presentation was made to Council at the Elected Members Engagement Session last week, covering the comprehensive review and modelling that will be undertaken with regard to Local Planning Scheme 6 as well as the State Government reforms at a density level. The work being undertaken is reflected in this motion, and this motion is making that work publicly available and identified through a governance pathway. It's also setting timeframes with which the City had anticipated in any case.

Question 2:

Is there any purpose to this motion at all then?

Response 2:

Further to my previous response, it is reflecting the work that's being undertaken at the moment by the City's administration and making such work evident to the public, along with making timeframes known as well.

Question 3:

Will the additional communications and consultation with the community result in any changes to the time frames and timelines around the next phase of the project?

Response 3:

The City is absorbing those communications at the moment as part of the current engagement on Local Planning Scheme 6. We're making very clear to the community what aspects of the scheme review are impacted by the State Government R Codes reforms, and we'll continue to liaise with the City's Community Engagement team to ensure that the information is clear after the Local Planning Scheme 6 consultation concludes towards the end of this month.

Question 4:

This motion won't incur any extra cost or extra officer time, will it?

Response 4:

Many local governments across the metropolitan area that are undertaking this process at the moment are having to pivot and reallocate resources to respond to this change.

As part of the City's resource planning for the Local Planning Scheme 6 review, there will be additional resources, but those additional resources will be allocated through our general business planning and in response to broader State Government initiatives; we can't always forecast what changes and impacts there will be on the business. In consultation with the CEO and other Directors, resources are being pivoted accordingly, and an example of that is absorbing the changes as part of the current engagement.

Question 5:

Are you saying that this motion is going to necessitate additional costs to see it happen, or is it the State Government changes to the R Codes that will?

Response 5:

That's correct. Through the State Government's announcements, we've had to pivot and adjust our resourcing and allocation to the project to accommodate those changes.

At 8:17pm, Mr G Ponton left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:17pm, Ms K Bainbridge left the meeting and did not return.

At 8:17pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

16 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)

Nil.

17 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

At 8:18pm Cr M McGoldrick moved, seconded Cr C Yorke

That the Council considers the confidential attachments for the reports listed below behind closed doors, in accordance with section 5.23(4)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1995*:

C26/411 RFQ252661 – Supply of Security Infrastructure & Maintenance (WALGA)

This matter is considered to be confidential under section 5.23 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, 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 information contained in a tender received by the local government for a contract to the extent that the information –

(i) is a tendered price; or

(ii) a tendered methodology for calculating a price;

At 8:18pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)

At 8:20pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

At 8:22pm Cr J Spanbroek moved, seconded Cr K Wheatland

That the meeting be re-opened to members of the public.

At 8:22pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (13/0)

18 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

At 8:23pm, the Presiding Member advised that item C26/411 RFQ252661 – Supply of Security Infrastructure & Maintenance (WALGA) had been discussed behind closed doors.

At 8:24pm, the Presiding Member returned to item UP25/94 Review of Local Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Development to allow Elected Members to raise additional questions.

UP25/94 Review of Local Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Development

Officer Presentation At 8:24pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 8:25pm.

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:

With regard to the officer recommendation, which as pointed out earlier has changed, will that automatically be updated in the agenda or will it require action from Elected Members next Tuesday night?

Response 1:

There was an understanding that the item was deferred at the previous meeting, however we have received advice from Governance to state that it is a referral, not a deferral. While all the information in relation to this item is contained within the Officer Advice Note, between the Agenda Briefing Forum and the Ordinary Meeting of Council that report will be reviewed in consultation with Governance so that it is a formalised, revised recommendation with an associated report, and clarification of the misunderstanding between referral and deferral will be reflected in this revised report.

19 CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 8:25pm.