



City of
Melville

NOTES

AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30pm Tuesday, 10 June 2025

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

The City of Melville acknowledges the Bibbulmun people as the Traditional Owners and custodians of the lands on which the City stands today and pays its respect to the Whadjuk people, and Elders both past, present and emerging.

Notes to be confirmed at the next Ordinary Council Meeting

These minutes are hereby confirmed as true and accurate

Mayor K Mair

Date



Vision

Vibrant, Sustainable, Inclusive Melville

Mission

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

Values

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

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

Our Approach

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



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

Making A Deputation

A deputation is a verbal presentation by one or more members of the public on a matter to be considered at the Council meeting. Deputations are made at the relevant Agenda Briefing Forum, held one week prior to the Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Information on making a deputation is available on the City's website. [Request to make a Deputation.](#)

Public Question Time

You can ask a question at a Council meeting during Public Question Time. Information on how to ask a question can be found on the City's website. [Public Question Time.](#)

Complex questions or those related to matters on the agenda and requiring a response at the meeting are "questions on notice" and should be submitted in writing, by the close of business the Tuesday prior to the meeting.

Disclaimer

Any plans or documents in agendas and minutes may be subject to copyright. The express permission of the copyright owner must be obtained before copying any copyright material.

Any statement, comment or decision made at a Council or Committee meeting regarding any application for an approval, consent or licence, including a resolution of approval, is not effective as an approval of any application and must not be relied upon as such.

Any person or entity who has an application before the City must obtain, and should only rely on, written notice of the City's decision and any conditions attaching to the decision, and cannot treat as an approval anything said or done at a Council or Committee meeting.

Any advice provided by an employee of the City on the operation of written law, or the performance of a function by the City, is provided in the capacity of an employee, and to the best of that person's knowledge and ability. It does not constitute, and should not be relied upon, as a legal advice or representation by the City. Any advice on a matter of law, or anything sought to be relied upon as representation by the City should be sought in writing and should make clear the purpose of the request.

Audio-Visual Recording and Live Streaming

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

Purpose of Agenda Briefing Forum

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

Contents

1	Official Opening	7
2	Attendance and Apologies	7
3	Declarations by Members	9
	3.1 Declarations by Members who have not read and given due consideration to all matters contained in the business papers presented before the Meeting	9
	3.2 Declarations by Members who have received and not read the Elected Members Bulletin	9
4	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	9
	Approved Deputations	9
	Approved Written Submission	9
5	Disclosure of Interest	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	10
8	Applications for New Leave of Absence	10
9	Confirmation of Minutes	10
10	New Business of an Urgent Nature	10
11	Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed	11
12	Petitions	11
	12.1 - Receipt of Petition - Kearns Crescent Car Bays.....	11
13	Reports	12
	Items Brought Forward	12
	E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development.....	12
	13.1 Reports from Committees	19
	Policy and Legislation Committee Meeting held on 26 May 2025	19
	C25/280 New Council Policy - External Committee Members.....	19
	C25/281 Policy Review - CP-023 Procurement Policy	20
	UP25/71 Policy Review - CP-114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy.....	24
	13.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer	25
	Management Services	25
	Corporate Services	26

C25/282	2025 Annual Review of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments.....	26
C25/283	Common Seal June 2025.....	28
C25/284	Investment Statements for April 2025.....	28
C25/285	Schedule of Accounts Paid for April 2025	29
C25/286	Statements of Financial Activity for April 2025.....	29
C25/288	RFT242512 - Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform	30
	Community Development.....	31
CD25/45	Leeming Recreation Centre - Needs Analysis.....	31
CD25/46	Proposed Parking Station - Former Bridge Club Location (788, 790, 792 & 794 Canning Highway Applecross)	34
	Environment and Infrastructure.....	39
E25/71	Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development.....	39
	Planning	39
14	Motions with Previous Notice	39
15	Motions without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority)	39
16	Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public.....	39
C25/288	RFT242512 - Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform	40
17	Decisions Made While meeting was Closed to the Public	41
18	Closure	41

1 OFFICIAL OPENING

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, officially declared the meeting open at 6:30pm and invited Cr S 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 K Wheatland, Deputy Mayor

Cr T Fitzgerald

Cr D Lim

Cr N Robins

Cr S Hong

Cr G Barber

Cr J Edinger

Cr J Spanbroek

Cr M Woodall

Cr S Green

Cr T Lee

Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward (*electronic attendance*)

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Central Ward

Central Ward

Officers

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Mr M McCarthy

Director Environment & Infrastructure

Ms M Pickering (*from 6:33pm*)

Director Community Development

Mr G Tuffin

Director Corporate Services

Mr A Melville

Acting Director Planning

Mr J Bird (*until 7:54pm*)

Manager Natural Areas & Parks

Mr J Ahola (*until 7:54pm*)

Open Space Design Coordinator

Mr N Colliton (*until 7:54pm*)

Lead Civil Maintenance

Mr M Emery

Head of Community Safety

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Ms M Smith Poulton

Acting Senior Governance Officer

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery 4

Apologies

Cr C Ross Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

On Approved Leave of Absence

Nil.

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

- Mr L Rowe of Applecross
Item E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development
- Ms S Flis & Ms P Samson of Applecross
Item E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development

Approved Written Submission

- City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association
Item UP25/71 Policy Review – CP-114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

At 6:33pm Ms Pickering entered 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.

6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

At 6:34pm 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 information is detailed within the business papers of the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 June 2025.

At 6:35pm 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, 17 JUNE 2025.

8 APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVE OF ABSENCE

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 June 2025.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Nil.

10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

At 6:35pm, the Presiding Member advised that the following items had been identified as containing confidential attachments:

- Item E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development; and
- Item C25/288 RFT24512 – Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation Of A Customer Experience, Relationships & Request Management Platform.

12 PETITIONS

12.1 - Receipt of Petition - Kearns Crescent Car Bays

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 6:36pm Mr M McCarthy, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

A petition signed by 810 residents of the City of Melville and 350 non-residents was submitted by Mr Q Lau of Kardinya on Tuesday, 20 May 2025 and reads as follows:

We, the undersigned, all being electors of the City of Melville, respectfully request that the Council acknowledge and act on feedback from residents, businesses, and property owners and visitors of Kearns Cres and the surrounding community, and oppose the reduction in public carbays on Kearns Cres as part of the Kearns Cres Streetscape Upgrade.

We support the streetscape improvements of Kearns Cres but strongly oppose the reduction of public carbays.

Currently there is a deficiency in parking amenities and the loss of carbays will adversely impact businesses and individuals visiting the area, especially for those who are reliant on vehicles. (i.e. seniors, young families, and individuals with mobility needs).

The provision of public parking on Wilcock Street is not practical and will not negate the loss of carbays on Kearns Cres.

This petition is now presented to the Council for acknowledgement and consideration of actions to be taken.

That the Error! No document variable supplied. acknowledge the petition and request that a report be prepared by the August 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

13 REPORTS

Items Brought Forward

E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development

Deputations

At 6:37pm Mr L Rowe gave a deputation which concluded at 6:47pm. At 7:01pm Mr L Rowe returned to the Public Gallery. [Deputation – Mr L Rowe – Item E25/71](#) and [Hardcopy Information](#)

At 7:02pm Mr S Flis & Ms P Samson gave a deputation which concluded at 7:13pm. At 7:15pm Ms S Flis & Ms P Samson returned to the Public Gallery. [Deputation – Ms S Flis & Ms P Samson – Item E25/71](#) and [Hardcopy Information](#)

Officer Presentation

At 7:16pm, the Presiding Member advised that an Alternative Motion with Notice had been received and will be included in distribution on Friday, 13 June 2025.

At 7:16pm Mr J Bird, Manager Natural Areas & Parks, and Ms J Ahola, Open Space Design Coordinator provided an officer presentation which concluded at 7:21pm. [Officer Presentation – Item E25/71](#)

At 7:21pm, Mr J Bird and Ms J Ahola responded to questions which concluded at 7:54pm.

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:

If the parking was completely removed, what would be the cost savings?

Response 1:

Currently the City has estimated the parking with lighting to cost roughly \$350,000. If that were to be public open space, we anticipate that would be \$250,000 to \$300,000. Therefore there would be savings of approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Question 2:

If the parking was kept, what potential income could be earned from the parking?

Response 2:

The City has looked at the existing parking on the Moreau Mews site and took a daily average from the month of April 2025, which was \$175. If that data was extrapolated over the course of a year, it would come to approximately \$45,000 per year. Taking into account Saturdays and Sundays, where there is no charge for parking, and where restrictions are in place, the first hour is free and then a \$1.70 per hour.

Question 3:

Is it an option to retain some of the bays that are there currently to save some money?

Response 3:

There is, however the bays are in the middle of the park. So you would have public open space in the first two blocks, and then the car park, and another park on the other side so it doesn't function well. There are villas there at the moment which include the parking, however these will become part of the park.

Question 4:

Is it true there is a plan to widen the footpath opposite the potential park, if so why, and will this affect street parking?

Response 4:

Yes, the City would look to change the parking to become parallel to fit both the parking and a footpath the outside of the existing alfresco area. Currently, people need to walk through the middle of the shelter, which is causing conflict at the moment.

Question 5:

If the City did parallel, how many parking bays would we lose and what's the conflict?

Response 5:

Kinky Lizard has an awning over the top of their store, and the footpath currently goes through this awning. However, as there is the alfresco seating there, this causes conflict as pedestrians need to walk through this space to use the footpath. Changing the parking to parallel will mean we lose half the bays in that area, however we would gain those parking bays on the other side and could create a footpath and parking area inside the park.

Question 6:

Why are we giving Kinky Lizard extra area to possibly spill out further, and at the same time disadvantage other businesses, like the post office?

Response 6:

It is a bit of a compromise, however it is possibly the safest and easiest way to gain a pedestrian footpath. The other option would be that the City go back to Kinky Lizard and reduce the alfresco zones so that you can have a clear space through there.

Question 7:

Were the footpath costs included in the cost of the plans?

Response 7:

No, the footpath widening is a separate street works project.

Question 8:

As the plans have removed the basketball court, what is available at the park for teenagers and young adults?

Response 8:

Yes, the basketball court has been removed based on community feedback. What the City believes we will be able to put back in is seating areas, the activities from food trucks and events. There is still interested in having some kind of skateable elements in there, however are not exactly sure how that would fit at this stage and what that would mean.

Question 9:

If that's the case, then would taking out the parking altogether allow room for that? Also, how many more additional trees could you put there?

Response 9:

Yes, there would be more space for facilities like a basketball court if the City removed the car bay, however the response we got from the feedback isn't about the space, it was about the noise and potential disruption which could be caused by having a basketball court. Regarding the space for trees, it could accommodate approximately 15-16 trees.

Question 10:

With the original resolution of Council in 2023, there was a percentage of just public open space including trees?

Response 10:

The original motion resolved to forthwith progress conversion with 100% of the site to public open space, to include extensive tree planting, a children's playground and seating.

Question 11:

Can we get an indicative rates value for either apartments in Forbes or the Raffles?

Response 11:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided within the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda, distributed on Friday, 13 June 2025.

Question 12:

Would the City consider lobbying the state government and maybe using some of the stranded assets, some of the houses that live next door to the 20 meter high podiums, and use them as parking instead of the Moreau Mews site?

Response 12:

There has been some discussions previously about potential to look at land assembly in the area, and that's something that the planning team are still considering and will be a further piece of work that's done later. However, the City has met with the state government previously and they have clearly said that it's the City of Melville's responsibility to consider parking within the area and was pleased with the City's commitment to the Esplanade park and Moreau Mews site. The City is also currently working on a public open space strategy for the entirety of the Melville area, which is going to explore what public open space we have in every suburb and in the Canning Bridge Activity Centre area specifically.

Question 13:

What POS classification would this park be?

Response 13:

This park is quite a unique space, so our most accurate assumption at the moment would be a special classification. It is going to have the same assets as a neighbourhood park, but to a higher standard. The park will have a higher level of fit out and materials than our standard neighbourhood parks.

Question 14:

There is a lot more parking to square meter ratio compared to some of the parks we have in Melville. Normally for local parks you wouldn't see any parking on site?

Response 14:

This park is going to be a unique space which we have not designed before, so it will not function in the same way as a traditional park, and there will be a lot more activation. This will mean that we see a greater influx of people to the area so trying to compare it to another site is very difficult to do, and parking will be useful for these potential events and site activation.

Question 15:

How is it given the resolution of 100% public open space, that we ended up putting to the community a park which included significant parking?

Response 15:

Local individuals and businesses commented that they wanted to see adequate parking as part of any site redevelopment. In response, parking had been added to all three concept designs and went back to Council for consideration. This parking offers a number of benefits and improves accessibility for visitors from outside the area as well as the local community, and support for local businesses and events.

Question 16:

Regarding the basketball court – is there an opportunity to revisit this decision?

Response 16:

The removal of the basketball court was based on feedback the City received through the engagement process. We can add anything into the design if there is enough feedback or interest. The City has had examples from an environmental health perspective for existing basketball courts where there have been noise complaints. Unfortunately, it is an unstructured activity and due to the close proximity to the potential development of high rises near the park, it is a risk of noise complaints which will come to the City.

Question 17:

Where is the difference between the higher quality fit out of the play space and a regular play space?

Response 17:

This play space is very unique, and has a higher quality of finish and the City would look at more bespoke materials. We'd also look at bringing more of the Canning Bridge branding into the furniture so that the space begins to tie the whole precinct together.

Question 18:

Was any further consideration given to creative use of the road reserve?

Response 18:

The City has looked at this, however the timing of creating the park prohibits that from happening at the same time, however we will be looking at it and how it integrates in the future.

Question 19:

If this is considered, could the space become additional parking or additional landscaping in the future?

Response 19:

Yes, that would depend on what we actually ended up being able to do.

Question 20:

Instead of parking couldn't we have some kind of visionary attraction etc.?

Response 20:

This is currently being considered by the City, however there are no finalised plans in place.

Question 21:

Mr Rowe's deputation highlighted a key point as safety and the issue of having car parks on public open space. How would the City respond to those issues?

Response 21:

There are a lot of parks within the City which incorporate parking into the facility and next to change rooms and club rooms. There is always a risk with car parks and people using public open space. There are lots of ways that the City can address issues if these arise, such as putting fences up around the space etc.

Question 22:

Would it be fair to say the car park alignment could be used for a stage setup or that sort of thing with minimal impact to the green space?

Response 22:

Yes.

Question 23:

Which survey presented to the community is more accurate; the City's or the CRG?

Response 23:

The City's officers need to rely on the responses received through our own surveys, so it's not possible to say which is more accurate. It is noted that the playground in the City of Melville survey was highly popular and aligned with the original resolution of council, which was inclusive of a play space. However, the City didn't ask questions regarding specifically the safety elements brought up by the CRG, which is responded to in Response 22. Additionally, if there is an issue regarding safety of children, the design of the actual playground is not adjacent to the car parking in the concept design.

Question 24:

Is there any future consideration of potentially a wheeled sport element, and making it friendly for bikes or skateboard and learn to ride?

Response 24:

At a bare minimum, the footpath will be able to be used as a learn to ride, however the City is hopeful we can get more than that in the future.

Question 25:

What is the City's view on the meaning of 100% POS?

Response 25:

It is acknowledged there are different understandings of the definition of public open space amongst the community, the council and the City, however, from a land planning perspective, there is a common requirement to have car parking, public toilets and other facilities.

Additionally, it's acknowledged that if the community and the Council would like to see public events and place activation at the Moreau Mews site, they will need to provide parking management plans to support these.

Question 26:

Can the car park space be used as a multi-purpose area?

Response 26:

Yes, it can.

SUMMARY

- At the Ordinary Meeting of Council (OMC) held on 15 October 2024, the Council resolved to support the Community Engagement Approach and noted that a further report would be presented at the December 2024 OMC seeking approval of a budget to meet implementation costs for the Community Engagement Plan, fit out costs for 50-52 Kishorn Road as a temporary City office space and the demolition works for City owned buildings related to 31 Moreau Mews.
- At the OMC held on 10 December 2024, the Council resolved to fund the Community Engagement Approach and noted that the 3 concept plans prepared in response to initial feedback received would be presented to Council in March 2025.
- Community consultation was completed in November and December 2024 for the Moreau Mews Town Square project through the gathering of ideas via a range of engagement activities.
- Three concept designs were developed in response to feedback received and the second round of engagement was held April 2025.
- This item seeks Council endorsement of the recommended concept plan (Attachment 5) for the purpose of budgeting and proceeding to the detail design phase of this project.
- An alternative concept with no parking within the public open space area has also been prepared for Council consideration (Attachment 6).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- 1. Endorse the recommended concept plan for Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space (Attachment 5); and**
- 2. Adopts, by absolute majority decision, the budget of \$150,000 in the 2025/2026 Financial Year to proceed to the detail design phase of the project; and**
- 3. Endorse the progression to demolition of 50-52 Kishorn Street, as this building is no longer required for community or engagement purposes.**

At 7:00pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting and returned at 7:01pm.

At 7:17pm, Cr M Woodall left the meeting and returned at 7:20pm.

At 7:34pm, Cr G Barber left the meeting and returned at 7:35pm.

At 7:54pm, Mr J Bird left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:54pm, Ms J Ahola left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:54pm Mr N Colliton left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:54pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

At 7:55pm, Cr J Edinger left the meeting.

13.1 Reports from Committees

Policy and Legislation Committee Meeting held on 26 May 2025

C25/280 New Council Policy - External Committee Members

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:54pm Ms C Newman, Head of Governance responded to questions which concluded at 7:56pm.

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:

Number 3 in the policy statement states will they be paid the maximum meeting attendance fee for committee meetings and if the council requests they attend another type of meeting. Will this mean that they will be paid the meeting attendance fee for pre-briefing meetings?

Response 1:

No they would not. The meeting attendance fee is for meetings only. However, they may be reimbursed mileage if they come in on a different day or if they were required to pay parking. It is intended to cover those extra costs which may be incurred as a result of undertaking their role.

SUMMARY

- The *Local Government Amendment Bill 2024* makes provision that each local government must establish an Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee, and that this Committee is to be Chaired by an independent member.
- These provisions have not yet come into effect, however, the Council as part of its review of its Committee Structure has established an Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee in anticipation of the change to legislation and appointed two external members to take the roles of Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding Member.
- The *Local Government Act 1995* provides local governments with the ability to pay external committee members and meeting attendance fee and to reimburse expenses associated with their role on the Committee.
- In order to provide clarity and guidance on this matter, a proposed new Council Policy – External Committee Members is recommended for endorsement by the Council.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Council endorse the new Council Policy CP-130 External Committee Members (Attachment 1).

At 7:56pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

C25/281 Policy Review - CP-023 Procurement Policy

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:56pm Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 8:15pm.

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:

The changes to the policy appear to be relaxing some of the procurement controls. Is this appropriate given the recent OAG report and current climate?

Response 1:

These changes are intended to bring more practicality and efficiency for staff, so that they're able to comply with the policy. Looking at the first modification in relation to purchasing \$0 to \$1,000, this didn't exist previously and was up to \$10,000 meaning that any time staff were completing a transaction of \$100, they would be in breach of the policy. In regards to the OAG, this is a separate matter and there are a few other policies which relate to this issue. Any item over \$250,000 is still managed by legislation and we are not proposing any changes to this. Overall the policy is not intended to reduce any controls.

Question 2:

There appears to be an error in the OMC document, page 18 appears to repeat the same material presented on page 17.

Response 2:

This has been noted and will be updated in the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda distributed on Friday, 13 June 2025.

Question 3:

Concerns around the language used within the policy regarding the section on \$10,000 to \$50,000 and \$50,000 to \$250,000 range, where we've proposed to change it to "taking steps towards obtaining 3 quotes". This could be read as taking some steps, such as only getting one quote. Could this language be changed to something else such as "obtaining 3 quotes where possible"?

Response 3:

The policy still intends for officers to obtain 3 quotes, which will require that staff provide evidence that they have made an attempt to obtain the 3 quotes. However, the updated language provides practicality to staff in that they do not always receive responses back, so this language means that projects are not held up by the lack of 3 quotes received.

Question 4:

The policy also states “allow officers to obtain only one quote from an aboriginal business up to \$50,000”. Concerned around the lack of market testing where of there is an aboriginal business we’re intending to use we would still need to market test to make sure the quote is competitive?

Response 4:

It is not the intention to blindly accept a quote, there would still be a competitive process. However it is intended to provide flexibility for staff in obtaining more than one quote.

Question 5:

Can you expand on the policy that the City is working on to address the OAG concerns?

Response 5:

In regards to the OAG credit card performance audit, the City currently has procurement authorisation limits in place which control how much expenditure staff are authorised to incur. Additionally, we have credit card guidelines which spells out card holder responsibilities and security when staff are on leave, and restrictions on use. Card holders are required to sign an agreement stating they acknowledge these conditions. Currently, we’re also putting more information around the types of allowable expenditure.

It is noted that many of the findings did not relate to the City of Melville, particularly in relation to oysters and champagne, and there were six other local councils involved. The majority of the City’s findings were in relation to improvements as to some of the controls we currently have in place. The OAG audit found there was no case of misuse of the City of Melville’s credit cards by credit card holders, and all of our card holders have used their cards appropriately and in accordance with council policies and approved usage. Additionally, the Council receives monthly information on the card usage within the standard Finance council items.

Question 6:

You’ve stated there were no misuse cases within Melville, does this imply there were cases with other councils?

Response 6:

No, the City is not aware of any findings of misuse rather some relaxed conditions around the use of credit cards and whether some of the expenditure was appropriate in terms of the level of expenditure or type.

Question 7:

Regarding the section within the policy on \$10,000 to \$50,000 ends with “taking steps towards obtaining 3 quotes, outlining the specified requirements” – Does this need more information?

Response 7:

This would be the specifications of the service or good which we are looking for, which will vary for each occasion. The Policy is stating that we need to clearly outline what we're wanting to acquire in relation to the service or good, as part of the process to obtain quotes.

Question 8:

It also states that where possible, one quote should be obtained from a local disability enterprise or aboriginal business. The word "at least" has been taken out here, why?

Response 8:

This section is stating that if it's possible to gain a quote. There may be some products or services where there are not any providers available which meet this criteria.

Question 9:

The policy also states that only one written quote is required for purchases through WALGA, disability enterprises, aboriginal businesses, commonwealth or state government agencies below \$50,000. If only one quote is required, doesn't this unfairly exclude other companies?

Response 9:

This is in relation to social procurement, in terms of us supporting those particular types of agencies, in particular aboriginal or disability enterprise agencies, and making sure that we afford those agencies an opportunity. This does not necessarily mean that if they are not competitive that we would consider engaging their services.

Question 10:

Why then does it include commonwealth or state government agencies? Surely these agencies don't need more opportunities to grow their business?

Response 10:

No, this is not the intent. There are exemptions for commonwealth and state government purchasing agreements with local governments, and that's just providing a bit more flexibility to staff, that if it is one of these agencies that the option only requires one quote under \$50,000.

Question 11:

If we were looking to spend, for example, \$49,000 on a good or service by one of these agencies, ratepayers would still expect more than one quote for that amount of money, and at a minimum get a second quote to test the market. If there was a desire to change this section to require more than one quote, what would be the process for that?

Response 11:

The policy states that "obtaining more than one quote is recommended where possible, and the officer needs to be satisfied that value for money is achieved." So we are stating within the policy that they must be satisfied that that value for money is being achieved and it is not the case that getting one quote and accepting it is the intent.

Question 12:

Where are the supplies coming from? Does the supplier of the good provide evidence that those supplies are not coming from countries with slave labour etc.?

Response 12:

There is a section within the policy titled “6.2 Modern Slavery” which covers the issue raised and requires a declaration from the supplier, depending on the purchase being made. This section also outlines the City’s commitment to ensuring, as best as we can, that we are addressing these issues.

Question 13:

The policy states “the best value for money”, however often the best value for money may not always be the best product or service. What is the City’s response to that?

Response 13:

As a general rule, any substantial tender will have assessment criteria which is applied in the assessment panel, and that recommendation is also vetted through the contract and tenders assessment unit. There is a process in place to ensure that we aren’t just looking at value for money. In fact, generally, in the specifications value for money is just a consideration and not a weighted criteria.

Question 14:

If there is an interest in making changes to the policy, what is the way forward to do that?

Response 14:

The Governance team will consolidate the notes of the ABF meeting and assess the amount of work required to amend the policy. There may be an easy way to make the amendments, or it may be recommended that the policy is referred back to the Committee or Council meeting. Advice will be provided to Elected Members via distribution on Friday, 13 June 2025.

SUMMARY

- This report is provided to ensure the Policy is up-to-date, efficient, and compliant with Regulations, and that it is realistic in relation to expectations and market pressures.
- Assist with the implementation of the Council-approved Stretch Reconciliation Action Plan and uphold the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulation 1996 intent to support Aboriginal Businesses.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council adopt the revised CP-023 - Procurement Policy.

At 8:01pm, Cr J Edinger returned to the meeting.

UP25/71 Policy Review - CP-114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy

Deputations	At 8:15pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that a written submission was received in relation to this item, and is included in the notes. Written Submission – MRRA – Item UP25/71
Officer Presentation	At 8:15pm Mr A Melville, Acting Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 8:21pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:

Question 1:

What is the City's view on having a community reference group to review the policy?

Response 1:

It is the City's view that compliance actions is an administrative function and is undertaken in accordance with legislative requirements. Therefore, community involvement with that may not be beneficial in progressing those sorts of issues. However, the Council has established a Policy & Legislation Committee to facilitate those robust discussions. The policy is also being proposed in the recommendation to go out for community feedback, which provides an opportunity for members of the community to provide submissions and the policy will only be authorised should there be no objection received in response to the consultation.

Question 2:

If there was potentially a community reference group set up would that then fall under the same payment and meeting attendance fees as previous groups?

Response 2:

Yes, if the Committee was established under the Local Government Act, they would be entitled to those payments.

SUMMARY

- The City of Melville (the City) continuously reviews and updates policies to ensure that best practice is enacted in relation to decision making.
- The Compliance and Enforcement has been reviewed following Council resolution of 20 February 2024 UP24/31.
- The review aims to improve the City's compliance and enforcement outcomes following the deficiencies identified within the 2021 Weir Report.
- The previous Compliance and Enforcement Policy was adopted in June 2022.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That that the Council:**

- 1. Adopt the Amendments to Council Policy 114 – Compliance and Enforcement Policy for the purposes of public consultation for a period of not less than 21 calendar days; and**
- 2. Where no submissions in objection are received in response to the consultation undertaken, that the final adoption of amended Council Policy – 114 Compliance and Enforcement Policy shall be authorised by the Chief Executive Officer.**

13.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer**Management Services**

Nil.

Corporate Services

At 8:21pm, Cr T Fitzgerald left the meeting.

C25/282 2025 Annual Review of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 8:21pm Ms C Newman, Head of Governance provided an officer presentation which concluded at 8:23pm. [Officer Presentation – Item C25/282](#)

At 8:23pm, Ms C Newman responded to questions which concluded at 8:27pm.

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:

Why have most of the delegations have the “substantive amendments” section removed?

Response 1:

Yes, there is now a dedicated section with all of the substantive amendments listed at the end of the manual.

Question 2:

Can you elaborate on DA-007, and provide more detail on the sub delegation to apply to renewals and lease extensions?

Response 2:

There hasn't been any significant change with this delegation, but it provides the CEO the ability to negotiate leases and license agreements within certain parameters. Under section 3.58 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, there are requirements to advertise disposal of property to commercial entities but there are exemptions for not for profit entities, such as sporting clubs, community groups and arts and culture groups. So the delegation just allows for renewals and extensions to be negotiated with those types of organisations.

Question3:

Would that be for preliminary negotiations and then it would come before Council?

Response 3:

This is for terms up to 10 years, so anything over that will be presented to the Council for approval.

Question 4:

Regarding DA-131 Appoint Officers to Exercise Powers of Entry Under Sections 3.25-3.27 of the Local Government Act 1995, how many times has this been exercised and could you provide some examples of when it would be exercised?

Response 4:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided within the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda, distributed on Friday, 13 June 2025.

SUMMARY

- Delegations made under the *Local Government Act 1995* and various other legislation must, by law, be reviewed by the delegator at least once every financial year and listed in a register kept by the CEO.
- A review of all delegations, authorisations and appointments has been completed and it is recommended that the outcome of this review be adopted by the Council.
- Following the Council's resolution, the updated Delegations Manual will be uploaded to the website and provided to Elected Members for information.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council resolves by Absolute Majority Decision to:

- 1. Endorse the 2025 review of statutory delegations, authorisations and appointments; and**
- 2. Confirm the changes and edits to the instruments of delegation, authorisation and appointment, as contained in Attachment 1 - City of Melville Statutory Delegation and Authorisation Manual 2025-2026 MARKED UP.**

At 8:22pm, Mr M Emery left the meeting.

At 8:24pm, Cr T Fitzgerald returned to the meeting.

At 8:26pm, Mr M Emery returned to the meeting.

C25/283 Common Seal June 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:27pm Ms C Newman, Head of Governance was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

This standing Council report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied for the period from Wednesday, 19 March 2025 up to and including Monday, 19 May 2025 for the Council's noting.

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 Wednesday, 19 March 2025 up to and including Monday, 19 May 2025 for the Council's noting.

C25/284 Investment Statements for April 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:27pm Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate 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 April 2025 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 30 April 2025.

C25/285 Schedule of Accounts Paid for April 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:27pm Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate 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 April 2025 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts Paid be noted.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

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

At 8:28pm, Cr N Robins left the meeting.

C25/286 Statements of Financial Activity for April 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 8:28pm Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the Statements of Financial Activity, Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position for the period ending 30 April 2025; and
- Presents the variances for the month of April 2025 and recommends that they be noted by the Council; and
- Presents the budget amendments required for the month of April 2025 and recommends that they be adopted by the Council by Absolute Majority decision.
- The KPMG/OAG audit plan was presented to the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC) on 12 May. Both the interim and final audits of the annual financial statements are scheduled, with the final audit to be conducted in October. The final audit report will be presented to Council and the Minister for Local Government by 31 December.
- The Budget amendments required for the month of April 2025 and recommends that they be adopted by Absolute Majority decision of the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

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

C25/288 RFT242512 - Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform

As there was a request to discuss the confidential attachments associated with the report, this item was held to the end of the meeting to be discussed behind closed doors, please see page 42.

Community Development

At 8:29pm, Cr N Robins returned to the meeting.

CD25/45 Leeming Recreation Centre - Needs Analysis

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 8:29pm Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development provided an officer presentation, which concluded at 8:36pm. [Officer Presentation – Item CD25/45](#)

At 8:36pm Ms M Pickering responded to questions which concluded at 8:48pm.

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:

Will the Leeming High School be involved from the get go as a major stakeholder in the centre?

Response 1:

The school will be involved and have already been engaged with the work to date. They are also aware that the study is occurring and are waiting to see what the Council would like to do and have already gone ahead with some work in terms of the schedule of their requirements and thinking about what their options are depending on the Council's decision.

Question 2:

How do we achieve cost neutral while supporting a dying sport, such as squash?

Response 2:

Yes, both squash and indoor cricket were identified by the consultants as being a declining sport, but the point was made that because there is a lack of facilities for these sports, there is an opportunity to at least break even by continuing to provide a facility for those sports when there are no others within the immediate location. However, the next part of the project after the pre-feasibility study, and depending on the option that the Council would like to proceed with, are more thorough investigation of those sports will be included in terms of demand and marketing analysis.

Question 3:

In relation to each of the option and the pre-feasibility study, will it look at the potential revenue from each of those options in terms of covering the costs of any redevelopment?

Response 3:

The pre-feasibility stage will provide a very high level overview of those four different options, and then the very granular detail about the commercial return for each aspect of the centre will be done as part of the next stage once council has decided on which option they would like to proceed with.

Question 4:

If and when there is a plan for which of those options is preferred, will there presumably be an opportunity to seek state and federal grants?

Response 4:

As per the response provided in Response 3, the next stage after the Council has selected their preferred option, there will be an opportunity to explore external funding opportunities.

Question 5:

The presenters at the recent EMES made mention of the area being quite unique in the sense that the school is integrated with the rec centre. The presenter stated that's actually something being pushed for by the state government, are we capturing this and preparing to use it as leverage for support?

Response 5:

The City is in a really great opportunity with that co-location with the high school, and it was quite an innovative and creative development when created, and is still really popular. This is something that the Department of Education would like to pursue more of and so this could be a great role model for the department and state government going forward.

Question 6:

What is the cost of the study?

Response 6:

The study will cost \$21,000.

Question 7:

How will the development look from a community perspective with the school use, and still allowing use for the community?

Response 7:

At the moment there are definitely some improvements that if you were to upgrade the facility or even rebuild, that you would design differently in terms of the schools access and use. Particularly around the parts of the facility they use most being located closer to the school, as currently it's quite a distance from the school. In terms of usage, I think that the usage in terms of the daytime works well at the moment as it is quite contained for them.

Question 8:

In the needs analysis report, there was a 400 square metre learn to swim aquatic facility. If the existing building were to be upgraded, not renewed, where would the pool go?

Response 8:

The four options the City is looking at, or the two relating to that, would be to upgrade and enhance with the existing facilities, but if we were to introduce new facilities such as a pool, that would fall into the fourth category which is demolishing and building

Question 9:

Isn't the pool listed as optional, and will come out in the feasibility study?

Response 9:

Yes.

SUMMARY

- The Council have sought to understand the future role the Leeming Recreation Centre plays in the community, via resolution, at the December 2024 Ordinary Meeting of Council.
- This resolution requested that in June 2025, a Needs Analysis of the sites existing community facility provision (e.g. change rooms, toilets and storage facilities) and commercial opportunities that will support activation of the area (including but not limited to a café or restaurant) be presented to Council for consideration and further direction.
- This Report therefore provides Council with the Draft Needs Analysis which includes options for the future development of the site which can be further explored through a Pre-Feasibility Study.
- The Report also seeks Councils approval to proceed with the Pre-Feasibility Study.
- Should Council endorse the Officers recommendation, the findings of the Pre-Feasibility Study will be presented to Council in December 2025.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

- 1. Notes the Draft Needs Analysis prepared for the Leeming Recreation Centre (Attachment 1), and**
- 2. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to undertake a Pre-Feasibility Study of future options for the Leeming Recreation Centre contained within this Report.**

At 8:31pm, Cr S Green left the meeting.

At 8:33pm, Cr S Green returned to the meeting.

CD25/46 Proposed Parking Station - Former Bridge Club Location (788, 790, 792 & 794 Canning Highway Applecross)**Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 8:48pm Ms M Pickering, Director Community Development & Mr M Emery, Head of Community Safety provided an officer presentation, which concluded at 8:53pm. [Officer Presentation – Item CD25/45](#)

At 8:53pm Ms M Pickering & Mr M Emery responded to questions which concluded at 9:15pm.

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 the City anticipating people parking in the sandy areas?*Response 1:

It's likely to happen, it's currently happening now. So the signage will reflect that if they do park in the sandy areas is that the expectation is that they would have to purchase a ticket and failure to do so would be an offense.

Question 2:*Is the City going to be putting markings or infrastructure in place to show where people should be parking in the sandy areas?*Response 2:

The City's preference is for them not to park there, but if they do so, there will be signage up with the advice to purchase a ticket.

Question 3:*When will the marketing campaign occur for the sale of the land, and how long will the campaign be?*Response 3:

There is currently no date for the campaign at this stage. The process at this point is requesting proposals, 410 will be open for six weeks and 788 is proposed to be open for eight weeks. They will come back and be assessed by staff and a report presented to the Council to accept and progress any of the proposals. In terms of the timing, it will be a lengthy process which is likely to be next year.

Question 4:

If we're out for requests for proposals, it might not be prudent to wait for the result of that. So, what is the scope for us to wait until after the responses for the request for proposals come in?

Response 4:

From a financial perspective, there would be an income obtained from this. Secondly, once the City goes through this process, it may be a condition where it's still used as a temporary parking station up until the planning approval process for whatever the future land could be used for is completed, and the site handed over. Part of the rationale with the new signage to be installed will be making it clear that this is a temporary parking facility.

Question 5:

Can you comment on the practicality and logistics of having ticketed parking on the sandy areas for the sandy areas but not wanting people to park there?

Response 5:

This approach is from a customer experience perspective. However, we could consider disallowing the parking in that space, and it is noted that the City's preference is that they don't park there, but if they do, then they are required to purchase a ticket. When completing the use analysis of the space, we've seen a number of cars parked within the sandy area and the City is trying to be as pragmatic as possible with the space.

Question 6:

How many parking bays are in Bull Creek and Murdoch?

Response 6:

There are 613 bays available at the Bull Creek station, and 1,800 bays at Murdoch.

Question 7:

Can you explain the four hours free, and then after they pay, when across the road there is a three hour free zone, so why is there a differential in the payments?

Response 7:

The four hour free verge nearby is really to cater for people who live nearby, and we don't want to impact them by this proposal, who may have contractors arriving and using the verge nearby. However, if they are using the verges as overflow or for commuter use, then we're trying to make sure that they pay the same fee.

Question 8:

Will people be able to get a physical ticket?

Response 8:

The parking will utilise EasyPark, which is already used across the City. The City will put up a sign with a unique identifying number for the parking, and a QR code which people can use to download and pay for parking. The people using the parking station are regular commuters and are going to the same place each day. Therefore the intent is not to create a new parking destination for people, and are trying to target the people who may be using it already. Using this we're also not increasing our capital expense as it is not a long term parking solution.

Question 9:

What is the \$8,000 to \$10,000 for the implementation actually for?

Response 9:

This will be used for the line marking and infrastructure, as the current parking on the site has degraded so this will improve visibility of the parking bays, and will also be used for the signage within the area.

Question 10:

Is there a cheap solution to improve the condition of the sandy area?

Response 10:

The City does not currently have any indicative pricing for this subject site. However, previous experience suggest that once the City road base it, we have to look at potentially asphalt as the road base gets turned up quite quickly. Therefore, it is recommended that the Council look at what the longer term plan of the site is before starting to increase the capital requirements of the site.

Question 11:

Regarding the site's proximity to the Riseley Street Activity Centre, is the Riseley parking all day parking?

Response 11:

It is a mix of private and City parking, and we are working with the businesses in that area to try and consolidate parking. Regarding the City's parking and all day parking, this question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided within the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda, distributed on Friday, 13 June 2025.

Question 13:

Is the City going to look at other areas of the city where commuters might make the most of free parking?

Response 13:

Yes, the City is actively completing an ongoing review of the City's parking areas, especially around the Canning Bridge area. The Council will see over the next year a number of items coming to the Council in this space.

Question 14:

Is there a way to maximise return without formalising the parking, such as a coin machine or parking meter, and making it more of a temporary option?

Response 14:

The City wouldn't necessarily need a parking meter in there to maximise the potential return, as people who park there are regular users of the facility. So limiting our capital expense will maximise our return, as currently we can't confirm the duration of this solution.

Question 15:

Is the City calling the site a temporary parking area in the signage?

Response 15:

Yes, the signage will be clear that the area is a temporary parking station, and if possible may include some time frames associated with the change of land use in the future.

Question 16:

If the parking overflows to the side street, do you have a plan to stop that?

Response 16:

The City's intention is not to advertise this space as a destination parking space. However, if traffic and parking issues arose, the City would be able to explore this.

SUMMARY

- The subject site at 788, 790, 792, and 749 Canning Highway was formerly occupied by the Melville Bridge Club and now remains undeveloped.
- The on-site car park (approximately car bays 40 bays) remains in use by commuters due to its proximity to Transperth bus services.
- The site provides an opportunity to generate revenue and ensure consistency across the City's parking infrastructure.
- Recommended initial flat daily rate of \$5 per day.
- Estimated implementation cost is approximately \$8,000–\$10,000 and potential annual revenue of approximately \$45,000 with an upside of \$50,000 at full occupancy.
- To establish the location as a Parking Station, the City requires a Council Resolution in accordance with the City of Melville Parking Local Law 2023.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

- 1. Approves the designation of the car park located at 788, 790, 792 and 749 Canning Highway as a paid parking station under the City of Melville Parking Local Law 2023; and**
- 2. Approves the designation of metred zones on the subject sites adjacent verges of Tain Street and Simpson Street Applecross; and**
- 3. Approves an initial daily flat rate of \$5 per vehicle.**

At 9:13pm, Cr K Wheatland left the meeting.

Environment and Infrastructure**E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development**

This item was brought forward for the convenience of those providing a deputation. Please see page 12.

Planning

Nil.

14 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE

Nil.

15 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)**16 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC****COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

At 9:15pm Cr S Green moved, seconded Cr J Edinger

That the Council close the meeting to members of the public and go behind closed doors.

At 9:15pm the Presiding Member declared the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)

C25/288 RFT242512 - Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 9:15pm 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. 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:

Can we get further information or a breakdown of the staff costs / resourcing regarding the contract?

Response 1:

This question was taken on notice, and a response will be provided on the Elected Members Portal on Friday, 13 June 2025.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform.

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council by Absolute Majority Decision:**

- 1. Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT242512 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes; and**
- 2. Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**
- 3. Noting award of this Contract is subject to reaching an agreement on the final Contract Terms.**

At 9:15pm, Cr T Lee left the meeting.

At 9:17pm, Cr K Wheatland returned to the meeting.

At 9:18pm, Cr T Lee returned to the meeting.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

At 9:26pm Cr K Wheatland moved, seconded Cr T Fitzgerald

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

At 9:26pm the Presiding Member declared the motion

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (12/0)

17 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

At 9:27pm, the Presiding Member advised that item C25/288 RFT242512 - Restricted Tender Supply & Implementation of a Customer Experience, Relationship & Request Management Platform was discussed behind closed doors.

18 CLOSURE

At 9:27pm, the Presiding Member advised of the following late items to be included in the final Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda to be distributed on Friday, 13 June 2025:

- Item M25/52 City of Melville Corporate Business Plan 2025-2029 – Annual Review; and
- Item C25/287 Consideration and Adoption of The 2025-2026 Budget

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member confirmed Cr S Hong was still in attendance electronically and declared the meeting closed at 9:28pm.