



City of
Melville

NOTES

AGENDA BRIEFING FORUM

6:30pm Tuesday, 10 February 2026

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

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

Notes to be confirmed at the next Ordinary Council Meeting

These minutes are hereby confirmed as true and accurate

Presiding Member

Date



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
	6.1.1 Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek	10
	6.1.2 Mr S French, Ardross	11
	6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting	14
	6.2.1 Mr S French, Ardross	14
	6.3 Questions Taken on Notice at Previous Meeting	14
7	Awards and Presentations	14
8	Applications for New Leave of Absence	15
9	Confirmation of Minutes	15
10	New Business of an Urgent Nature	15
11	Identification of Matters for which Meeting May Be Closed	15
12	Petitions	16
	12.1 Receipt of Petition - DAP-2025-5 - 34-36 St Michael Terrace, Mount Pleasant.....	16
13	Adoption of Recommendations En Bloc	17
14	Reports	17
	14.1 Reports from Committees	17
	14.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer	17
	Management Services	17
	M26/63 Common Seal January 2026.....	17
	M26/64 City of Melville Annual Report for 2024 - 2025 - Corrections	18

M26/67	Response to the Annual General Meeting of Electors 2026 Motions Carried	20
Corporate Services		22
C26/355	2025-2026 Mid Year Budget Review	22
C26/356	Investment Statements for December 2025	23
C26/357	Schedule of Accounts Paid for December 2025	24
C26/358	Statements of Financial Activity for December 2025	25
C26/359	RFT252622 Supply of Tree Maintenance	26
C26/360	Investment Statements for November 2025	27
C26/361	Schedule of Accounts Paid for November 2025	27
Community Development.....		28
Environment and Infrastructure.....		28
E26/87	Adoption of New Council Policy - CP-129 Personal Memorials in Public Open Space	28
E26/88	RFT252611 Supply of Plumbing Services	31
E26/89	RFT252617 Supply of Electrical Maintenance Services	31
Planning		32
UP26/99	Review of the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan	32
UP26/100	Recruitment and Selection Report - City of Melville Design Review Group.....	39
UP26/101	Proposed Scheme Amendment - DA-2025-947 - Public Open Space to Residential R60 - Lot 12759 (No. 33) Worley Street, Willagee (Winnacott Reserve) Lot 50 (40-44) Worley Street, Willagee (Weeronga retirement village)	40
15	Motions with Previous Notice	43
16	Motions without Previous Notice (approval by absolute majority)	43
17	Matters for Which Meeting was Closed to the Public.....	43
18	Decisions Made While meeting was Closed to the Public	43
19	Closure	43

1 OFFICIAL OPENING

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

2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

In Attendance

K Mair

Mayor

Councillors

Cr M Woodall (*from 6:31pm*)

Cr J Spanbroek

Cr G Barber

Cr G Panayotou

Cr N Robins

Cr S Hong (*from 6:31pm*)

Cr C Ross

Cr D Lim

Cr K Wheatland

Cr S Green

Cr C Yorke

Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bull Creek - Leeming Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bicton - Attadale - Alfred Cove Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Bateman - Kardinya - Murdoch Ward

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward (*electronic attendance*)

Applecross - Mount Pleasant Ward

Palmyra - Melville - Willagee Ward

Central Ward

Central Ward

Officers

Ms G Bowman

Chief Executive Officer

Mr G Tuffin

Director Corporate Services

Mr J Coten

Director Environment & Infrastructure

Mr P Varelis

Director Planning

Mr M Yildiz

Director Legal, Governance & Risk

Ms M Pickering

Director Community Development (*electronic attendance*)

Mr G Ponton

Manager Strategic Planning

Ms J Ahola (*until 7:15pm*)

Acting Manager Natural Areas and Parks

Ms E Tallis (*until 7:15pm*)

Acting Open Space Design Coordinator

Ms C Newman

Head of Governance

Ms M Smith Poulton (*until 7:07pm*)

Lead Governance

Mr S Curulli

Governance Officer (Council Support)

Mr O Pugh

Governance Officer (Council Support)

At the commencement of the meeting:

Public Gallery 2

Apologies

Nil.

On Approved Leave of Absence

Nil.

At 6:31pm, Cr M Woodall entered the meeting.

At 6:31pm, Cr S Hong 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

Nil.

Approved Written Submission

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 6:33pm, the Presiding Member opened Public Question Time.

6.1 Questions Received with Notice

6.1.1 Mr G Waugh, Bull Creek

Preamble to Question 1:

Proposed Policy CP-129 has been put to Council without its supporting procedure required at s5.41(2)(c)(i) of the Local Government Act. Without its procedure Council has no way of knowing if or how the policy will be applied. of CP-129 is noted at Point 3 as incomplete. As a part policy it will create future conflict needing remedial work to retrospectively address areas not currently addressed. An example conflict arising through piecemeal management of existing policy is evident in response 2, P12 of the Elector's General Meeting Minutes with both the Governance Committee and ARIC to be non-compliant.

Question 1:

Melville Shadow Council asks the City of Melville Council place a moratorium on adopting further fragmented policy bits like CP-129 into the City's existing unsustainable piecemeal system?

Preamble to Question 2:

The City has around 130 policies. Exact number and identification are unknown due to the poor system used on the City's webpages. Some are saved to their title. Some are saved to their policy record number and some are saved with meeting minutes. An enormous amount of time is wasted researching difficult to find current versions of important records. The current publishing system obstructs functional compliance.

Question 2:

Melville Shadow Council ask the City of Melville Council to have the online publishing of all existing policies, codes of conduct, procedures and other important reference records system cleaned and records resaved to a recognised record identification system policy, including linking through a tabular reference with approval dates and next review due dates?

Preamble to Question 3:

While the attached example requires updating for changes in legislation its concept remains sound. A system as proposed by the example would ensure consistency and integrity across City Policies, would make currency maintenance simple, would provide clarity for the community and significantly reduce Councils periodic review workloads. Such a simple system can be developed by Melville Shadow Council and gifted to the City of Melville Council thus saving Council hundreds of thousands currently unnecessarily expended.

Question 3:

Melville Shadow Council ask the City of Melville Council to initiate and engage in the development of a uniform policy "system / manual" integrating all policy into a singular format similar to that described in the attached example?

Response to Questions 1 to 3:

As the City is not aware of the Shadow Council group, its legal status, the membership or what the group's purpose purports to be, the City provides this response to Mr Waugh directly to ensure that the City's response is readily and publicly available.

The City is currently developing a comprehensive Policy Framework that addresses many of the issues identified, will ensure compliance with the Local Government Act and applies the principles of good governance. The Policy Framework will provide clear guidance on the:

- Distinction between the role of Council to provide clear strategic policy direction was opposed to the CEO's executive function role to manage the administrative function
- Development and systematic review of policies
- The approval and governance processes
- A consistent, corporate approach to policy management and ongoing evaluation.

It is expected that the draft Policy Framework will be presented to the Council for consideration in due course. Once endorsed, the Policy Framework will be available on the City's website, and the City will commence a project to assess and review all City of Melville policies against the principles outlined in the Framework.

6.1.2 Mr S French, ArdrossPreamble to Questions 1 to 4:

The City has a motion before it for debate and decision at the next ordinary meeting concerning capacity issues at Applecross Senior High School (ASHS), to which currently proposed Local Planning Scheme 6 density increases will add significant additional pressure.

It is a detailed motion that reflects the scale of the problem at hand and hopes to assist the City in recognizing the size of the overcapacity problem and action the City needs to take. However - new information has just come in, with Applecross SHS confirming its numbers have jumped yet again - 8 years in a row - with 330 year 7 enrolments following the departure of 276 Year 12's last year. That's a net increase of 54 students last week and with further requests likely still to come. Only 6 more are needed to hit the 61 average year-on-year.

This means 2,016 students right now at the school for a school-built capacity of 1,563 (excluding transportables). The Member for Bateman has also announced plans for Stage 1 expansion - a new learning hub including 8 classrooms (when built that's +240 students capacity based on the maximum students per classroom - a small fraction only of the planned total increase to 2500 students built capacity).

So 2,500 future capacity (not built yet) less 2,016 students there right now = 484 students future capacity remaining - right now. At the current rate of increase - which does not allow for any developments already approved or in progress, including right here along Almondbury Rd, the entire future capacity will be consumed within 8 years - so 2034 - at the latest.

This means school capacity to accommodate the City's proposed LPS6 density increases is practically zero. Yet, the City is proposing to put 51% of LPS6 density increases in the Applecross intake area. This is not sustainable and conflicts with practically every value written on the front of your agenda for this very meeting.

Question 1:

My question to you, is - what have you actually been told about this in your briefings?

Response to Question 1:

The impacts of the Local Planning Scheme 6 review proposals on infrastructure capacity, including schools, are currently being investigated. Updated information on school capacity, reflecting the recently announced improvements and incorporating advice from the Department of Education as the lead agency for school planning, will be presented as part of upcoming Elected Member briefings.

Question 2:

Do you understand just how big this problem is?

Response to Question 2:

Understanding how the Local Planning Scheme 6 review proposals affect infrastructure capacity, including schools, is a core part of the review program. Information on the scale of these impacts, along with options to respond to or avoid them, will continue to be provided to Elected Members to support informed decision-making.

Question 3:

If nothing, what will you elected members do to inform yourselves of this significant and obvious problem concerning the school, and what the consequences of the LPS6 proposals really are?

Response to Question 3:

Investigating how the Local Planning Scheme 6 review proposals affect infrastructure capacity, including schools, is a key component of the review program. This work includes information and feedback from school planners and demographers within the Department of Education. The findings from these investigations will be provided to Elected Members to support informed decision-making.

Question 4:

And lastly.... do you need help to go through the numbers

Response to Question 4:

Your assistance in highlighting school capacity issues is appreciated. The review of Local Planning Scheme 6 will include detailed investigation of this matter, and the findings will inform future decision-making.

Preamble to Questions 1 and 2

With respect to The Melville City Centre Structure Plan, (now referred to as the Booragoon [Melville City Centre] Precinct Plan), statutory ten-yearly review - and specifically the early engagement you propose with DPLH, Minister for Planning and the WAPC - given the appalling outcome determined by the States Development Assessment Panel for DAP-2024-13 for No.3 Bragor Place, 17 and 19 Bragor Almondbury Road.

For context you will recall this development application was for a 7-storey building in excess of the 4 storey limit set for the frame precinct along Almondbury Road. This was comprehensively rejected by the community and by the City. Yet, despite this and:

- *Despite over 30 detailed submissions from the public including irrefutable lines of evidence (including photographic evidence)*
- *Despite objections from Councillors Barber and Lim (thank you though for trying) the DAP overturned the Councils decision - largely on the grounds of 'an exemplary design'.*

It would seem at this time both community and City views are ignored and that a dangerous precedent has now been set for the sky's the limit along Almondbury Road.

My question is as follows in two parts:

Question 1:

How can built form outcomes follow a performance-based approach, with height and massing guided by context, community expectation and design quality rather than blanket zoning be realistically achieved given the appalling outcome determined by the States Development Assessment DAP-2024-13 for No.3 Bragor Place, 17 and 19 Bragor Almondbury Road?

Response to Question 1:

The review will establish a more refined and contemporary planning framework by strengthening the focus on design quality, community expectations, economic feasibility and the supporting infrastructure required for more intensive development. In doing so, it also directs key concerns to the State Government, through early engagement with the Minister for Planning and the Chair of the WAPC, to ensure that issues raised by the community and Council are understood at the level where final decisions on density and activity centre planning are ultimately made.

Question 2:

If you do agree a performance-based approach, would a Development Assessment Panel actually take any notice of it?

Response to Question 2:

The review is designed to ensure that development control guidelines are realistic, evidence-based and directly linked to the readiness of supporting infrastructure. By strengthening the underlying technical basis for built-form and infrastructure expectations, the approach seeks to maximise alignment between the City's intended outcomes and the decision-makers who ultimately determine major development proposals, including Development Assessment Panels. Engaging early with the Minister for Planning and the WAPC Chair is also intended to ensure these expectations are understood at the State level, where final decisions on activity centre planning and development controls are made.

6.2 Questions Received at the Meeting

6.2.1 Mr S French, Ardross

Question 1:

What level of regard will the State have to that plan once it's put in place?

Response to Question 1

Should the Activity Centre Plan Review follow the due process outlined within the Planning Regulations, it will be a key guiding document in making decisions. In 2015 when the Planning Regulations changed, structure plans, precinct plans and the like became due regard documents, meaning decision makers are not bound to the limits of those plans and that they are to have regard for those plans and all other matters that form part of the planning assessment before them. The limits within any plan, precinct plan or activity plan will be the limit that's stated and determined by Development Assessment Panels because in 2015 the regulations changed for those documents to be due regard documents.

Question 2:

Are you aware that the Department of Education has been documented to have consistently underestimated student numbers at the school over a significant number of years? And when you refer in your agenda briefing to discussion with the Department of Education planners and demographers, with the demographers are you referring to the ID property organisation who are based right next door in Collingwood, Melbourne and who today have on their website an article about how falling birth rates impact future demand for schools and services, and do you have confidence in those sources of information?

Response to Question 2:

This question was taken on notice in accordance with section 6.8(1)(b) and 6.9(c) of the *City of Melville Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Local Law 2022*. The question and response will be provided in the March 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda.

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, 17 February 2026.

At 6:53pm, 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 February 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, 17 February 2026.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

This item is detailed in the agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 February 2026.

10 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

11 IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

At 6:54pm, the Presiding Member advised the Council that the following items had been identified as containing confidential attachments:

- C26/359 RFT252622 Supply of Tree Maintenance; and
- E26/88 RFT252611 Supply of Plumbing Services; and
- E26/89 RFT252617 Supply of Electrical Maintenance Services; and
- UP26/100 Recruitment and Selection Report – City Of Melville Design Review Group

12 PETITIONS

12.1 [Receipt of Petition - DAP-2025-5 - 34-36 St Michael Terrace, Mount Pleasant](#)

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 6:55pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning provided an officer presentation which concluded at 6:56pm. At 6:57pm, Mr P Varelis responded to questions which concluded at 6:58pm.

[Officer Presentation – 12.1](#)

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

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

Question 1:

I'm just wondering if the director can actually advise what the reasoning was for not supporting it?

Response to Question 1:

The main reasons for refusal related to amenity within the residential zone, and while traffic as a technical reason was not an identified reason for refusal, the impacts of traffic to amenity were part of the concerns that were raised. That was the primary reason for refusal in consistency with the scheme and its provisions around the amenity expectations for the residential zone and also provisions within the City's Local Planning Policy regarding childcare centres and their intensity within the residential zone.

13 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS EN BLOC

This item will be dealt with at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday, 17 February 2026.

14 REPORTS

14.1 Reports from Committees

Nil.

14.2 Reports of the Chief Executive Officer

Management Services

M26/63 Common Seal January 2026

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 6:58pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance was available to answer questions on the matter.

Disclosure of Interest Nil.

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

SUMMARY

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville Common Seal has been applied for the period from 19 November 2025 up to and including 23 January 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 Wednesday, 19 November 2025 up to and including Friday, 23 January 2026 for the Council's noting.

M26/64 City of Melville Annual Report for 2024 - 2025 - Corrections

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 6:59pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance responded to questions which concluded at 7:01pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>Regarding the presentation of the ratios, why are they not presented in a consistent format?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>The opportunity to strengthen the presentation of ratio information is acknowledged and will be reviewed and improvements made in future Annual Reports.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Regarding the Annual Report, more specifically the page that reports Councillor attendance at committee meetings, I do not believe it clearly defines which committee each Councillor is on. Could that perhaps be looked at?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>Absolutely we can make sure that there is further clarity provided in that. There is a statutory requirement for certain information to be provided but any further clarification is not an issue.</p>

SUMMARY

- At the Special Meeting of Council held 16 December 2025, the Council accepted the City of Melville 2024 – 2025 Annual Report.
- Local public notice of the City's Annual Report was given and the Annual Report was published on the City's website and hardcopies made available at various locations.
- After publication, the City became aware of errors within the Annual Report and presents this report seeking the Council's approval to make corrections to the accepted Annual Report.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council endorse the corrections to the City of Melville 2024-2025 Annual Report, as follows:

1. Page 64, amend the third line that reads:
“The ratio of complaints to compliments was 1:0.78 with the target ratio being 3:1.”
 To read:
“The ratio of complaints to compliments was 1:0.58 with the target ratio being 3:1.”

2. Page 78, update the section that reads:
“Number of total hours worked for the period = 922,252”
 To read:
“Number of total hours worked for the period = 930,810”

3. Page 81 Freedom of information update the Freedom of information activity report with the figures below:

	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023	2021-2022	2020-2021	2019-2020
FOI request received	60	47	43	56	61	40
Average processing time (days)	34	40	83	44	49	45
Amendment of personal information applications received	1	1	2	3	1	0
Outcome						
Access in full	1	1	2	3	6	7
Edited access	44	39	37	38	41	30
Application withdrawn	2	2	5	2	4	1
Access deferred	0	0	0	1	0	0
Access refused*	6	0	11	2	7	2
Requests in progress at 30 June	7	5	1	16	12	13
Total	60	47	56	62	70	53

4. Minor typographical amendments, that do not affect the intent of the document.

At 7:00pm, Mr S Curulli left the meeting.

M26/67 Response to the Annual General Meeting of Electors 2026 Motions Carried

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:02pm, Ms C Newman, Head of Governance responded to questions which concluded at 7:05pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>What actually happens to motions passed at the Electors AGM?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>The officer recommendations are in the agenda and late items that were circulated on Friday, 6 February 2026. Council will consider those recommendations at the Ordinary Meeting of Council next week.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u></p> <p><i>Just to confirm, next week will we just acknowledge them or note them, and then of course that's just putting them on the table is it? And then for officers to respond to them, is that what you're referring to?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 2:</u></p> <p>You'll see there are six officer recommendations, each recommendation relates to one of the motions that was proposed, and there are a variety of actions within those recommendations.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u></p> <p><i>There were some queries about how the people that were online weren't able to vote. Is it expected that there will be some sort of facility to enable that for next year's Annual General Meeting of Electors?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 3:</u></p> <p>Yes, we are going through a process of looking to upgrade the AV equipment in the Conference Room. As part of that the scope will ensure the use of MS Teams will be stable and won't be subject to any interference, so that way we would be able to – if the functionality is there – be able to record votes from those attending online.</p> <p><u>Question 4:</u></p> <p><i>Do we have an estimate for how many did attend the AGME online?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 4:</u></p> <p>We had approximately 62 views through the course of the livestreaming of the meeting, with the average duration being 28 minutes for each of those views.</p>

At 7:03pm, Mr S Curulli returned to the meeting.

SUMMARY

- On Monday, 2 February 2026, the City of Melville (the City) held its Annual General Meeting of Electors (AGME) for the purpose of receiving the 2024-2025 Annual Report.
- At the AGME 6 motions were received from the community and carried by the meeting.
- This report presents the motions carried at AGME, along with officer comments and recommendations for the consideration of the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**AGME Motion 1**

That the Council:

1. **Acknowledges 'urban heat' as a foreseeable risk due to climate change, committing to the actions within the Urban Forest strategy review, as trees are a key mitigation opportunity; and**
2. **Notes the other elements of AGME Motion 1 and take no further action at this time.**

AGME Motion 2

That the Council:

1. **Note AGME Motion 2; and**
2. **Acknowledge that the items raised in the motion are being considered and responded to through the review of Local Planning Scheme 6.**

AGME Motion 3

That the Council:

1. **Note AGME Motion 3; and**
2. **Acknowledge that the items raised in the motion are being considered and responded to through the review of Local Planning Scheme 6.**

AGME Motion 4

That the Council:

1. **Note AGME Motion 4; and**
2. **Acknowledge that the option of aligning with the WALGA Tree Retention Policy is being considered through current actions to prepare a Local Planning Policy response for tree protection on private property.**

AGME Motion 5

That the Council:

1. **Note AGME Motion 5; and**
2. **Continue to progress the actions within the *Urban Forest Strategy Review 2024*, looking for practical sustainable increases in the tree canopy.**

AGME Motion 6:

That the Council:

1. **Note AGME Motion 6; and**
2. **Review the use of artificial turf as part of the next verge policy review, scheduled to occur later in 2026.**

Corporate Services**C26/355 2025-2026 Mid Year Budget Review****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 7:05pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services responded to questions which concluded at 7:06pm.**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 there was a budget amendment for a project that was not delivered and was carried over to the next year, does that mean some of that budget can be used to fund something else within that area?

Response to Question 1:

In short, that would be possible. What actually happens if a project has been deferred, the monies are not transferred from reserve so they sit there. It would require a formal decision of Council by absolute majority to authorise that expenditure.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the results of the 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review for the period 1 July 2025 to 31 December 2025 and highlights the significant positive and negative variations that require budget amendments.
- This report recommends that the Council notes the results of the 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review, and by Absolute Majority, approves the recommended budget amendments required to the 2025-2026 Budget as a result of the review.
- This report presents amendments to the 2025-2026 Fees and Charges Schedule and recommends that they be adopted by Absolute Majority decision of the Council.
- This report presents a deviation from the City's Accounting Policy CP-025 and recommends that it be noted and authorised by Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

1. **Notes the 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review and Attachments:**
 - (a) **Summary Amendments 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review (Attachment 1); and**
 - (b) **2025-2026 Significant Capital Works Expenditure Budget Amendments (Attachment 3); and**
2. **Notes and authorises the deviation from the City's Accounting Policy CP-025.**
3. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review with the amendments to be made to the Statement of Financial Activity adopted in the 2025-2026 Annual Budget, as detailed in Attachment Summary Amendments 2025-2026 Mid-Year Budget Review; and**
4. **By Absolute Majority Decision adopts the amendments to the 2025-2026 Fees and Charges Schedule as detailed in Attachment Amendments to 2025-2026 Fees and Charges Schedule.**

C26/356 Investment Statements for December 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:07pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the investment statements for the period ending 31 December 2025 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council notes the Investment Report for the period ending 31 December 2025.

C26/357 Schedule of Accounts Paid for December 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:07pm, 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 December 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 December 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 December 2025 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details December 2025 (Attachment 2).

At 7:07pm, Ms M Smith Poulton left the meeting and did not return.

C26/358 Statements of Financial Activity for December 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:07pm, Mr G Tuffin, Director Corporate Services was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report presents the Statements of Financial Activity, Statement of Comprehensive Income and Statement of Financial Position for the period ending 31 December 2025; and
- Presents the variances for the month of 31 December and recommends that they be noted by the Council;

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Notes to the Statement of Financial Activity and Statement of Comprehensive Income for the month ending December 2025 as detailed in the following attachments:**
 - **Statement of Financial Activity December 2025 (Attachment 1); and**
 - **Statement of Comprehensive Income December 2025 (Attachment 2); and**
 - **Net Working Capital December 2025 (Attachment 3); and**
 - **Reconciliation Net Working Capital as of 31 December 2025 (Attachment 4); and**
 - **Notes to Statement of Financial Activity December 2025 (Attachment 5); and**
 - **Statement of Financial Position as of 31 December 2025 (Attachment 6); and**
 - **Summary Rate Debtors December 2025 (Attachment 7); and**
 - **Rates Collections Graph December 2025 (Attachment 8); and**
 - **General Debtors Aged 90 Days December 2025 (Attachment 9).**
2. **Endorse the writing off of the two sundry debtor amounts below, relating to two sporting associations, where all reasonable recovery actions have been exhausted and further recovery is not economically viable.**
 - (a) **Profutsal – \$3,347.50**
 - (b) **WA State Futsal League – \$33,788.88**

C26/359 RFT252622 Supply of Tree Maintenance

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:08pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 7:09pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>With regard to the tree maintenance contract, will it include proactive canopy maintenance or any sort of relative maintenance on trees?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>Yes it will include maintenance on the urban canopy, and I'd be happy to send a scope of works of what's involved outside of the meeting to Elected Members.</p>

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252622 Supply of Tree Maintenance.

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252622 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;**

C26/360 Investment Statements for November 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:09pm, 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 November 2025 and recommends that it be noted by the Council.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

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

C26/361 Schedule of Accounts Paid for November 2025

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:09pm, 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 November 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 November 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 November 2025 (Attachment 1) and Card Payment Details November 2025 (Attachment 2).

Community Development

Nil.

Environment and Infrastructure**E26/87 Adoption of New Council Policy - CP-129 Personal Memorials in Public Open Space**

Deputations Nil.

Officer Presentation At 7:10pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure responded to questions which concluded at 7:17pm.

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:

With regard to the questions asked by Mr Waugh this evening, is there anything that you'd like to expand on?

Response to Question 1:

Mr Waugh's questions were related to our policies in general. Mr Waugh's preamble to the question was making a distinction between adopting the policy and also Council adopting the procedures. There is a clear distinction in the Act that talks about Council adopting strategic policies and providing strategic direction, and the procedures are an executive function of the CEO to implement the policies. Our interpretation of the Act and interpretation of how policies are to be adopted would be making sure there is a clear distinction between the two; a clear distinction between a strategic policy of Council and an operational policy under the executive functions of the CEO within the Act.

Question 2:

Is there any chance you could email Elected Members that information?

Response to Question 2:

This information will be provided to Elected Members.

Question 3:

The report mentions equity a lot, with the cost of a park bench listed as \$3,800. Does the report need to mention equity, as I don't think it's an equity issue? Can officers make comment on this?

Response to Question 3:

That was based on some of the feedback that was received by staff. In terms of \$3,800 being a lot of money, that probably depends. Different people would perhaps give different answers to that. I would certainly acknowledge it would be less than the cost of an average funeral, but people would potentially be paying for a funeral as well as paying for the cost of the memorial. It is probably a subjective matter as to whether or not \$3,800 is a considerable amount of money.

Question 4:

Just a further comment about something that was mentioned in the report: the \$3,800 was paid for by the applicant, would that be correct?

Response to Question 4:

Yes, that is correct.

Question 5:

It's got in here under community engagement, and it's highlighted, that several comments suggested they don't agree with personal memorials at all because they don't believe ratepayers' money should be invested in memorials. So would that be an incorrect statement?

Response to Question 5:

The statement is correct in saying that's the feedback that was provided as part of the consultation, and it may have been that people were unaware that the applicants were paying themselves. They may also have been referring to staff time involved in organising them and things like that, which may not be directly costed.

Question 6:

Given that the issue largely seems to be about oversaturation, which I gather from the diagram of Bicton Quarantine Park is about the number of benches and not necessarily the number of plaques, has consideration been given to having multiple plaques on a bench or putting plaques on trees?

Response to Question 6:

Yes, consideration has been given to that. Some of the issues with the benches is that some of them have already been installed and been paid for by one particular family, so it would obviously be quite stressful for the people and the staff involved in going and asking if it's alright to put another plaque on there. The report did also consider looking at the option of not just plaques on trees but plaques on other infrastructure as well, which could be barbecues, playgrounds or things like that, so that option was considered as well.

Question 7:

Was consideration given to other infrastructure that would be considered useful for our residents, for example jetties, upkeep restoration and water fountains?

Response to Question 7:

On page 79, one of the options was that purchased assets could include infrastructure like trees, gardens, drink fountains and barbeques. I'm not sure if jetties were specifically considered, but they would be grouped in the same group, so that was the consideration.

SUMMARY

- The City has for a long period of time allowed personal memorials mainly in the form of bench seats to be installed as a means of assisting the local community with grieving for loved ones, however, there has never been a formal position on this matter.
- Locations along the foreshore are very popular for those requesting a personal memorial bench which has resulted in these areas reaching a saturation point.
- In 2024, the City temporarily paused accepting requests for personal memorials until a Policy could be developed as there were challenges in placing bench seats in areas with high demand.
- The cost of a memorial bench and plaque in 2024 was approximately \$3,800 funded by the applicant, which has led to inequities associated with limiting bench installation to only those that can afford the cost.
- A desktop review of other Local Governments in Perth was undertaken to determine what their respective Councils have put in place for memorial requests has assisted in shaping the Officer's position and recommendation going forward.
- In November and December of 2023, the City undertook community engagement to understand the level of support for memorials in public places.
- The Officer recommendation is to discontinue the practice of allowing the installation of Personal Memorials within Public Open Space and to create four inclusive Reflection/Remember Me spaces across the City to allow for contemplation and reflection for loved ones that have passed.
- Based on the issues identified in this report, a new Council Policy on Personal Memorials in Public Open Space has been prepared for consideration by the Council.
- The policy has been presented to previous Elected Member Information Sessions and Policy and Legislation Committee meetings, most recently at the December 2025 meeting.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council adopts the Council Policy CP-129 Personal Memorials in Public Open Space (Attachment 1).

At 7:15pm, Ms J Ahola left the meeting and did not return.

At 7:15pm, Ms E Tallis left the meeting and did not return.

E26/88 RFT252611 Supply of Plumbing Services

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:17pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to the Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252611 Supply of Plumbing Services.

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252611 Contract and Tender Advisory Unit Minutes (Attachment 1); and**
2. **Upon resolution of the recommendation, directs that the successful respondents' names be inserted below this point 2, awarded;**

E26/89 RFT252617 Supply of Electrical Maintenance Services

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:17pm, Mr J Coten, Director Environment & Infrastructure was available to answer questions on the matter.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	No discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation.

SUMMARY

- This report is presented to the Council to recommend the acceptance of a request submitted for RFT252617 Supply of Electrical Maintenance Services.

CTAU RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Accepts the recommendations as contained in the confidential attachment to this report, RFT252617 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;**

Planning**UP26/99 Review of the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Structure Plan****Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 7:18pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 7:33pm.**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 you please explain or give an example of the two envelope approach that is referred to in the report?

Response to Question 1:

The two envelope approach in the report references intensity of development subject to infrastructure upgrades and investment with the centre more broadly. Community feedback through the preliminary consultation indicated that there was an understanding and acceptance that the Booragoon Strategic Centre required density to meet the targets that are expected by the State Government, but for the community to accept the intensity of development it expected the infrastructure within the centre to be upgraded to withhold and sustain that intensity of development.

The two envelope approach provides an opportunity for the City to set density expectations at a lower range should the State Government and private sector not provide that level of expected investment, and should that level of expected investment eventuate, the City, Council and community can expect a high level of intensity. We're really trying to set benchmarks to ensure that the infrastructure for the area is commensurate to the intensity of development, as opposed to having the intensity of development and the infrastructure coming later.

Question 2:

So would we be seeking commitment from the State Government that they would invest in that infrastructure before we move forward with a certain density?

Response to Question 2:

There will be conversations had and hence the resolution has expectations to engage with the WAPC chair and the Minister for Planning, but it's not just the State Government, it's also the private sector. Scentre Group, Westfield are a major land owner within the centre and they have a key interest in the development outcomes and intensity of development within the centre. The community and the City also have a key interest in ensuring investment within the infrastructure that Westfield and Scentre Group own, so ensuring there is commensurate investment by the private sector and State Government, but also the local government as well with regard to footpaths, streetscapes and the like. All stakeholders have a key role to play in this centre to ensure its appropriate success depending on what intensity of development occurs.

Question 3:

Looking at the officer recommendation and the ACP review part (b), it says, "Built form recommendations will adopt a performance-based approach to height and massing with additional height being context appropriate". Does this mean our zoning will just be a temporary guide and the sky's the limit?

In part (a) and (b) I can't see anything in here about community benefit for so called performance-based approach to height, so are there going to be any controls or is it just going to be performance-based, and what are the community benefits?

Response to Question 3:

The response provided to Mr French earlier mentioned the Planning Regulations and changes that occurred in 2015. The City, through the Activity Centre Plan and precinct planning process, can set to understand and benchmark the height limits that are envisaged for the centre, however when applications are made and should they exceed those limits, decision makers such as the Development Assessment Panels or possibly the Western Australian Planning Commission do have the liberty to provide decisions that are higher than those anticipated through the structure planning or precinct planning process. That's legislation that is outside of the City's control and sphere of influence, and the nature of the planning legislation and framework in Western Australia is not something that we can augment at a local level. Notwithstanding, we can ensure that our plans are prepared in a robust manner, and that we undertake detailed community engagement and preliminary engagement – which was undertaken in this instance – to ensure that those expectations at a local level are understood and relayed across to the State Government and those decision makers. This also ensures that the plans are as robust as possible for when decision makers do have proposals before them, and that they are well informed by those local frameworks.

With regard to community benefit, the resolution is quite broad in its context and it speaks to a development being context appropriate. That does have regard for community benefit as well, and as part of the precinct planning process and guidelines, community benefits are a key consideration. If the City was to consider more intense development in the envelope B category, we would be expecting community benefits that are commensurate to the intensity of development as well.

Question 4:

So would this document be a due regard document, or what sort of category of document would it have?

Response to Question 4:

It would be a due regard document, as mentioned that's the way the Western Australian planning legislation is established. Notwithstanding precinct plans are a higher order document than another piece of planning instrument like a local planning policy for example. It's one of the highest orders of due regard documents that decision makers can have regard to.

Question 5:

How do we go about factoring in things like safety, congestion and traffic when we are required to meet State density targets?

Question 6:

What else can we do to address these issues that have been raised over and over and over again, not just by people in the Booragoon area but also around Melville Senior High School, around Santa Maria, around all the primary schools, what can we do to address that outside of the planning framework?

Question 7:

Whilst we have to meet these targets through the State Government's density targets, can we push back or advocate, or is there any other avenue that we can take to address our concerns and address these safety issues?

Response to Questions 5 to 7:

Broadly speaking we will be looking at traffic assessment and impact of any increased density, any infrastructure such as schools in that vicinity. Director Environment & Infrastructure will be looking at what we can do to work with the State Government and also private providers regarding traffic management and parking management around school precincts because that's something that's not just for the City of Melville to consider but it is a national issue and there have been papers and studies around that being a particularly difficult and challenging problem at the moment.

The Council Report on page 93 speaks to decision gates, and you will note that the precinct plan preparations in the City of Melville haven't necessarily undertaken the approach that's been proposed through this report and for this precinct. We've had a lot of community feedback through Local Planning Scheme 6, we've had a lot of community feedback through proposals around the Booragoon centre, particularly on Almondbury Road. As a result of that we've really taken stock through preliminary community engagement on this plan, we've also undertaken some technical investigations to inform where this prep plan preparation process will head. To quote a section of the report regarding decision gates:

"To ensure disciplined governance, manage community and State expectations, and avoid premature or unsupported planning outcomes, the review will proceed through four clearly defined decision gates. Each gate represents a formal checkpoint at which Council confirms direction before any further work progresses."

It's important that we note those different decision gates, engage with Council on those decision gates, and provide you appropriate technical information to guide us in the paths and directions that we take through this plan review.

There will also be work for Councillors to do at a State level to lobby your local members and the Ministers to make clear the community and City's expectations depending on the envelope that we choose this plan proceeds with.

Question 8:

We tried to get a meeting with a high school and they didn't want to discuss traffic concerns with the Council. When there's a situation where an education institution is not willing to take ownership of their students driving their cars to school and parking all over the surrounding streets, can we not go back and look at our policies and start doing no parking?

Question 9:

Can we start charging them to park their cars in the street to stop any future safety concerns?

Response to Questions 8 and 9:

There are traffic engineering controls that we have available to us regarding parking controls.

Question 10:

Is there a link or argument that can be made if we were to accept higher density and height limits in the Booragoon, Garden City Activity Centre?

Question 11:

In lieu of higher density in the surrounding residential suburbs, can the argument be made to concentrate that higher density and height limits in this commercial block?

Question 12:

What is the likelihood of WA Planning accepting that argument?

Response to Questions 10 to 12:

The intensity of development within the Booragoon precinct plan area will contribute towards the density targets for the City. Our engagement with the State Government is that density targets are a guide, and it may be 18 months or so ago now that the CEO, Director Planning and Deputy Mayor at the time, Cr G Barber, engaged with the Minister for Planning.

While intensity in our activity centres is a form of contribution towards density targets, other forms of density such as medium density anticipated within other parts of the City and adjacent to our activity centres are also considered important contributors towards the density target.

While we may consider more intense development in areas like Booragoon contributing a higher percentage to the density target, the State Government and particularly the current Minister for Planning has a view that there is a spectrum of density which needs to contribute towards those density targets.

It's not necessarily always apartment product, it may also be other lower forms of density such as medium density town houses or even aspects of lower density standard traditional suburban development as well.

Question 13:

Does the \$250,000 price tag take us all the way through to a final version of the Structure Plan?

Response to Question 13:

That is an estimate provided as part of the reporting. It will be subject to a tenders and quotations process which we can further engage with Council on through the budget process.

SUMMARY

- The Melville City Centre Structure Plan, now referred to as the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Precinct Plan, is subject to a statutory ten-yearly review. The Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) has approved a two-year extension to allow completion of the review by 2027.
- To prepare for the review, a preliminary engagement phase has been completed, capturing feedback from the community, key stakeholders, Elected Members, and the City's Senior Leadership Team. The findings from this preliminary dialogue with stakeholders is summarised in the Engagement Outcomes Report (Attachment 1).
- The preliminary engagement phase has highlighted opportunities for the City Centre and equally has noted a number of concerns, pre-requisites and delivery challenges, should future planning contemplate additional growth and intensity.
- Issues that would need to be addressed in the future City Centre include the need for upfront public realm investment, traffic and transport management, land assembly, tree protection, quality of design and built form together with effective stakeholder communication.
- Based on the preliminary work undertaken, an evidence-led, staged approach is proposed for the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Activity Centre Plan review:
 - The review will be evidence-led and staged, drawing on technical investigations, the preliminary community engagement and progressing through Elected Member workshops prior to any draft plans being prepared.
 - Built form outcomes will follow a performance-based approach, with height and massing guided by context, community expectation and design quality rather than blanket zoning.
 - Early engagement with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage, Minister for Planning and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) will test feasible density scenarios, expectations, and delivery mechanisms before options are presented to Council.
 - Engagement materials will clearly communicate the expected impacts on traffic, housing diversity, and character.
- This approach recognises that while State Government legislation identifies Booragoon as a major centre within the metropolitan hierarchy, any movement towards that role and vision will require support of stakeholders and attention to the concerns raised during the preliminary engagement.
- Accordingly, a tailored planning review program is recommended which establishes the parameters, scope, and decision framework upfront, ensuring all decisions are guided by agreed technical evidence before any draft plans or maps are prepared.
- Council is recommended to note the Engagement Outcomes Report and endorse the evidence-led, engagement aligned and staged approach to the review.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. Notes the Preliminary Community Engagement Report and Findings for the Booragoon (Melville City Centre) Activity Centre Plan (ACP).
2. Confirms the governance and scope controls for the ACP review:
 - (a) The ACP review will be evidence led, drawing on Local Planning Scheme No.6 technical investigations (Land Economics, Traffic Impact Assessment to 2050, Tree Canopy Impact Assessment, further stakeholder engagement and targeted State agency inputs), and progressed through Elected Member Workshops prior to any drafting of plans for public consultation.
 - (b) Built form recommendations will adopt a performance-based approach to height and massing with any additional height being context appropriate, informed by community engagement and design led.
3. Requests the CEO to initiate early dialogue with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) Minister for Planning and Chair of the Western Australian Planning Commission to test acceptable density scenarios, expectations and delivery mechanisms for Booragoon prior to option presentation to Council.
4. Requests the ACP engagement materials to include well explained impact sheets (before/after visuals, traffic/parking outcomes, tree canopy outcomes, housing diversity/affordability, character retention/transitions) prepared in alignment with the Local Planning Scheme No. 6 Detailed Engagement and Elected Member Workshop process.
5. Requests the integration of tree outcomes across the various options, consistent with the updated CP029 Trees on City managed land (including the 2026 compulsory verge tree program for suitable commercial frontages) and the forthcoming Local Planning Policy for Trees on Private Land, showing retention, deep soil requirements, street tree expansion, and offsets/contributions where removal is necessary.

At 7:32pm, Cr J Spanbroek left the meeting.

UP26/100 Recruitment and Selection Report - City of Melville Design Review Group

Deputations	Nil.
Officer Presentation	At 7:33pm, Mr P Varelis, Director Planning responded to questions which concluded at 7:35pm.
Disclosure of Interest	Nil.
Notes from Forum	<p>General discussion took place regarding the item and officer recommendation. During discussion of the item, the following questions and/or requests for information were raised by Elected Members and will form part of the Final Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda:</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u></p> <p><i>Is an urban designer the same as an urban planner?</i></p> <p><u>Response to Question 1:</u></p> <p>An urban designer has skills associated with localised outcomes at the streetscape level, as well as human scale interaction between private development and the public realm. They have skills closely associated with architecture but not necessarily defined to a single building, particularly the interaction of those buildings with the public realm. Urban planners on the other hand have skills associated with urban design, which are generally around the process of developing plans. This is much broader than just the interface between the public and private realms – it also accounts for community consultation, infrastructure requirements and statutory planning processes.</p>

SUMMARY

- Following expiry of the current Design Review Panel tenure, the City sought expressions of interest to join the Melville Design Review Group (DRG), previously known as the City's Design Review Panel (DRP).
- The DRG is responsible for reviewing major development applications and providing independent design advice to applicants and the City.
- Applicants applied to be part of the DRG through an expression of interest (EOI) process conducted by the City. Each member will be appointed for a term of two years. The EOI criteria was formulated in accordance with Section 3.1 of the State Government's new Local Government Design Review Manual. The City received 23 expressions of interest to join the DRG.
- Seven core members and six sessional members are recommended by the City to be appointed to the DRG. Whilst a number of the other applicants could add some value to the panel, they are not recommended to be appointed to the DRG as they do not have a relevant design review related qualification or did not sufficiently meet the experience criteria.
- One of the seven core members is recommended to act as the DRG Chairperson, and another recommended to be appointed as the Deputy Chairperson as detailed within the confidential attachment.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council endorse the Recommended Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Core and Sessional Members and appoint them to the City of Melville Design Review Group as outlined within confidential Attachment 2 to this report.

At 7:34pm, Cr J Spanbroek returned to the meeting.

UP26/101 Proposed Scheme Amendment - DA-2025-947 - Public Open Space to Residential R60 - Lot 12759 (No. 33) Worley Street, Willagee (Winnacott Reserve) Lot 50 (40-44) Worley Street, Willagee (Weeronga retirement village)**Deputations** Nil.**Officer Presentation** At 7:35pm, Mr G Ponton, Manager Strategic Urban Planning provided an officer presentation which concluded at 7:39pm. At 7:40pm, Mr G Ponton responded to questions which concluded at 7:50pm.[Officer Presentation – UP26/101](#)**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:

In your dealings with Alchera Living, have they actually indicated that they are willing to engage with the community and City about the proposed boundary treatments in this area and access way?

Response to Question 1:

As part of processing the scheme amendment application, we as officers have noted the poor appearance of the access way and have sought to seek improvements to the appearance of the land. To date, we have not had any support from the consultants that we're dealing with to achieve that, and therefore via the officer recommendation we are seeking to formalise that through a request.

Question 2:

Can you help me with some amendments to this motion?

Response to Question 2:

The scheme amendment process is relatively limited in what we can do, but we can use the procedure to formalise a request to the applicant, asking that they attend to what is currently a fairly poor outcome in terms of the interface to the park. The landowner concerned is likely to put in future development applications, and those applications might give us a better opportunity to enforce improvements. So yes, there would be an opportunity to expand on the officer's recommendation to submit a request to Alchera Living in this case and ensure the issue is well known. As future development applications are received by the City we could more formally explore opportunities for improvement.

Question 3:

Is there any way the landowner can use that access way they want for a road to put a development on there?

Response to Question 3:

The portion of land is owned freehold now by Alchera Living. It is effectively part of their land and is no longer part of the reserve, so the current reservation of the land as public open space does need to be attended to. It would be very open in the long-term for the landowner to explore development on that site.

For the medium-term, our understanding is that they intend to use the access way as an alternative driveway for further apartment construction on their site. The dwellings immediately adjoining the access way are probably the newest built form in that particular village, and indications are that there are no plans to redevelop that portion of the site. In the long-term it is freehold land, and subject to this amendment it would be zoned for development, although the reality is that would be some time later.

Question 4:

In relation to the report and officer recommendation, there is a line which says the proposed scheme amendment is a condition of the sale of the land between Alchera Living and DPLH. Does that mean if the scheme amendment was not approved then the sale of the land doesn't actually take place if it's a condition?

Response to Question 4:

To our understanding it was a requirement of the sale, but it wasn't linked to a requirement being met pre-settlement. Condition might not be the correct term to use, though it was an obligation of the owner to sort it out; it wasn't a requirement to be done before settlement.

Question 5:

Would Council have the option of declining to progress the scheme amendment, and requesting that they make improvements to the appearance of the driveway prior to us considering any request for a scheme amendment?

Response to Question 5:

The options for Council in dealing with this application are to, as recommended, adopt the scheme amendment as a basic amendment and refer it directly to the Western Australian Planning Commission. Secondly, Council could consider it a standard amendment and seek to advertise the amendment, or thirdly Council could also seek to not initiate the amendment, although by not initiating the amendment the landowner may seek recourse. There are also governance issues associated with leaving a portion of reserved land in private ownership, but it is an option for Council.

Question 6:

Can we amend part 2 by using the word "require" as opposed to "request", or are we limited in what we can expect them to do?

Response to Question 6:

The scheme amendment process limits our ability, hence why we've used the term "request". Should the request not be followed through by the landowner, we would still have opportunities as future development applications are submitted for other development on the site. We're hopeful that we can make the request and gain some improvements upfront.

Question 7:

If Council were not to support the officer recommendation, how will this impact Alchera Living?

Response to Question 7:

There would be little immediate effect, however there would be more with the long-term use of the land. As highlighted previously, it would result in a governance issue where we have a portion of privately owned land reserved for public open space, and this would create an anomaly and potential complications. In the short-term it wouldn't have a huge impact on the landowner, and officers expect that the landowner would explore other avenues to resolve the anomaly.

Additionally, under the consequences section of the report it states:

“Should Council decide not to initiate the scheme amendment, the applicant is able to seek the intervention of the Minister for Planning under section 76 of the Planning and Development Act, and the Minister can order the City to proceed with public advertising and/or adoption of the amendment.”

SUMMARY

- A request has been received to re-zone a portion of land adjoining the Alchera Living (Weeronga Retirement Village) from a reserve for Public Open Space (POS) (Winnacott Reserve) Lot 12759 (No. 33) Worley Street, Willagee, to Residential R60.
- The land was originally part of Winnacott Reserve. In 2017, Council permitted the use of the land to provide temporary site access to a proposed four storey apartment building at the retirement village. The temporary access was secured via an easement.
- Alchera Living subsequently sought to purchase the accessway land. In February 2021, Council resolved to seek public comment on the proposal to dispose of the portion of Winnacott Reserve.
- At its meeting of 15 June 2021 (P21/3920) Council considered the results of the public comment period and resolved to support the transfer of the ownership of the land to Alchera Living, approve the relinquishment of the Management Order over the portion of reserve and to support the amalgamation of the land into the adjoining site. Sale of the land from Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage to Alchera Living has subsequently progressed. A condition of the sale requires the purchaser to progress an amendment to rezone the land to Residential R60.
- An application has now been received to formalise the change in the reservation of the land as Public Open Space to Residential R60. The application is largely administrative given the previous Council support for the disposal and the progress of the land transaction.
- Accordingly the scheme amendment is considered to be a “basic amendment”. Adoption of the amendment is recommended. It is further recommended that Alchera Living be requested to undertake improvements to the interface between the accessway land and the adjoining reserve with respect to fencing and drainage.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**That the Council:**

1. **Resolve, pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, to adopt an amendment to the Local Planning Scheme No. 6 by:**
 - (a) **Rezone portion of Lot 12759 (No. 33) Worley Street, Willagee from Reserve for 'Public Open Space' to 'Residential' with a density coding of 'R60'.**
 - (b) **Amend the Scheme Maps accordingly.**
2. **Request Alchera Living to undertake improvement to the appearance of the interface between the accessway land and the adjoining reserve, particularly with regard to the standard of fencing.**

15 MOTIONS WITH PREVIOUS NOTICE

Nil.

16 MOTIONS WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTICE (APPROVAL BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY)

Nil.

17 MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil.

18 DECISIONS MADE WHILE MEETING WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil.

19 CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss, the Presiding Member confirmed Cr C Ross was still in attendance electronically, and declared the meeting closed at 7:51pm.