



— *City of* —
Melville

**NOTES
OF THE
AGENDA FORUM
HELD ON
TUESDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2007**

DISTRIBUTED: 9 NOVEMBER 2007



— City of —
Melville

10 Almondbury Road Booragoon WA 6154
Postal Address: Locked Bag 1, Booragoon WA 6954
Tel: 08 9364 0666
Fax: 08 9364 0285
Email: melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au
Web: www.melville.wa.gov.au

Notes of the Agenda Forum held in the Swan Room, Melville Civic Centre, 10 Almondbury Road, Booragoon on Tuesday, 6 November 2007 commencing at 6.38pm.

FORUM NOTES

PRESENT

Cr H Everett JP (Deputy Mayor)	Applecross/Mount Pleasant
R A Aubrey (Mayor)	All Wards
Cr N Pazolli	Applecross/Mount Pleasant
Cr D J Macphail, Cr A Ceniviva	City
Cr C W Robartson, Cr R Subramaniam	Bill Creek/Leeming
Cr L M Reynolds, Cr J R Bennett	University
Cr P M Phelan, Cr C M Halton	Palmyra Melville/Willagee
Cr M N Barton, Cr G Wieland	Bicton/Attadale

IN ATTENDANCE

M Tieleman	A/Chief Executive Officer
A Banks-McAllister	Director Strategic Community Services
R G C Willis	Director Technical & Development Services
C McClure	Director Strategic Urban Planning
P Gale	Manager Technical Services
K Weymes	Manager Planning & Development
J Clark	Governance & Compliance Program Manager
B Taylor	Manager Information & Corporate Support
I Davis	Environmental Programs Manager
L Ebbelaar	Sustainability Development Officer
D Vinicombe	Planning Services Coordinator
L Croxford	Corporate Administration Officer
A Rutigliano	Minute Secretary

There were 31 (thirty one) people present in the public gallery at the commencement of the Agenda Forum.

APOLOGIES

Nil

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

QUESTION TIME

P07/3023 – Four Storey Mixed Use Building – Five Multiple Dwellings & One Office on Lot 314 (4) Forbes Road Applecross

Mr R Keys of Applecross

Question 1

“The plans attached to the report on the City of Melville website indicate the communal gym has replaced the office. Is this correct and does this mean the proposal is wholly residential with a maximum plot ratio of 0.6:1 rather than mixed-use with a maximum plot ratio of 1.2:1 resulting in the proposal (at 0.874:1) being non-compliant?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The plans attached to the report on the website were not the most up to date plans. The final proposal includes an Office in the area depicted as a gym. The proposed total plot ratio is 0.874 comprising 0.805 residential and 0.069 non residential. The residential plot ratio exceeds the allowable 0.6 plot ratio.

Question 2

“The ground floor plan shows a 2.7m wide “Deck” along the entire northern side of the building. This deck (RL 14.56) is up to 1m higher than the existing ground level along the northern boundary (RL13.50 to RL14.00). What type of new boundary fencing, privacy screening or means of prohibiting access to this “deck” will be required under the approval to prevent unobstructed views into the living and bedroom windows of 2 Forbes Road?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

That the area is non accessible from within the building. There are no doors which provide for access to the area. The adjacent north facing windows are either opaque or have a sill height to prevent overlooking. As the area is generally non accessible, it is not an active open space area and as a consequence does not require screening to prevent overlooking from it.

P07/3024 – Three Storey Plus Roof Deck Mixed Use Building – Including Shop, Takeaway Foot Outlet, Café, Three Offices & Six Multiple Dwellings On Lots 24 & 25 (23) Queens Road Mount Pleasant

Piera Cole of Mt. Pleasant

Question 3

“Why should local residents have to defend the Council’s Town Planning Scheme when Councillors are elected to uphold the Amenity’s Code Structure on behalf of ratepayers?”

QUESTION TIME (Continued)

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The Council has received an application for planning approval and is required to consider it based on the requirements of the Community Planning Scheme and the merits of the application

Question 4

John Cole of Mt Pleasant

“With the increase in density can the Council assure residents will not be impacted by extra vehicle parking and traffic concerns?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The proposal does not and can not have an increased density. It proposes a plot ratio in excess of that provided for by the Community Planning Scheme. The application proposes an increase in commercial floor space and residential dwellings together with both on and off site car parking. The development has increased parking and will attract increased traffic which will impact on the local community. The additional parking, access and vehicle movements are however considered to be reasonable and focused on Queens Road for the majority of the movements.

Question 5

“Why has the Council Officer recommended approval of a building that totally disregards the neighbours’ privacy and at least three metres over the height limit, compromises all surrounding residences?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The proposal satisfies the visual privacy provisions of the Residential Design Codes but exceeds the height requirements of the Community Planning Scheme. The proposal could be amended to generally bring it into compliance with the height requirements however the Council is required to consider the merits of the application as submitted.

QUESTION TIME (Continued)

Question 6

“Why has the Council Officer recommended approval if the proposal does not comply with the scheme re:

- (a) plot ratio – variation – non residential 80%, residential 10%*
- (b) height by three metres – 4% at The Promenade, 28% at Reynolds Road*
- (c) landscaping – variation 100% - none proposed*
- (d) parking*
- (e) setback*

What is the gain to the residents?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The consideration of the application requires the Council to consider the proposal with respect to each element and its compliance with the scheme, the merits of overall proposal, the reasonableness of the requirements and whether the variations could be supported.

The proposal provides for some community benefits including the provision of local shops/cafe etc.

Joyce Pereira of Mt. Pleasant

Question 7

“What sort of guarantees do we have that the demolition and construction works will not impact on the structural foundations of immediate existing homes?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

It is normal for the demolition contractor/builder to undertake a condition report of the adjoining buildings prior to works commencing to provide a basis for establishing whether the adjoining buildings have been impacted by the works. Additionally the introduction of new construction methods particularly with respect to driving sheet piling has made these processes almost vibratio and noise free.

Question 8

“What existing course of action is available to home owners should there be such an impact on their homes?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

That the matter will need to be taken up with the builder.

QUESTION TIME (Continued)**Question 9**

“What sort of parking is proposed and where on the Promenade as this impacts on our driveway?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The proposal does not require or propose any parking in The Promenade. There are 2 existing on-street bays and these are to be retained. The development is focussed on Queens Road for customer parking and the rear parking for residents and staff

Question 10**M Creedy of Mt. Pleasant**

“The proposed development is outside Council regulations. Why does the onus appear to be with the residents to keep planning within Council parameters and not with the Developer to show cause why regulations should be amended?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

That is not the case. The applicant has submitted their reasons for the application and have requested that the Council support the proposal. The application has been advertised so that the views of affected residents/owners can additionally be considered by the Council. The Scheme provides that the Council may (generally) vary any provision of the scheme. The Council must consider the proposal based on the merits of the application.

Question 11**M Creedy of Mt. Pleasant**

“Will Council listen to the concerns of in excess of 200 residents/ratepayers?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The Council is required to consider the comments, concerns and views of residents/owners but the process is not as simple as those for and against the proposal. Most of the proposal generally complies with the scheme and there are some major variations. The proposal together with the submissions from the applicant and comments, concerns and views of residents/owners all must be considered by the Council

QUESTION TIME (Continued)

Question 12

M Creedy of Mt. Pleasant

“The proposed development is nothing special – why allow it to proceed outside the Council Regulations?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The application does have some attributes that are worthy of support. It also seeks some extensive variations and bonuses. The Council is required to consider whether the proposal is worthy of support either as submitted or in some modified form.

Question 13

M Creedy of Mt. Pleasant

“On what grounds will council approve the proposal?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The application does have some attributes that are worthy of support. It also seeks some extensive variations and bonuses. The Council is required to consider whether the proposal is worthy of support either as submitted or in some modified form

D Curnuck of Mt. Pleasant

Question 14

“Can the Council, who is supposed to control building height regulations – for privacy, aesthetics, etc., please give reason to why a block of flats with neighbours’ privacy gone, aesthetics in a family community not appealing, can be approved? Noise will be immense from entertainment if this is approved.”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded :

The Community Planning Scheme provides for maximum standards for building height and other matters. It also provides for the ability for most of these standards to be varied. The form and nature of the development is permitted and matters such as privacy comply with these standards. The standards for noise emissions are the same as in any residential area. Apart from the residential units the proposed uses are not that dissimilar to the existing uses.

QUESTION TIME (Continued)

Question 15

“If this is approved, can I put two more stories on my house two doors up from these flats? Or turn the whole street into commercial?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The subject development site is within a Community Centre precinct in which both residential (R 40) and commercial uses are permitted. It has a height limit of 10.5m. Outside of the centre the commercial uses are not permitted and residential development is limited to a density of R20 with a height limit of 10.5m. That height limit could accommodate a 3 story development and many have been constructed throughout the City.

Question 16

“The Council is asked to consider what they consider they will be doing to eliminate congestion of traffic, (quantity) of visitors, customers, commercial and private vehicles increased from now to a lot more, with consideration to this being a school area already with children crossing roads, no parking for our own visitors already and the increased danger to children?” “Childrens’ safety affected”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

There is no doubt that the development will result in a marginal increase in traffic and parking demand. The proposal provides for on site parking for staff and residents and generally increased on street parking for customers. At present there are only on street parking bays. The development is focused on Queens Road and it is not expected that it will result in parking spilling out of the area.

The footpath is at present within the development site and the applicant has proposed that it remain to allow the angled street parking to be retained and pedestrian access to the school to remain on the south side of the road.

It is additionally proposed to extend the Reynolds Street splitter island to provide for better safety near the pedestrian crossing point.

Mark Angwin of Mt. Pleasant

Question 17

“Why is it possible for developers to get their plans through Council with such generous bonuses when there are set limits put down by Council?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The Council is required to consider each application on its merits. At this stage the Council has neither approved or refused the application.

QUESTION TIME (Continued)

Question 18

Anonymous

“If the garden area is to be used for entertainment purposes, what time / day restrictions will be in place?”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

There are no restrictions on the time of use however there are restrictions on matters such as noise.

Question 19

Anonymous

*“Facilities to be considered - Chemist/Pharmacy, Newsagent.
No food takeaway.”*

The Manager of Planning and Development responded:

The Council has little control over the potential tenancies and the applicants have sought to provide similar community uses to the existing situation. Chemists are regulated by the Federal government and newsagents are limited licences from such agencies as the Lotteries Commission.

Question 20

Manuel Soriano of Mt Pleasant

“Is the proposed development (P07/3024 – Lot 24 & 25 (23) Queens Road, Mt. Pleasant meet the requirement on Town Planning Scheme 5? Design, plot ratio, landscaping, parking, tele-communication tower, building height Reynolds Road local area?

This development should demonstrate that they meet the above requirement.

The City should also make the surrounding residents aware of this Policy / Town Planning Scheme 5 in relation to this proposed development.

(I may not be present during this Agenda Forum but I want this question to be included for consideration. Thank you)”

The Manager of Planning and Development responded that:

The standards for development of land in the City are set out in Community Planning Scheme No 5, the R Codes and the Councils Policies. The proposal is seeking many variations to these standards particularly in relation to height, plot ratio and car parking. Some modifications are possible to bring the proposal closer to these standards. The application also provides many elements which provide some community benefit and provide for an enhanced outcome. The Council needs to consider all of these matters as part of its decision making process and decide on the merits of the proposal.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995

Members' interests in matters to be discussed at meetings to be disclosed

S.5.65 (1) A member who as an interest in any matter to be discussed at a Council or Committee meeting that will be attended by the member must disclose the nature of the interest -

- (a) in a written notice given to the Chief Executive Officer before the meeting; or
- (b) at the meeting immediately before the matter is discussed.

Penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

Meeting to be informed of disclosures

S.5.66 If a member has disclosed an interest in a written notice given to the Chief Executive Officer before a meeting then before the meeting -

- (a) the Chief Executive Officer is to cause the notice to be given to the person who is to preside at the meeting; and
- (b) the person who is to preside at the meeting is to bring the notice to the attention of the persons who attend the meeting.

Disclosing members not to participate in meetings

S.5.67 A member who makes a disclosure under Section 5.65 must not -

- (a) preside at the part of the meeting relating to the matter; or
- (b) participate in, or be present during, any discussion or decision making procedure relating to the matter,

unless, and to the extent that, the disclosing member is allowed to do so under Section 5.68 or 5.69.

Penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

Please refer to your Handbook for definitions of interests and other detail.

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- Cr J Barton - P07/1009
- Cr J Barton - P07/3023
- Cr H R Everett - C07/6004
- Mayor R Aubrey – C07/6004

BUSINESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- P07/1009 – Pedestrian Access Way Between Windelya Road & Murdoch University Playing Fields Kardinya
- P07/3023 - Four Storey Mixed Use Building – Five Multiple Dwellings & One Office on Lot 314 (4) Forbes Road Applecross
- P07/3024 - Three Storey Mixed Use Building on Lots 24 & 25 (23) Queens Road Mount Pleasant
- T07/2001 - Draft Ecological Sustainability Plan
- T07/3002 - Wireless Hill South Eastern Tower Refurbishment
- C07/5009 - Local Law Amendment Parking Facilities Modified
- C07/8016 - Wireless Hill Security
- CO10/07 - Supply and Laying of Hot Asphalt for Minor Works
- C07/5020 - Election of Representatives to Occasional, Advisory, Local Government & Community Committees
- C07/6004 - Review of Mayoral & Deputy Mayoral Allowances Policy 14-PL-003
- C07/5018 - City of Melville Annual Report 2006-2007
- C07/5019 - New City of Melville Logo

AGENDA ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	
P07/1009	<p>PEDESTRIAN ACCESS WAY BETWEEN WINDELYA ROAD AND MURDOCH UNIVERSITY PLAYING FIELDS KARDINYA (REC) (ATTACHMENT)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested deletion of an access way between WINDELYA Road to the playing fields at Murdoch University (western end) as shown on the Murdoch University Master Plan. • The retention of the access way was one of the key elements of the residential precinct (western end) of the Murdoch University Master Plan adopted by the Council on 21 December 2004. • Residents of St Ives Murdoch petitioned (200 signatories) the Council in May 07 seeking the deletion of the access way through the St Ives village. The objection was based on the division of the village by the location of the access way, the creation of a security risk and the detrimental effect the location of the access way will have on resident rights to a quiet and secure enjoyment of the village. • The petition was received by the Council at its 15 May 2007 meeting where it resolved to note the petition and sought the preparatio of a report on the subject. St Ives residents subsequently requested that consideratio of the issue be postponed providing the University and others additional time to consider alternatives to resolve the impasse. • A second petition was received from residents of Kardinya on 16 September 2007 concerned at the proposed loss of access to the playing fields via the proposal to delete the access way. A further submission was received on 25 October from the KRA adding an additional 23 residents concerned at the loss of the access way. • St Ives residents and management, Mayor, Ward Councillors, Council staff, members of the Kardinya Ratepayers Association and representatives from Murdoch University met to discuss the access way issues on 28 September 2007 at the St Ives Village. • The subject access way is not a legislated pedestrian access way however, has been utilised by the community as an access way for many years. The access was initially utilised as a vehicle access however, as part of the Master Planning process, the community requested that vehicular access be closed and the access way remain available for pedestrians (and service vehicles). The access way provides direct and convenient access to the university playing fields for the Kardinya community located to the west of the university. • Recommended that the access way as shown on the Murdoch University Master Plan be deleted from the plan.

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT

TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

P07/1009

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS WAY BETWEEN WINDELYA ROAD & MURDOCH UNIVERSITY PLAYING FIELDS KARDINYA (REC) (ATTACHMENT) (Continued)

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[1009 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The street map and photographs formed part of the attachments to Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[1009A November 2007.pdf](#)

The plan formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[1009B November 2007.pdf](#)

The plan formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[1009C November 2007.pdf](#)

Disclosures of Interest

Item No : P07/1009 - Pedestrian Access Way Between Windelya Road & Murdoch University Playing Fields Kardinya
Member : Cr J Barton
Type of Interest : Interest under Code of Conduct
Nature of Interest : Husband employee on Murdoch University
Extent of Interest : Interest under Code of Conduct
Request : Stay and Observe
Decision of Council : Stay and Observe
Meeting Note:

Cr Halton requested information on crime rate statistics for the access way between Windelya Road and Murdoch University. Mr C McClure would make enquiries and provide the requested information, if available.

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT
TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**P07/3024****THREE STOREY PLUS ROOF DECK MIXED USE BUILDING – INCLUDING SHOP, TAKEAWAY FOOD OUTLET, CAFÉ, THREE OFFICES AND SIX MULTIPLE DWELLINGS ON LOTS 24 AND 25 (23) QUEENS ROAD, MOUNT PLEASANT (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Description**

- Three storey and roof deck Mixed Use building – 6 Commercial Units and 6 Multiple Dwellings.
- Non-compliance with Plot Ratio.
- Non-Compliance with on site Carparking.
- Non-Compliance with Building Height.
- Non-Compliance with Landscaping.
- Existing angled carparking encroaching into the property.
- Existing public pathway is located within the property boundaries.
- Existing low impact mobile phone facilities are proposed to be reconstructed on the development.
- Advertised for 21 days in accordance with the City of Melville's Community Planning Scheme No. 5.
- Significant objections (11 submissions inclusive of a petition containing 204 signatures) received based on concerns relating to excessive plot ratio, building height, inappropriate density, traffic problems, loss of privacy, insufficient parking, loss of property value, lack of architectural merit and noise issues.
- Supported for approval subject to conditions inclusive of required modifications to address submissions.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[3024 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The property map formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3024 PROPERTY MAP.pdf](#)

The plan formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3024A November 2007.pdf](#)

The submission schedule formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3024B November 2007.pdf](#)

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT**TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

P07/3024	THREE STOREY PLUS ROOF DECK MIXED USE BUILDING – INCLUDING SHOP, TAKEAWAY FOOD OUTLET, CAFÉ, THREE OFFICES AND SIX MULTIPLE DWELLINGS ON LOTS 24 AND 25 (23) QUEENS ROAD, MOUNT PLEASANT (REC) (ATTACHMENT) Continued.
-----------------	---

Meeting Notes:

Cr Reynolds queried whether the proposed mixed use building was correctly described as a three storey building or should it be described as a four storey building.

Cr Barton queried the amount of the bonus being given to the developers, and recommended that the removal of the toilet blocks be looked into.

Cr Robartson requested that an alternative design be investigated that would do away with the toilet blocks on the roof deck which would make the design more acceptable.

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT
TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**P07/3023****FOUR STOREY MIXED USE BUILDING – FIVE MULTIPLE DWELLINGS & ONE OFFICE ON LOT 314 (4) FORBES ROAD APPLECROSS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Description**

- Mixed Use four storey building with basement carparking.
- Mixed Use – 5 Multiple Dwellings and 1 Office.
- Advertised for 21 days in accordance with the City of Melville's Community Planning Scheme No. 5.
- Three submissions were received relating to increase in traffic due to the proposed office, bulk of the building, office use, excessive plot ratio, loss of privacy, reduced open space and noise from the communal pool.
- Proposed plot ratio of the residential component is 0.805 in lieu of 0.6.
- Proposed plot ratio of the non-residential component is 0.069.
- Total proposed plot ratio – 0.874.
- Non-compliance with side setbacks.
- Supported for approval subject to conditions.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[3023 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The map formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3023 PROPERTY MAP.pdf](#)

The plans formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3023A November 2007.pdf](#)

The submission schedule formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[P07 3023B November 2007.pdf](#)

At 8.52pm Cr Barton departed from the meeting due to Disclosure of Interest.

Disclosures of Interest

Item No : P07/3023 - Four Storey Mixed Use Building – Five Multiple Dwellings & One Office On Lot 314 (4) Forbes Road
Applecross Member

Member: Cr J Barton

Type of Interest : Interest under Code of Conduct

Nature of Interest : Daughter owns an adjoining property.

Extent of Interest : Interest under Code of Conduct

Request : Stay and Observe

Decision of Council : Leave

Meeting Notes:

Cr Bennet requested that an alternative recommendation be prepared.

At 9.15pm Cr Barton returned to the meeting

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	
T07/2001	<p>DRAFT ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (REC) (ATTACHMENT)</p> <p><u>Description</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking Council approval to release the Ecological Sustainability Plan for public comment <p><u>Attachment</u></p> <p>The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007. 2001 Draft Report 2007.pdf</p> <p>The Draft Ecological Sustainability Plan formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007. 2001 November 2007.pdf</p>

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
TECHNICAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	
T07/3002	<p>WIRELESS HILL SOUTH EASTERN TOWER REFURBISHMENT (REC)</p> <p><u>Description</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This report seeks approval for one of the options listed below for the South Eastern Anchor Point at Wireless Hill. Option 1 - Restore the anchor point to its original 1912 condition. Option 2 - Restore/repair the concrete structure and replace the staircase to make it once again accessible as a viewing platform. <p><u>Attachment</u></p> <p>The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007. 3002 Draft Report 2007.pdf</p>

Meeting Notes:

Cr Barton recommended that an Engineers Report on the structure be obtained.

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT****C07/5009****LOCAL LAW AMENDMENT PARKING FACILITIES MODIFIED (REC)****Description**

- Following the Annual review of Fees & Charges in April 2007 the Modified Penalties for Parking Infringements were increased.
- This increase requires an amendment to the Local Law Relating to Parking Facilities before the new Penalties can be imposed.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5009 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT****C07/8016****WIRELESS HILL SECURITY (REC)****Description**

- At its September 2007 meeting, Council resolved that a report be prepared on the security measures for Wireless Hill.
- Accordingly, it is recommended that additional security measures be considered as part of the development of the Strategic Plan for Wireless Hill.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[8016 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
CUSTOMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES	
CO10/07	<p>SUPPLY AND LAYING OF HOT ASPHALT FOR MINOR WORKS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)</p> <p><u>Description</u></p> <p>To accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the 'supply and laying of hot asphalt for minor works'.</p> <p><u>Attachment</u></p> <p>The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007. CO010_07 Draft Report 2007.pdf</p> <p>Confidential attachments to this item to be distributed to Elected Members on 2 November 2007.</p>

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
STRATEGIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	
C07/5020	<p>ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO OCCASIONAL, ADVISORY, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEES (REC)</p> <p><u>Description</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Item provides the Council with the opportunity to review the continuation of each Committee and if still required, to elect representatives to the various Occasional, Advisory, Local Government and Community Committees. <p><u>Attachment</u></p> <p>The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007. 5020 Draft Report 2007.pdf</p>

Meeting Notes:

Cr Macphail advised that the West Corridor Development & Employment Foundation (Inc) Committee had recently changed it's name to The South West Development Corporation (Inc).

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT****C07/6004****REVIEW OF MAYORAL AND DEPUTY MAYORAL ALLOWANCES POLICY
14-PL-003 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Description**

- In accordance with a Council resolution made at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Tuesday 20 February 2007 this report presents a review of the Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances paid in accordance with Council Policy 14-PL-003 which is entitled “Elected Members Claims for Allowances and Expenses and Conference Attendance”.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[6004 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The policy formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[6004 November 2007.pdf](#)

At 9.44pm the Mayor and Cr Everett declared an interest in this Item and left the meeting. Cr Macphail stepped in as Chairperson.

ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT	
STRATEGIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	
C07/6004	REVIEW OF MAYORAL AND DEPUTY MAYORAL ALLOWANCES POLICY 14-PL-003 (REC) (ATTACHMENT) Continued

Disclosures of Interest

Item No : C07/6004 - Review of Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances Policy 14-PL-003
Member: Mayor R A Aubrey
Type of Interest : Financial Interest in accordance with the Act
 Interest under Code of Conduct
Nature of Interest : Personal benefit to be gained
Extent of Interest : Personal benefit to be gained
Request : Leave
Decision of Council : Leave

Disclosures of Interest

Item No : C07/6004 - Review of Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances Policy 14-PL-003
Member: Cr H R Everett
Type of Interest : Financial Interest in accordance with the Act
Nature of Interest : Holder of one of the positions to be reviewed
Extent of Interest : Holder of one of the positions to be reviewed
Request : Leave
Decision of Council : Leave

Meeting Notes:

Cr Ceniviva requested a change to the policy regarding printers and multi functional office equipment. Cr Robartson suggested that the item be presented to the Council in its current format and that the Policy be reviewed in relation to the purchase of multi functional printers and be referred to a future meeting of the Council.

At 10.02pm the Mayor and Cr Everett returned to the meeting, with Cr Everett resuming as Chairperson.

**ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT
MANAGEMENT SERVICES****C07/5018****CITY OF MELVILLE ANNUAL REPORT 2006/2007 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Description**

- This report presents 2006-2007 Annual Report for the Council's acceptance.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5018 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The Community Annual Report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5018 November 2007.pdf](#)

**ITEM NO. DESCRIPTION / ATTACHMENT
MANAGEMENT SERVICES****C07/5019****NEW CITY OF MELVILLE LOGO (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****Description**

- To determine whether a new logo is desired for the City of Melville in order to retain and protect the Heraldic Crest as the formal heraldic symbol of the City for formal and ceremonial purposes.
- Creation of a new logo which can work appropriately on all applications and best represent the personality, aspirations of the organisation and the community.
- Select of the logo from a set of three alternatives developed through a research and consultative methodology.

Attachment

The draft report formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5019 Draft Report 2007.pdf](#)

The logo option 1 formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5019A November 2007.pdf](#)

The logo option 2 formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5019B November 2007.pdf](#)

The logo option 3 formed part of the attachments to the Agenda distributed to members of the Council on 2 November 2007.

[5019C November 2007.pdf](#)

Meeting Notes:

Cr Bennett requested that a fourth option be included in this item being not to adopt a new logo and to retain the Heraldic crest.

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the forum closed at 10.15pm.