



— *City of* —
Melville

MINUTES
OF THE
ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
HELD ON
17 OCTOBER 2006

DISTRIBUTED: 20 OCTOBER 2006



— 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

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE, 10 ALMONDBURY ROAD, BOORAGOON, COMMENCING AT 6.30PM ON TUESDAY, 17 OCTOBER 2006.

1. PRESENT

Her Worship the Mayor, Katherine Jackson JP

COUNCILLORS

Cr D J Macphail (Deputy Mayor)
Cr A Ceniviva
Cr C W Robartson; Cr R A Aubrey
Cr P M Phelan; Cr C M Halton
Cr M J Barton; Cr L J Wyatt
Cr J R Bennett; Cr L M Reynolds
Cr H R Everett, Cr J Phillips

WARD

City
City
Bull Creek/Leeming
Palmyra/Melville/Willagee
Bicton/Attadale
University
Applecross/Mount Pleasant

2. IN ATTENDANCE

E Lumsden PSM
A McAllister

C McClure
M Tieleman
R G C Willis

D Gillam
B Taylor

K Weymes (Departed at 7.31pm)

I Davis (Departed at 6.41pm)
K Hinks (Departed at 6.41pm)
L Reid
T Hirst
R Dougall

POSITION TITLE

Chief Executive Officer
Director Strategic Community
Development
Director Strategic Urban Planning
Director Customer & Corporate Services
Director Technical & Development
Services
Manager Health & Leisure Services
Manager Information & Corporate
Support
Manager Planning & Development
Services
Environmental Programmes Manager
Facilities & Assets Manager
A/Community Recreation Coordinator
Senior Administration Officer
Minutes Secretary

At the Commencement of the Meeting, there were seven (7) people present in the public gallery, including five (5) staff and there were two (2) members present in the press gallery.

3. APOLOGIES AND APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil.

5. AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 WATER AWARDS 2006

Category 4: LOCAL GOVERNMENT WATER EFFICIENCY AWARD (open to WA Local Governments) recognises the efficient use of water resources by a Local Government in a Local Government Area.

The Water Awards 2006 were created by the Department of Water and the Water Corporation and held at the Perth Convention Centre last Friday night the 13th of October 2006. The City of Melville was a finalist in the above category and subsequently was the winner.

The award submission contained details of the ongoing water efficiency programme which started in 1999. Over this period the program has reduced water usage for public open space by 1.9 GL or 1.9 billion litres. This is an average of 12.9% below the Department of Waters allocation.

In summary, this program has included the implementation of:

A sophisticated data management system, automated irrigation monitoring system linked to weather stations, a regular monitoring and maintenance regime which includes flow testing, soil moisture probes, lysimeters, leaf tissue analysis and irrigation systems audits; water efficient irrigation design - such as sub surface irrigation, water wise plant selection, soil amendment and the use of alternative sources of water.

These initiatives are cost effective and innovative measures which demonstrate the City of Melville's contribution to the sustainable use of Western Australia's water resources.

The Council acknowledges the contribution to acclaim this award by Kelton Hinks, Ian Davis and Phil Gale.

** **At 6.41pm the Facilities & Assets Manager, Kelton Hinks left the Chamber.**
** **At 6.41pm the Environmental Programmes Manager, Ian Davis left the Chamber.**

5.2 A record of functions attend by the Mayor, and Elected Members representing the Mayor for the Council, for the period 19 September 2006 to 16 October 2006, forms an attachment to the Minutes of the Meeting.

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr M J Barton –

THAT THE RECORD OF FUNCTIONS ATTENDED BY THE MAYOR, AND ELECTED MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE MAYOR ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL, FOR THE PERIOD 19 SEPTEMBER 2006 TO 16 OCTOBER 2006, BE NOTED.

The Mayor submitted the motion,
which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (13/0)**

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

6.1 ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL – 19 SEPTEMBER 2006

Cr M J Barton moved, seconded Cr C Halton –

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 2006 BE CONFIRMED.

The Mayor submitted the motion,
which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (13/0)**

7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- Cr R Aubrey (C06/3000)

8. APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVES OF ABSENCE

- Cr L J Wyatt
- Cr R Aubrey
- Cr M J Barton
- Cr A Ceniviva
- Cr J Phillips

9. IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil.

10. PETITIONS

Nil.

11. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Table of Contents

P06/3017	TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE.....	2
T05/1027	COMMITTEE REQUEST - ALTERNATIVE FOOTPATH PRODUCTS.....	15
C06/3000	LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT)	11
P06/7002	COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON.....	33
T06/2011	PETITION REVIEW POLICY FOR SPRAYING PATHS AND ROAD KERBS .	11
C06/8007	COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007.....	11
C06/8008	BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT	11
CO06/06	SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK.....	11
CO07/06	SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK.....	11
CO10/06	SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER.....	11
C06/5000	COMMON SEAL REGISTER	11
C06/6000	INVESTMENT STATEMENTS	11
C06/6001	SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS.....	74
C06/6002	FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	11

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	:	City
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	DA-2006-1079
Property	:	22A Mullings Way, Myaree WA 6154
Proposal	:	Two (2) Storey Single Dwelling
Applicant	:	Mr L M King
Owner	:	Mr L M King
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	No relevant previous items

SUMMARY

The application is for a two (2) storey single dwelling on Lot 782 (22A) Mullings Way, Myaree.

The two storey on battleaxe lot development standards of the Living Area – MY1 precinct apply to the site.

It is recommended that the application be approved.

BACKGROUND

The Western Australian Planning Commission have issued an approval (WAPC Ref 131360) dated 9 June 2006 for the subdivision of the parent lot into two (2) lots in a battleaxe configuration.

Scheme Provisions

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Living Area – MY1
R-Code	:	R20
Use Type	:	Residential
Use Class	:	P

Site Details

Lot Area	:	432sqm total
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	No
Street Tree(s)	:	No
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	No
Site Details	:	{Link to Site Photo}

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

DETAIL

Development Requirements

Development Requirement	Required/ Allowed	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve variation	Plan Notation
Open Space	50% (176sqm)	50% (178sqm)	Complies		
Building Height	10.5 metres maximum	8.5 metres maximum	Complies		
Carparking	2 bays at least 1 covered	2 covered bays	Complies		

Two Storey on Battleaxe Lot Development Standards

Development Requirement	Required/ Allowed	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve variation	Plan Notation
Plot Ratio	0.4 effective lot area (133sqm)	0.62 (207sqm)	Does Not Comply	Council	
Upper Floor Area	30% (55sqm)	45% (82sqm)	Does Not Comply	Council	

(Note: Non-compliances are emphasised in bold)

Setbacks

Wall	Required	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve Variation	Plan Notation
Front (N)					
Ground	1 metre	1 metre	Complies		
Upper	4 metres	3.4 metres	Does Not Comply	Council	
Rear (S)					
Ground	3 metre min and 6 metre average	1.1 metre min and 1.8 metre average	Does Not Comply	Council	
Upper	4 metres	4 metres	Complies		

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Side (E)					
Ground	1 metre	Nil	Does Comply	Not	Council
Upper	4 metres	5.7 metres	Complies		
Side (W)					
Ground	1.5 metres	4.3 metres	Complies		
Upper	4 metres	4.5 metres	Complies		

(Note: Non-compliances are emphasised in bold)

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

No relevant Council Policy.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Advertising Required: Yes
 Neighbour's Comment Supplied: Yes
 Reason: Variation to precinct development standards
 Support/Object: Three (3) objections

Affected Property	Summary of Submission	Support/ Objection	Officer's Comment	Action (Condition/ Support/ Dismiss)
23 Stammers Place Myaree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development departs from the development standards in relation to plot ratio, upper floor area and southern ground floor setback. It is grossly unjust of the Council to consider this application because it does not comply with the development standards. 	Objection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to make comment on the likely impact of the aspects of the proposed design that vary from the development standards. The provisions of the CPS 5 permit the Council to vary development standards contained in the CPS 5. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dismiss. Dismiss.

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

	<p>3. Before the submission is considered by the Council the onus should be on the builder to provide a design that complies with the development standards.</p>		<p>The important issue is the potential impact of any departure from development standards not the fact that the proposed design seeks to vary the development standards. No comment made on the potential impact.</p> <p>3. The applicant has the right to ask for the Council to consider a design that does not meet the development standards. It is the applicant's responsibility to justify any variation using arguments based on sound planning principles.</p>	<p>3. Dismiss</p>
<p>22 Mullings Way Myaree</p>	<p>1. The plot ratio standard is in the CPS for a reason and why should the applicant be permitted to vary the standard.</p> <p>2. In relation to the proposed reduced upper floor setbacks, concern is raised relating to noise, privacy, fire risk. The upper floor will be far too close to the</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>1. No comment relating to the potential impact of the proposed variations to the development standards.</p> <p>2. The proposed design complies with the Acceptable Development standards of Element 8 of the 2002</p>	<p>1. Dismiss.</p> <p>2. Dismiss.</p>

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

	<p>dwelling on 22 Mullings Way Myaree.</p> <p>3. The proposed pool is to be located next to our outdoor living area which is of a concern due to the noise that area may generate.</p>		<p>R Codes and there is no other information provided in the comment to suggest this requires further investigation. Fire risk is assessed at building licence application stage and at this time there is nothing information provided in the comment to suggest otherwise.</p> <p>3. Any noise generated from pool pumps and any amplified music will be required to comply with the Environmental Health (Noise) Regulations 1997. Human voices and noise from the general enjoyment of the property is exempt from the noise regulations and is unlikely to adversely affect the enjoyment of 22 Mullings Way Myaree.</p>	<p>3. Dismiss</p>
--	--	--	---	-------------------

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

<p>24 Mullings Way Myaree</p>	<p>1. The proposed building is “large” and “boxy” which is not consistent with the intent of the two storey on battleaxe lot development standards.</p> <p>2. The excessive upper floor area is very intrusive on the the enjoyment of the property, 24 Mullings Way Myaree. It is likely to reduce access to light for the garden and pool. It is likely to obstruct views of the trees in the park close by. The occupiers use the rear yard frequently and the appearance of a large and boxy dwelling will detract</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>1. The intent of the two storey on battleaxe lot development standards is to prohibit large and boxy developments on rear lots. The issue of whether or not the proposed design meets the intent of the development standards is discussed in the comment section below. The proposed design is close to meeting the upper floor boundary setbacks which means that any perceived ‘bulk’ is set well back from the boundaries of the site.</p> <p>2. In relation to access to light, the proposed design complies with the Acceptable Development standards of Element 9 of the 2002 R Codes. In addition to those standards, the eastern upper floor building wall is proposed to be setback in excess</p>	<p>1. Dismissed and Noted – the comment is relevant.</p> <p>2. Dismissed and Noted – the comments are relevant.</p>
-------------------------------	--	------------------	--	---

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

	<p>from the visual amenity of that area.</p> <p>3. The east facing window in the upper floor bedroom overlooks the rear yard and pool area on 24 Mullings Way Myraee.</p>		<p>of 4 metres from the boundary. It is likely that there will be no adverse impact relating to access to light. In relation to appearance, the proposed building could be considered to have an attractive appearance. The high roof pitch rising to a flat summit, combination of difference in setbacks between the ground floor and upper floor, rendered brick and tile finish and architectural chimney feature all contribute to a neat, conservative, simple and pleasant appearance.</p> <p>3. The major opening in the eastern upper floor building wall is setback appropriately from the eastern boundary of the site complying with the Acceptable Development standards of Element 8 of the 2002 R Codes.</p>	<p>3. Dismiss and Noted – the comment is relevant.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

	<p>4. The eastern ground floor boundary wall is acceptable however there is concern in relation to the dividing fence (will the wall form part of the dividing fence) and the footings of the proposed wall are likely to be close to the pool on 24 Mullings Way Myaree.</p>		<p>It is acknowledged that there may be overlooking into 24 Mullings Way Myaree (based on a person being able to see further than 5.7 metres) however the distance of separation is adequate to provide privacy for 24 Mullings Way Myaree and provide access to light and ventilation and an outlook from inside the bedroom for the proposed dwelling.</p> <p>4. The matter of a dividing fence between the two properties is a matter to be resolved between the landowners. At building licence application stage the applicant will be required to find a solution to enable the construction of the boundary wall without compromising the integrity of structures on the adjoining site.</p>	<p>4. Dismissed.</p>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

	<p>5. The proposed building is out of character with the existing buildings in the street.</p>		<p>The applicant will be required to enlist the services of a certified practising structural engineer.</p> <p>5. The writer has not defined the character or style of architecture of the buildings in the street. A site visit in the street observed a number of architectural styles in the street. The proposed design could be considered to be conservative and simple, it does not display aspects of unique contemporary design and for that reason is unlikely to be 'out of character' with the existing built development in the locality.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Not required.

**P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY,
MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Should the City of Melville refuse the application for planning approval, the applicant may have the right to have the decision reviewed in accordance with Part XIV of the Planning and Development Act 2005.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no anticipated financial implications.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

There are no anticipated strategic implications.

COMMENT

The site abuts a site zoned under the Community Planning Scheme No. 5 as Living Area – MY1 and in the ownership of the Department of Land Information. The site is currently used as a local park and for the purposes of assessing this application for planning approval, there is deemed to be no impact on that site because it is occupied by a non-residential use.

The application has been assessed in accordance with the provisions of the Community Planning Scheme No. 5, Council Policy and the Acceptable Development standards of the 2002 Residential Design Codes and the application proposes to depart from the development standards as follows:

- Plot ratio of zero point six two (0.62) of the effective lot area in lieu of zero point four (0.4). This relates to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards for the Living Area – MY1 Precinct.
- Upper floor area of forty five percent (45%) of the permissible gross floor area in lieu of thirty percent (30%). This relates to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards for the Living Area – MY1 Precinct.
- Northern upper floor boundary setback of three point four metres (3.4m) in lieu of four metres (4m). This relates to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards for the Living Area – MY1 Precinct.
- Rear ground floor boundary setback minimum of one point one metres (1.1m) in lieu of three metres (3m) and average of one point eight metres (1.8m) in lieu of six metres (6m). This relates to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards for the Living Area – MY1 Precinct.

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- Comment from the potentially affected land owners has been provided with three (3) objections. Two (2) of the objections do not make comment relating to the any potential impact on amenity and are considered to be of no benefit in the subjective assessment on impact to amenity. The other objection makes comment relating to potential impact on amenity and should be considered to be of benefit in the subjective assessment on amenity. Technical comment relating to the objection has been provided above in the public consultation section of this report.
- The intent of the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards is to prevent 'bulky' developments on rear lots. The proposed design does not comply with the plot ratio, upper floor area, northern upper floor boundary setback and rear ground floor boundary setback standards. Despite this, the development does not appear to be 'bulky.' There are a number of articulations in the walls on the proposed upper floor and the proposed upper floor is generally well setback from the site boundaries. The combination of the two assists the proposed design in ameliorating the impact of building bulk and protecting access to sunlight and ventilation for the proposed development and the potentially affected sites.
- The proposed upper floor does not comply with the plot ratio standard and upper floor area standard but is close to achieving compliance with the upper floor boundary setbacks. Plot ratio is a tool usually incorporated into development standards to control building bulk. If the building (and associated bulk) is appropriately setback from the boundaries of the site then it is reasonable to conclude that the building bulk is not likely to be imposing on the potentially affected sites.
- More than half of the proposed excess plot ratio is contained in the ground floor. This has less impact than if contained in the upper floor and is likely to have less impact as the setbacks for the proposed building, generally, comply with the Acceptable Development standards of the 2002 R Codes.

It is recommended that the proposed variations to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards of the Living Area –MY1 precinct be supported.

- Eastern ground floor boundary setback to the Garage of nil in lieu of one metre (1m). This relates to the provisions of the 2002 Residential Design Codes.
 - Comment has been obtained from the potentially affected owner. The comment objects to the proposed variations to the two (2) storey on battleaxe lot development standards but does not object to the proposed boundary wall.
 - The shadow cast from the proposed wall will be down the boundary line as measured to comply with the provisions of Element 9 of the 2002 Residential Design Codes. The proposed wall is likely to assist the potentially affected site achieve better solar passive living by providing minimal protection of the outdoor living area from afternoon sunlight.

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- In relation to building bulk, the existing dwelling on the potentially affected site is ends before the location of the proposed boundary wall and therefore there is likely to be no visual impact on major openings on the potentially affected dwelling. The existing outdoor living area on the adjoining site is extensive and the proposed wall is close to being compliant with the Acceptable Development standard. It is unlikely the proposed boundary wall will have an adverse visual impact.
- There are no openings proposed in the wall, the privacy of the potentially affected site is protected.

It is recommended that the proposed boundary wall be supported.

Officer Recommendation

That the application for a two (2) Storey Single Dwelling on Lot 782 (22A) Mullings Way, Myaree, be Approved and subject to the following:

Standard Conditions:

RESSD 03, 04, 06, 11, 13, 16 and RESGD 07

Special Conditions:

- 1. The existing bore cavity in the access way being filled in and compacted appropriately or being modified, in a manner suitable to a certified practising Structural Engineer, to be trafficable and safe so as not to cause harm to any vehicles or persons whom are likely to travel on or over the bore cavity. The manner suitable to the engineer being provided in writing to the City of Melville with the application for a Building Licence.**
- 2. During construction of the approved development access to the site is permitted using the street frontage only.**

P06/3017 – TWO (2) STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Cr A Ceniviva moved, seconded Cr J R Bennett -

THAT THE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION BE REJECTED AND REPLACED WITH THE FOLLOWING:

THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A TWO (2) STORY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 782 (22A) MULLINGS WAY, MYAREE, BE REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE TWO (2) STORY ON BATTLEAXE LOT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE LIVING AREA – MY1 PRECINT AS SPECIFIED IN PART 4 OF THE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5. THE INTENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IS TO PROHIBIT DEVELOPMENT THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED BEING ‘BOXY’ AND ‘BULKY’ ON REAR LOTS. THE APPLICATION PROPOSES TO VARY THE PLOT RATIO, UPPER FLOOR AREA, UPPER FLOOR BOUNDARY SETBACK (TO THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY ONLY) AND REAR GROUND FLOOR BOUNDARY SETBACK DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND IS THEREFORE CONSIDERED NOT TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE INTENT OF THE TWO STORY ON BATTLEAXE LOT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

CARRIED (12/1)

T05/1027 – COMMITTEE REQUEST - ALTERNATIVE FOOTPATH PRODUCTS (REC)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Footpath Construction
Customer Index	: Community & Technical Services
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: T05/1027 – Committee Request – Alternative Footpath Products (December 2005) 1027 P1 October 2006.pdf T05/1027 – Committee Request (September 2005) 1027 P2 October 2006.doc
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	: Philip Gale, Manager Infrastructure Services

SUMMARY

This report reproduces the report previously presented to Council in December 2005. The report confirms that there is low demand for alternative path construction techniques and that they are costly to build.

BACKGROUND

At the September 2005 meeting of the Community and Technical Services Committee, Her Worship the Mayor, Katherine Jackson JP requested that Officers look at other options for footpaths. It had been brought to her attention that the current footpaths, which are constructed from concrete could be causing foot and knee problems for residents of the City of Melville.

Further follow up for this agenda item was required and we have been waiting for some research findings to be presented from the University of Western Australia (UWA). As these findings are still some time off we are re-presenting the original report into this issue with added comments.

The recommendations from the previous item were;

1. *“That a further report be submitted following receipt of the findings of the school of human movement report from the University of Western Australia.*
2. *That further investigations be conducted into the costs involved and supply issues for the various types of alternative footpaths products available.”*

T05/1027 – COMMITTEE REQUEST - ALTERNATIVE FOOTPATH PRODUCTS (REC)

DETAIL

The following table demonstrates the estimated costs associated with the construction of a footpath that is eight hundred metres (800m) long by one point eight metres (1.8m) wide with two (2) pram ramps. The reinstatement costs are also included.

Material	Cost	Life Span	Additional Costs
Insitu Concrete Slabs	\$51,000	25 year life	\$160 a panel (3m x 1.8m)
Bitumen	\$122,000	15 year life	patching \$50 / panel \$200
Rubber Paving Slabs <i>(US supplier – no supplier found in Australia as yet)</i>	\$76,000	Unknown	\$300 for a 3m x 1.8m section

At this time the cost alone prohibits the use of rubber paving for our road reserve footpaths. The construction programme would drop from between twelve to fifteen kilometres (12km – 15km) per year to between seven and eight kilometres (7km – 8km), with large stretches of footpath, over one (1) kilometre, using almost one-third (1/3) of the budget.

Flexible paving has been used throughout Australia, but only in short sections in recreational environments. The requirements of a footpath on a road reserve are much higher as pedestrian usage is much higher and the effects of vehicle traffic over sections must be taken into consideration.

Officers have been unable to find any other Local Government body using rubber paving for large sections of footpath. Small sections of crushed rubber paths have been installed around verge trees in many Councils across Australia including Port Philip Council, which uses a five metre (5m) x one point seven metre (1.7m) rubber mat product around its street trees in the main hub areas. These mats cost two thousand dollars (\$2,000) each and are installed at a total cost of three thousand seven hundred dollars (\$3,700). An equivalent concrete path would cost three hundred dollars (\$300) and in bitumen it would cost two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250).

Bitumen footpaths used in road reserve footpaths have not been fully investigated as the whole-of-life cost is much higher than concrete, plus we do not have the facilities to maintain them at this time.

Through two (2) different tests, the report states that concrete is the lowest scoring material overall sixth (6th), though the hard data actually shows that it is fourth (4th) or fifth (5th). It is agreed that bitumen does rank the highest in these tests. The real question on these results is how this relates back to normal walking conditions, which is unknown as these tests are not designed to gather this type of information.

T05/1027 – COMMITTEE REQUEST - ALTERNATIVE FOOTPATH PRODUCTS (REC)

Of note is the fact that Antiskid Industries are currently developing a rubber/bitumen coating for concrete and bitumen paths and Boral Asphalt are developing a rubber/bitumen mix for paths, both of which will be followed up in the New Year.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Policy 27-001 – Footpaths.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Discussions with the School of Human Movement – UWA, Exceed Consulting, Antiskid Industries and Boral Asphalt have or are being undertaken.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no statutory or legal implications for Council in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications are significant, and any move to change materials would require either additional funding or transference of funds from other programs. Increased funding for the preservation of our current assets is difficult enough to procure without adding a more expensive process for what would be very low or negligible benefit

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Forward programmes for the upgrade and construction of new footpaths will be directly affected. This item will also affect programmes related to reserve improvements and maintenance programmes. A level of risk to the public and the risk of using a material that the longevity and ongoing maintenance is at this stage not known.

COMMENT

There are three (3) issues which need to be considered regarding this issue.

Firstly the question of benefit should be addressed. This at the present time is a perceived benefit concept. There is no scientific evidence to suggest that the preponderance of hard surfaces on our pathways is causing any increase in damage to skeletal structures. Whilst they may be hard to walk on for some they do provide firm even surfaces for the community to enjoy.

Secondly the choice of material is an issue. Currently there is no specific pavement surface that could be used for this purpose. There are a number of products around such as asphalt and rubberised materials that can be used but these are not tested materials for this specific purpose and would in all probability not achieve improved results.

T05/1027 – COMMITTEE REQUEST - ALTERNATIVE FOOTPATH PRODUCTS (REC)

And thirdly there is the cost element. This has been addressed previously in the report but any path is a costly item and by injecting unknown construction and maintenance variables into the whole of life equation for these assets has the potential to cause large budget gaps for future operations.

Further research into whether other path construction bodies have used similar pavements have revealed no such information. There is certainly no confirmed link between the pavements we currently supply and increased joint damage to users of these facilities.

A more accurate report on the suitability of different materials for footpaths is currently being prepared by The School of Human Movement at the University of Western Australia. This report was to have been completed by April 2006, however this has not eventuated. When the report is to hand, it will be forwarded to Elected Members.

However, Associate Lecturer Jacque Alderson did make the comment that she believes that very few injuries (if any) occur as a result of impact with a footpath in the normal course of walking.

Officer Recommendation

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr C W Robartson -

That given the low benefit and potentially high cost of constructing paths from alternate material, no further action be taken.

Amendment 1

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr H R Everett -

That the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

That given the low benefit and potentially high cost of constructing paths from alternative material, no further action be taken at the present time but the issue be monitored in the event of products or processes being developed for future use.

Her Worship the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared **(LOST 5/8)**

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

The Mayor, submitted the substantive motion being –

THAT GIVEN THE LOW BENEFIT AND POTENTIALLY HIGH COST OF CONSTRUCTING PATHS FROM ALTERNATE MATERIAL, NO FURTHER ACTION BE TAKEN.

which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (13/0)**

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	: University
Category	: Strategic
Subject Index	: Murdoch Regional Hospital - Proposed
Customer Index	: Department for Planning and Infrastructure
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: P04/1012 – Lot 3071 (110) Murdoch Drive, Murdoch - Proposed Murdoch Regional Hospital (October 2004) 3000 P1 October 2006.pdf
Works Programme	: 2007 - 2011
Funding	: Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	: Martin Spencer Special Projects Officer – Strategic Urban Planning

SUMMARY

The Draft Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan was released in August 2006. Officers from the City of Melville have had the opportunity to be involved in the planning towards this document. The Consultants for the Department of Health and the Department for Planning and Infrastructure have presented most of the information from the structure plan to two (2) Elected Members Workshops in October 2005 and March 2006. The importance of the proposed Fiona Stanley Hospital and it's integration into the 'Murdoch Super Block' and the surrounding residential areas has been recognised with previous recommendations through Council. This item presents the submission by the City of Melville to the structure plan and request endorsement by Council. It highlights some of the issues that will impact on our residents and reiterating some of the issues that are considered important to the Council.

BACKGROUND

In October 2004 Council endorsed the decision to locate the proposed regional hospital at Murdoch.

The recommendation from Council was

“That The Council support the proposal from the Department of Health to develop a regional public hospital adjacent to St John of God Murdoch Hospital as it builds on the uniqueness of the site and synergies with the existing St John of God Murdoch Hospital, Murdoch University, TAFE, and Railway/BUS Station.

That the Department of Health, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and Murdoch Stakeholders, including the City of Melville encourage the planning for a Transit Oriented Development including the Hospital and mixed uses on the proposed and adjoining sites.

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

That the Health Department undertake a vision/master planning exercise for the subject land dealing with the integration of any new public hospital with the existing hospital, TAFE, prison and Murdoch University and addressing parking, transportation, traffic, environmental issues etc.”

The site chosen provides the opportunity to link with the existing uses of the super block which include St John of God Hospital, Murdoch University, Police and Fire and Emergency Services, Challenger TAFE and Spotless Linen Services. The locations proximity to the Kwinana Freeway, Murdoch Station on the Southern Suburbs Railway and South Street provides extremely good regional transport access. The proposal has the potential to provide not only first class public health services to the city but also to provide an employment centre, a medical research and development hub and also a site for a Transit Oriented Development.

Consultation has been undertaken through stakeholder workshops held in June 2005 and now a public advertising period of 60 days.

The Draft Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan (including Fiona Stanley Hospital and Health Precinct) responds to the recommendation.

DETAIL

The following are the major points and issues of the Draft Murdoch Activity Centre and Structure Plan that should be included in the submission.

Road Networks and Infrastructure

- i. Recognition of the City of Melville Transport Strategy and South West Groups Integrated Transport Strategy should be given in the Existing Statutory and Planning Considerations. These plans are integral to the transport planning within the region and include strategic objectives regarding integrated transport and land use planning, promotion and planning for public transport, cycling and walking and the importance of regional and local transport networks.
- ii. As the City of Melville is likely to be responsible for internal roads, foot and cycle paths and public open space, we request representation and input into the detailed design phase.
- iii. The need to widen Farrington Road Bridge is questioned as currently there are two lanes each way. Farrington Road east of the Freeway is now also only a single lane in each direction. An option of reconfiguration of lanes using a single east bound lane and three west bound lanes (one (1) right turn, one through and right turn combined and one through lane) should perhaps be considered rather than further construction. Refer to Figure 7 in [3000_October_2006.pdf](#)
- iv. Restrict right turn from North-South Connector Road onto Farrington Road. Instead direct traffic to Murdoch Drive.
- v. Pedestrian/Cycle access on the Farrington Road bridge needs to be retained.

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- vi. The governing principles establishing Road Segment B - Central includes the paragraph 'follows the alignment of Envall Way east of the Freeway and provides shared path connection and possible emergency vehicle access across the freeway in the long term.' Measures need to be included that ensure this does not become a priority route for emergency vehicles but rather a route to be used as an alternative in emergencies. Refer to Figure 8 and 7 in [3000 October 2006.pdf](#)
- vii. Reconsider the intersection of the north-south link road from Farrington road, the TOD access road and the Central east-west Link Road (Segment B, Segment E and Segment D.) The configuration shown on the plans lends itself to a difficult design exercise. Refer to Figure 8 in [3000 October 2006.pdf](#)
- viii. Ensure grade separated connection of Principle Shared Path remains with the construction of the new off ramp at South Street and the on ramp at Farrington Road
- ix. A cycle way on the east of the freeway between South Street and Farrington Road should be included in the plans and further research should be done on timing of the construction. This would assist in providing access for greater areas of Bull Creek to the stations and to the Murdoch Activity Centre.
- x. Traffic Signals on Murdoch Drive are considered to be too close. As a minimum they should be coordinated.
- xi. Double turn lanes on Murdoch Drive and South Street would be preferred to long single turn lanes allowing better performance intersection because of shorter phasing.
- xii. Pedestrian connections and access needs more research and detail. Pedestrian Phases should be included at all lights including South Street.
- xiii. Mid Block grade separated access should be considered across South Street
- xiv. Promote use of ITS displays to identify parking availability eg: number of bays available and location.
- xv. A parking strategy must be completed before development occurs to identify parking requirements for development; probable parking controls (short and long term) and pricing strategies.
- xvi. A permanent TravelSMart Office / end of trip facility should be established as part of the TOD.
- xvii. All internal parking, including on street parking should be constructed prior to handing over to Local Government.
- xviii. East/ West connections with Roe Highway through to the Murdoch Drive extension need to be included as part of Stage Three Road works to relieve pressure on the South Street intersections. Refer to Figure 6 in [3000 October 2006.pdf](#)

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Environment

- xix. Although storm water may be considered to be relatively good quality, there is still a need to consider hydrocarbons that may be generated on site.
- xx. Water sensitive urban design needs to be a major consideration throughout the design phase rather than concentrating drainage into existing water bodies.
- xxi. Drainage on Murdoch Drive especially the extension to Farrington Road and the Freeway should be considered in discussions with City of Melville and City of Cockburn. Consideration should be given to a wetland drainage infiltration basin.
- xxii. Collection of seeds and native plant specimens for landscaping would be encouraged.
- xxiii. Provision of sufficient time in the planning and construction phase to be given to allow for salvage and relocation of flora and fauna.
- xxiv. Serious consideration should be given to an appropriate offset arrangement to compensate for the significant destruction of urban bushland.

Urban design

- xxv. City of Melville Telecommunication Strategy and Policy should also be considered when looking at the impact of telecommunications especially in relation to co location, integration of facilities and location of towers.
- xxvi. Consideration should be given to the City of Melville Sustainable Development Manual, guidelines and policy for the construction of buildings on the subject land.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan recognises the City of Melville Local Commercial Strategy; Planning and Building Policy PB28 Bicycle Planning and End of Trip Facilities in Non Residential Areas; Green Plan, Storm Water Management Strategy; Sustainable Greenhouse Action Plan; Cities for Climate Protection; TravelSmart Plan; Waste Minimisation Policy and Sustainable Living Manual.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

The Department for Planning and Infrastructure has released the Draft Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan for Public comment for a period of sixty (60) days. The City of Melville has advertised the release of the Draft Structure Plan through press releases.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Metropolitan Region Scheme The land is reserved as Public Purpose (Hospital) under the MRS and Community Planning Scheme No.5.

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Aboriginal Heritage Act (1972) An ethnographic survey has been initiated (March 2006). An heritage survey is also required under the act.

Airports (protection of airspace) regulations 1996 of the Airports Act 1996
Development must comply with height and emission requirements.

Environmental Protection Act (1986) The development proposal will be referred to the EPA as part of the subdivision process and also as part of the development application.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications for Council in this application. The future detailed design and construction stages will have financial implications in providing linkages and maintenance of infrastructure that is handed over to the City.

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The Development of the site at Murdoch will have a significant impact on the community and the City of Melville's long term plans. One of the impacts will be the on the economic development for the City. The health precinct will provide an increase in employment opportunities. This will also increase the services available to the local and regional community. The development will also change the focus of the area creating another major attractor within the City. There is an opportunity that the Transit Oriented Development and the Health Precinct will have a flow on effect to the surrounding area increasing the attractiveness of these areas for health professionals and other workers within the precinct.

Some negative impacts will be experienced with an increase in traffic to the area; however the impact should be reduced with the management of traffic on the major roads such as South Street, Murdoch Drive and Kwinana Freeway. The loss of natural bushland, although a major negative impact, needs to be balanced against the positive impact to the community of the development. The staged development should provide for a staged clearing of the bushland and therefore a more ordered approach to capture and relocation of native fauna.

COMMENT

The development of the Fiona Stanley Hospital and Health Precinct, and the Transit Oriented Development will have a major impact on the City of Melville. Although the Murdoch super block has been a strategic site for larger scale health, education and other projects, it is fair to say that the scale of this development is far greater than anything previously undertaken in Melville. It is important therefore that the City of Melville is involved in the project as much as possible so that the impact on adjoining areas and the City as a whole is considered from the City's point of view.

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

The importance of the development cannot be denied, however it is also important to recognise the hierarchy of centres that currently exists within the City of Melville. There is no reason that the creation of a centre of this size should detract from the importance of Garden City as the City Centre or of Canning Bridge as the major office and commercial centre. Nor should it detract from Myaree being a major activity centre.

The City of Melville has had an opportunity to be involved in the preliminary stages of this planning process. Throughout the preliminary stages there has been the opportunity to ensure the impact of the development on the City has been managed. Local stakeholders have had the opportunity to be involved as well.

The Draft Murdoch Structure Plan therefore is the result of over twelve months of preliminary work. There are no major surprises in the Draft Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan. Most of the issues that the City of Melville has raised during the process have either been dealt with satisfactorily or raised as issues that still need to be considered in the following stages of the project.

The process of making a submission provides an opportunity to reinforce some of these issues as well as raising some concerns that may have arisen as the plans become more formalised.

The main issues being raised relate to

- Traffic issues and the infrastructure needed to manage the flow of traffic.
- The environment and measures to ensure the disruption to native flora and fauna is managed
- Sustainable development guidelines including use and disposal of waste water and
- Urban Design Principles.

It is therefore recommended that the Council build on their previous support of the Murdoch Activity Centre through this submission and continue to offer our support to the design stage of the project.

Disclosures of Interest

Item No	:	C06/3000 – Lot 3071 (110) Murdoch Drive, Murdoch – Submission for Draft Murdoch Activity Centre for Structure Plan (including Fiona Stanley Hospital and Health Precinct)
Member	:	Cr R Aubrey
Type of Interest	:	Proximity Interest in Accordance with the Act (s 5.60B)
Nature of Interest	:	Resides on Envall Way, Leeming
Extent of Interest	:	Lives in close Proximity
Request	:	Leave
Decision of Committee	:	Not Applicable
Decision of Council	:	Leave

**** At 7.18pm Cr R Aubrey departed the Meeting.**

Officer Recommendation

Cr D J Macphail moved, seconded Cr A Ceniciva -

- 1. That the Council support the Murdoch Activity Centre Structure Plan.**
- 2. That this item forms part of a submission to be made to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the Health Department supporting the Draft Murdoch Structure plan and requesting the continued involvement of the City of Melville in the design and implementation phases of the project.**
- 3. That the submission raise the following points:**

Road Networks and Infrastructure

- I. Recognition of the City of Melville Transport Strategy and South West Groups integrated transport strategy be given in the existing statutory and planning considerations with reference to the transport planning within the region including strategic objectives regarding integrated transport and land use planning, promotion and planning for public transport, cycling and walking and the importance of regional and local transport networks.**
- II. As the City of Melville is likely to be responsible for internal roads, foot and cycle paths and public open space, we request representation and input into the detailed design phase.**
- III. The need to widen Farrington Road bridge is questioned. Farrington Road east of the Freeway is now also only a single lane in each direction. An option of reconfiguration of lanes using a single east bound lane and three west bound lanes (one (1) right turn, one through and right turn combined and one through lane) be considered rather than further construction.**

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- IV. Restrict right turn from north-south connector road onto Farrington Road. Direct traffic to Murdoch Drive instead.
- V. Pedestrian/cycle access on the Farrington Road needs to be retained.
- VI. The governing principles establishing road segment B - central includes the paragraph 'follows the alignment of Envall Way east of the freeway and provides shared path connection and possible emergency vehicle access across the freeway in the long term. Measures need to be included that ensure this does not become a priority route for emergency vehicles but rather a route to be used as an alternative in specific localised emergencies.
- VII. Reconsider the intersection of the southern internal link road from the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to Farrington Road (segment B, segment E and segment D.) The configuration shown on the plans lends itself to a difficult design exercise.
- VIII. Ensure grade separated connection of principle shared path remains with the construction of the new offramp at South Street and the new on ramp at Farrington Road.
- IX. East/ West connections with Roe Highway through to the Murdoch Drive extension need to be included as part of stage three road works to relieve pressure on the South Street intersections.
- X. A cycle way on the east of the freeway between South Street and Farrington road be included in the plans and further research be done on timing of the construction. This would assist in providing access for greater areas of Bull Creek to the stations and to the Murdoch Activity Centre.
- XI. Traffic signals on Murdoch Drive are considered to be too close together. As a minimum they need to have coordinated phases to improve traffic flow.
- XII. Double turn lanes on Murdoch Drive and South Street are required in lieu of long single turn lanes allowing better performance of intersections because of shorter phasing.
- XIII. Pedestrian connections and access needs more research and detail. Pedestrian phases should be included at all lights including South Street.
- XIV. Mid block grade separated pedestrian access be considered across South Street

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- XV. Promote use of Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) displays to identify parking availability eg: number of bays available and location.
- XVI. A parking strategy must be completed before development occurs to identify parking requirements for development; probable parking controls (short and long term) and pricing strategies.
- XVII. A permanent Travelsmart Office / end of trip facility be established as part of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD).
- XVIII. All internal parking, including on street parking be constructed prior to handing over to Local Government. (see page 49 of structure plan)

Environment

- XIX. Although storm water may be considered to be relatively good quality, there is still a need to consider pollutants that may be generated on site.
- XX. Water sensitive urban design needs to be a major consideration throughout the design phase rather than drainage into existing water bodies.
- XXI. A wetland drainage infiltration basin be provided for drainage on Murdoch Drive especially the extension to Farrington Road and the freeway after discussions with City of Melville and City of Cockburn.
- XXII. Collection of seeds and native plant specimens for landscaping and City of Melville seed banks be discussed in conjunction with the City of Melville prior to clearing
- XXIII. Provision of sufficient time in the planning and construction phase to be given to allow for salvage and relocation of flora and fauna.
- XXIV. Appropriate offset arrangements to compensate loss of urban bushland is to be in place prior to clearing.

Urban design

- XXV. City of Melville telecommunication strategy and policy be considered in regard to co location, integration and site location of telecommunications facilities.
- XXVI. Consideration be given to the City of Melville sustainable development manual, guidelines and policy.

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Amendment 1

Cr C W Robartson moved, seconded Cr C Halton -

That condition VI be amended to read as follows:

VI Any connections from the Fiona Stanley Health Complex across the Kwinana Freeway to Envall Way not be implemented without the approval of the City of Melville.

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)

Amendment 2

Cr C W Robartson moved, seconded Cr M J Barton -

That condition number IX be amended to read as follows:

IX. The east / west connections with Roe Highway (modified as per City of Melville plan 1 dated 3.10.06 with tonnage limits) through to Murdoch Drive extension being included as part of stage 2 and 3 construction works to provide an alternative entrance point for emergency vehicles to the hospital and relieve traffic pressures on South Street and Farrington Road.

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

LOST (4/8)

Amendment 3

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr L M Reynolds -

That Condition IX be deleted and the remaining conditions be renumbered accordingly.

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

CARRIED (9/3)

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

The Mayor submitted the substantive motion, being -

- 1. THAT THE COUNCIL SUPPORT THE MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN.**
- 2. THAT THIS ITEM FORMS PART OF A SUBMISSION TO BE MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT SUPPORTING THE DRAFT MURDOCH STRUCTURE PLAN AND REQUESTING THE CONTINUED INVOLVEMENT OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE IN THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION PHASES OF THE PROJECT.**
- 3. THAT THE SUBMISSION RAISE THE FOLLOWING POINTS:**

ROAD NETWORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

- I. RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND SOUTH WEST GROUPS INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY BE GIVEN IN THE EXISTING STATUTORY AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE TRANSPORT PLANNING WITHIN THE REGION INCLUDING STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES REGARDING INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AND LAND USE PLANNING, PROMOTION AND PLANNING FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT, CYCLING AND WALKING AND THE IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL TRANSPORT NETWORKS.**
- II. AS THE CITY OF MELVILLE IS LIKELY TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL ROADS, FOOT AND CYCLE PATHS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, WE REQUEST REPRESENTATION AND INPUT INTO THE DETAILED DESIGN PHASE.**
- III. THE NEED TO WIDEN FARRINGTON ROAD BRIDGE IS QUESTIONED. FARRINGTON ROAD EAST OF THE FREEWAY IS NOW ALSO ONLY A SINGLE LANE IN EACH DIRECTION. AN OPTION OF RECONFIGURATION OF LANES USING A SINGLE EAST BOUND LANE AND THREE WEST BOUND LANES (ONE (1) RIGHT TURN, ONE THROUGH AND RIGHT TURN COMBINED AND ONE THROUGH LANE) BE CONSIDERED RATHER THAN FURTHER CONSTRUCTION.**
- IV. RESTRICT RIGHT TURN FROM NORTH-SOUTH CONNECTOR ROAD ONTO FARRINGTON ROAD. DIRECT TRAFFIC TO MURDOCH DRIVE INSTEAD.**
- V. PEDESTRIAN/CYCLE ACCESS ON THE FARRINGTON ROAD NEEDS TO BE RETAINED.**
- VI ANY CONNECTIONS FROM THE FIONA STANLEY HEALTH COMPLEX ACROSS THE KWINANA FREEWAY TO ENVALL WAY NOT BE IMPLEMENTED WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE.**

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

- VII. RECONSIDER THE INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHERN INTERNAL LINK ROAD FROM THE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) TO FARRINGTON ROAD (SEGMENT B, SEGMENT E AND SEGMENT D.) THE CONFIGURATION SHOWN ON THE PLANS LENDS ITSELF TO A DIFFICULT DESIGN EXERCISE.**
- VIII. ENSURE GRADE SEPERATED CONNECTION OF PRINCIPLE SHARED PATH REMAINS WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW OFFRAMP AT SOUTH STREET AND THE NEW ON RAMP AT FARRINGTON ROAD.**
- IX. A CYCLE WAY ON THE EAST OF THE FREEWAY BETWEEN SOUTH STREET AND FARRINGTON ROAD BE INCLUDED IN THE PLANS AND FURTHER RESEARCH BE DONE ON TIMING OF THE CONSTRUCTION. THIS WOULD ASSIST IN PROVIDING ACCESS FOR GREATER AREAS OF BULL CREEK TO THE STATIONS AND TO THE MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE.**
- X. TRAFFIC SIGNALS ON MURDOCH DRIVE ARE CONSIDERED TO BE TOO CLOSE TOGETHER. AS A MINIMUM THEY NEED TO HAVE COORDINATED PHASES TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW.**
- XI. DOUBLE TURN LANES ON MURDOCH DRIVE AND SOUTH STREET ARE REQUIRED IN LIEU OF LONG SINGLE TURN LANES ALLOWING BETTER PERFORMANCE OF INTERSECTIONS BECAUSE OF SHORTER PHASING.**
- XII. PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS AND ACCESS NEEDS MORE RESEARCH AND DETAIL. PEDESTRIAN PHASES SHOULD BE INCLUDED AT ALL LIGHTS INCLUDING SOUTH STREET.**
- XIII. MID BLOCK GRADE SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN ACCESS BE CONSIDERED ACROSS SOUTH STREET**
- XIV. PROMOTE USE OF INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEMS (ITS) DISPLAYS TO IDENTIFY PARKING AVAILABILITY EG: NUMBER OF BAYS AVAILABLE AND LOCATION.**
- XV. A PARKING STRATEGY MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE DEVELOPMENT OCCURS TO IDENTIFY PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT; PROBABLE PARKING CONTROLS (SHORT AND LONG TERM) AND PRICING STRATEGIES.**
- XVI. A PERMANENT TRAVELSMART OFFICE / END OF TRIP FACILITY BE ESTABLISHED AS PART OF THE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD).**
- XVII. ALL INTERNAL PARKING, INCLUDING ON STREET PARKING BE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO HANDING OVER TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT. (SEE PAGE 49 OF STRUCTURE PLAN)**

C06/3000 - LOT 3071 (110) MURDOCH DRIVE, MURDOCH – SUBMISSION FOR DRAFT MURDOCH ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (INCLUDING FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL AND HEALTH PRECINCT) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

ENVIRONMENT

- XVIII. ALTHOUGH STORM WATER MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE RELATIVELY GOOD QUALITY, THERE IS STILL A NEED TO CONSIDER POLLUTANTS THAT MAY BE GENERATED ON SITE.**
- XIX. WATER SENSITIVE URBAN DESIGN NEEDS TO BE A MAJOR CONSIDERATION THROUGHOUT THE DESIGN PHASE RATHER THAN DRAINAGE INTO EXISTING WATER BODIES.**
- XX. A WETLAND DRAINAGE INFILTRATION BASIN BE PROVIDED FOR DRAINAGE ON MURDOCH DRIVE ESPECIALLY THE EXTENSION TO FARRINGTON ROAD AND THE FREEWAY AFTER DISCUSSIONS WITH CITY OF MELVILLE AND CITY OF COCKBURN.**
- XXI. COLLECTION OF SEEDS AND NATIVE PLANT SPECIMENS FOR LANDSCAPING AND CITY OF MELVILLE SEED BANKS BE DISCUSSED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CITY OF MELVILLE PRIOR TO CLEARING**
- XXII. PROVISION OF SUFFICIENT TIME IN THE PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION PHASE TO BE GIVEN TO ALLOW FOR SALVAGE AND RELOCATION OF FLORA AND FAUNA.**
- XXIII. APPROPRIATE OFFSET ARRANGEMENTS TO COMPENSATE LOSS OF URBAN BUSHLAND IS TO BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO CLEARING.**

URBAN DESIGN

- XXIV. CITY OF MELVILLE TELECOMMUNICATION STRATEGY AND POLICY BE CONSIDERED IN REGARD TO CO LOCATION, INTEGRATION AND SITE LOCATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES.**
- XXV. CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO THE CITY OF MELVILLE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT MANUAL, GUIDELINES AND POLICY.**

which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**** At 8.05pm Cr R Aubrey re-entered the Chamber**

ADOPTION OF ITEMS NOT WITHDRAWN

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr L M Reynolds –

THAT THE FOLLOWING REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER EXCLUDING ITEMS P06/3017, T05/1027 AND C06/3000 BE RECEIVED AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN BE ADOPTED.

The Mayor submitted the motion,
which was declared

CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (13/0)

Recommendations adopted as part of the above resolution include the following -

- P06/7002 COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON
- T06/2011 PETITION – REVIEW POLICY FOR SPRAYING PATHS AND ROAD KERBS
- C06/8007 COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007
- C06/8008 BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT
- CO06/06 SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK
- CO07/06 SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK
- CO10/06 SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER
- C06/5000 COMMON SEAL REGISTER
- C06/6000 INVESTMENT STATEMENTS
- C06/6001 SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS

P06/7002 – COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	:	Bicton / Attadale Ward
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	DA-2005-557/B
Property	:	4 Kent Street, Bicton
Proposal	:	Amendment to the finished ground levels within the front setback area by reducing the swimming pool level from RL 9.40 to RL 8.9. The gazebo level will remain at RL 9.4 the same as the outdoor alfresco dining on the subject site.
Applicant	:	Mr D R Fletcher
Owner	:	Mrs C A and Mr D R Fletcher
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	DA-2005-557 and DA-2005-557/A approved with conditions

SUMMARY

Approval is sought for a further amendment to the recently approved finished outdoor ground levels within the front setback area. The applicant is appealing to the Council for support of the gazebo level being allowed to remain at RL 9.40 the same as the already approved alfresco dining area in lieu of the conditional approval of RL8.9.

Following the decision of the Council on 18 July 2006, the applicant has lodged an appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal. The appeal, however, has not been activated unless and until payment of necessary appeal fees have been made. At the time of preparing this report, the appeal has not been activated. The applicant contends that with revision to the finished outdoor ground levels, his proposal is more in keeping with the streetscape character as it follows natural topography of the land. Moreover, the front fence is also tarred appropriately to reduce visual impact from the street.

The application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions being imposed.

BACKGROUND

On 18 July 2006, the Council approved the western side boundary level to RL8.9 in order to minimise retaining wall height on 2 Kent Street. And it also required the front setback area containing the swimming pool and the gazebo levels be reduced to RL8.9 as the proposal did not preserve the natural topography.

P06/7002 – COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Scheme Provisions

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Bicton Four (BC4)
R-Code	:	R12.5 / 17.5 (R17.5 applies)
Use Type	:	Residential
Use Class	:	P - permitted

Site Details

Lot Area	:	583sqm
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	None
Street Tree(s)	:	None
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	None
Site Details	:	P06 7002 Property Map.pdf

[P06 7002 October 2006.pdf](#) A copy of the plans forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to Members of the Council on Wednesday 11 October 2006.

DETAIL

There are no changes made to the approved plans other than finished ground levels which are summarised as follow:

Western Side boundary	RL 8.9
Swimming Pool Level	RL 8.9
Gazebo Level	RL 9.4

The gazebo is located on the higher side of the ground and is following the natural topography of the block.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Advertising Required:	No
Neighbour's Comment Supplied:	No
Reason:	No change from previous approval other than respecting the natural contour of the land.
Support/Object:	N/A

P06/7002 – COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Should the Council refuse the application for planning approval, the applicant is highly likely to activate the appeal that has already been lodged with the State Administrative Tribunal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

COMMENT

The amendment involves maintaining the outdoor ground levels to the western side and the swimming pool to RL 8.9 consistent with the Council's approval in July. And raise the gazebo level to the same as the approved alfresco dining level at RL 9.4.

The proposed amendment achieves two (2) outcomes. The first is to provide the added privacy needed by the applicant. The applicant has indicated that as the subject site is surrounded by other two storey buildings located on higher ground levels. The front wall over the length of the gazebo provides the privacy needed particularly having regard to the orientation of outdoor living area. The second is by terracing the front setback area between the gazebo and the swimming pool level, it follows the natural sloping terrain which characterise that part of Kent Street. This solution removes the objection of the mass of the front wall because it reduces it over a longer distance and does it in two steps.

Further, the City has recently received a subdivision application referral from the Western Australian Planning Commission seeking comment on the subdivision of the adjoining property at 2 Kent Street. The application proposes to subdivide that property into two (2) side by side lots. It is considered that the amenity of that existing property is somewhat unknown particularly the subdivision approval is approved by the Commission.

Having regard to the objectives of the R-Codes, it is considered that the current revision has achieved the intent by respecting the natural topography of the land.

From a planning view point, the current application should be supported as the applicant has terraced the front wall, thus, reducing the visual impact of the street.

P06/7002 – COUNCIL APPEAL – AMENDMENT TO FINISHED GROUND LEVELS WITHIN FRONT SETBACK AREA CONTAINING A GAZEBO, SWIMMING POOL AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE APPLICATION FOR MODIFICATION TO THE OUTDOOR FINISHED GROUND LEVELS TO THE SWIMMING POOL, GAZEBO AND FRONT FENCE WITH RETAINING WALL ON LOT 3 (4) KENT STREET, BICTON AS INDICATED ON THE AMENDED PLAN RECEIVED ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2006 BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- 1. ALL CONDITIONS OF PLANNING APPROVAL GRANTED ON 18 JULY 2006 REMAIN VALID AND APPLICABLE OTHER THAN CONDITION NO. 2.**
- 2. THE FOLLOWING LEVELS ARE APPROVED:**
 - A) WESTERN SIDE BOUNDARY LEVEL BEING RL 8.9.**
 - B) SWIMMING POOL LEVEL BEING RL 8.9**
 - C) GAZEBO LEVEL BEING RL 9.4**

CARRIED EN BLOC

**T06/2011 PETITION – REVIEW POLICY FOR SPRAYING PATHS AND ROAD KERBS
(REC)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Weed Control
Customer Index	:	Petition
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Not Applicable
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Philip Gale, Manager Infrastructure Services

SUMMARY

This item relates to a petition received at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on Tuesday, 19 September 2006, requesting that the City of Melville reconsiders the Policy for using chemical sprays to eliminate weeds on paths and road kerbs.

BACKGROUND

A petition was received from eighteen (18) signatories requesting that the City of Melville reconsider the practice of using chemical sprays to eliminate weeds on the verges and paths in the City and that Council re-investigate the effectiveness of using steam treatment and mechanical controls. Council has investigated the option of using steam and mechanical means by having this as an option in its last weed spraying tender but this was dismissed on the grounds of excessive cost and practicality.

DETAIL

The City of Melville has considered the use of non-chemical weed controls in the past and continues to monitor their effectiveness and cost. Unfortunately they remain significantly less effective and much more expensive than chemical controls.

The City of Melville currently lets a contract for the broad acre control of weeds within the City. The 2006 tenders submitted included a tender for the steam and mechanical control of weeds. This tender was two and a half ($2\frac{1}{2}$) times more expensive than chemical weed control. As the total value of the chemical control contract was approximately three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000) the cost differential for using steam and mechanical controls is very great.

In addition to the significant cost increase steam and mechanical control means also have the following disadvantages:

- The steam can actually promote the growth of couch grass unless it is very carefully and rigorously applied.
- Steam can aid the germination of fleabane seeds which require heat to crack the seed pods

**T06/2011 PETITION – REVIEW POLICY FOR SPRAYING PATHS AND ROAD KERBS
(REC)**

- Application times for steam are significantly longer than those of chemicals which can increase inconvenience and disruption in the community and increase traffic hazards.
- Mechanical controls do not usually kill the weeds so become, in effect, a form of mowing.

Comments have been sought from the City of Fremantle staff, who use steam and mechanical control, and the above problems have been confirmed to be their experience.

It should also be noted that there are relatively few residents of the City of Melville who have exercised their prerogative to not have their verges sprayed with chemicals.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There is no policy on this matter.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

No external communication has been carried out as the number of petitioners is small and the issue is predominantly a financial one.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no statutory or legal implications for Council in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

If non-chemical weed treatment is required by Council then additional funding of an average of two hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars (\$295,000) per year will be required to maintain the current level of service. This figure was the difference in prices submitted between the chemical and non-chemical treatments costed as options in the tenders received this year for a three (3) year weed spraying contract.

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The chemical glyphosate is of low toxicity and has very little residual activity in soil. It is also rated as having low to very low mobility in both soil and water. The application of pesticides are controlled by the Health (Pesticides) Regulations 1956. These require that pesticides be applied in a safe and proper manner, and strictly in accordance with the registered label. Use of a chemical in compliance with the label ensures that safety to the user, other community members and the environment is maximised.

**T06/2011 PETITION – REVIEW POLICY FOR SPRAYING PATHS AND ROAD KERBS
(REC)**

COMMENT

Because of the greatly increased cost and significantly reduced effectiveness of non chemical weed treatment the existing mechanism of allowing any individual to choose to have their property excluded from chemical spraying, whilst retaining an overall chemical spray programme for the City, is considered the most appropriate.

Currently both the City of Fremantle and the City of Wanneroo have contracts to use this particular weed management process. In checking with both Councils they confirm the increased cost and difficulty in managing weed growth throughout their City's.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

- 1. THAT THE PETITIONERS BE ADVISED THAT THE COUNCIL HAS RECENTLY INVESTIGATED THE EFFECTIVENESS AND COSTS OF NON CHEMICAL AND MECHANICAL WEED CONTROL AND;**
- 2. THAT DUE TO COST CONSIDERATIONS AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY THE PRESENT PRACTICE OF HERBISIDE WEED SPRAYING WILL CONTINUE.**
- 3. THAT RESIDENTS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THEIR PROPERTY TO BE EXCLUDED FROM THE CHEMICAL SPRAYING PROGRAM.**

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Recreation
Customer Index	: Department of Sport & Recreation
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Nil
Works Programme	: Nil
Funding	: Nil
Responsible Officer	: Dennis Gillam, Manager Health & Lifestyle Services

BACKGROUND

This report seeks Council approval for the Grant Applications by the Applecross Tennis Club, Attadale Netball Club, Kardinya Tennis Club, Applecross Junior Football Club and the South Side BMX Club for the annual Community Sport and Recreation Facility Fund (CSRFF) facilitated by the Department of Sport and Recreation. The City of Melville annual budget contains fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for potential CSRFF Grant Funding.

Change to the CSRFF Process in 2007

Traditionally the City of Melville has advertised the CSRFF funding round on an annual basis during the months of July - September annually. It is thought that advertising the funding round earlier in the year to February-April will provide a number of benefits include:

- a more thorough assessment of each project.
- the proposed developments to be approved with all planning and building approvals in place prior to being presented to Council.

The timeframe for the 2008/2009 funding round will be amended accordingly.

Applications received this year are detailed as follows:

APPLECROSS TENNIS CLUB - RESURFACING OF TWO TENNIS COURTS.**DETAIL**

The Applecross Tennis Club (ATC) is situated on the Jeff Joseph Reserve in Applecross. It consists of fourteen (14) tennis courts, twelve (12) grass courts and two (2) which are synthetic surfaces. The ATC have submitted an application for the removal of the worn carpet surface on two (2) of its hard tennis courts (courts 3 and 4). It is the clubs intention to replace these carpeted surfaces with macro curl sixteen millimetre (16mm) sand filled synthetic grass surfaces. This particular surface is the preferred playing surface of the sports peak body, Tennis West.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

The total cost of the project is forty nine thousand eight hundred and seventy dollars (\$49,870) (incl. GST). The replacement of the surfaces is required due to unsafe condition of the current surfaces and will provide for:

- Increased Club usage
- Increased income at the club
- Safer playing environment
- Improved general public access

In June 2006 the ATC applied and were successful in getting this project recognised by the Australian Sports Foundation (ASF). The ASF offers tax deductibility to donors. To date the ATC have raised eleven thousand six hundred dollars (\$11,600) from donations to the scheme.

Draft Community Sport and Recreation Policy

Within the draft policy review for Community Sport and Recreation there is a category for specialised sporting venues. This category aims to identify the level of support the City of Melville will provide to Community Sport and Recreation groups that require facilities above the standard of provision that is normally provided. Because clubs/groups within this category are assigned single sporting group status they will not receive the same priority for financial assistance as groups whose playing surfaces are openly available or form part of public open space.

Funding

The ATC has an existing Self Supporting Loan with the City of Melville, which is up to date.

As part of the draft policy review the City of Melville would be responsible for the payment of fees and charges associated with the lodgement of planning and building approvals. However these charges are not required for this project.

Statewide, the sport of tennis places a high level of funding requests on the annual CSRFF budget. Because of this the CSRFF assessment process allows for the Department of Sport and Recreation (DSR) to contribute either one third, one sixth or nothing at all. It should be noted that the ATC CSRFF grant application of sixteen thousand one hundred and seventy dollars (\$16,170) is slightly less than one third of the total cost of the project. The club has confirmed that should any shortfall in grant funding occur it is in a position to fund the shortfall from the clubs operations.

There is also a requirement within the draft policy that the replacement of playing surfaces must be appropriately budgeted for within the normal financial operations of the club. The ATC have indicated that the life expectancy of the macro-curl synthetic surfaces is ten - twelve (10 – 12) years and allocated an annual depreciation budget of six thousand dollars (\$6,000) for the eventual surface replacement.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

The ATC application indicates the following level of funding from the identified groups:

Option 1 (1/3 donation from DSR)		Option 2 (1/6 donation from DSR)	
City of Melville	\$ 4,000 (Single Sporting Club Status)		\$ 4,000
Cash (ATC)	\$29,700		\$37,558
CSRFF 1/3	<u>\$16,170</u>	(CSRFF 1/6)	<u>\$ 8,312</u>
TOTAL	\$49,870 (Inc GST)		\$49,870 (Inc GST)

ATTADALE NETBALL CLUB – NEW FLOODLIGHTS

Detail

The Attadale Netball Club (ANC) is situated on the Troy Park Reserve in Attadale. It currently has twenty four (24) teams that use the facility for scratch matches and regular weekly training.

The ANC have submitted an application for the removal of the existing floodlights from the netball courts at Troy Park and to replace them with new modern and usable floodlights as the existing lighting is not to Australian standards and not appropriate for training purposes.

The total cost of the project is estimated at forty six thousand four hundred and fifty dollars (\$46,450) (excl. GST).

By providing new lights it will allow for:

- Increased Club usage
- Increased income at the club
- Safer playing environment
- A greater spread of hours for training purposes

The ANC is a well managed club and is active in the running of the Troy Park Sporting Association. The ANC has approximately two hundred (200) members and fields Junior and Adult teams and is the largest netball club in the City of Melville.

Draft Community Sport and Recreation Policy

Within the draft policy review for Community Sport and Recreation the sport of Netball is considered as a sport that is allocated limited use of public reserve. Because there is not a huge infrastructure demand from the sport of Netball consideration has been given to the City of Melville conducting an audit of all Netball Courts within the City to determine the possibility of playing surface replacement and the potential lighting of all courts. This audit would determine a fully costed ten (10) year forward plan for the development and replacement of Netball facilities throughout the City.

Funding

As part of the draft policy review the City of Melville would be responsible for the payment of fees and charges associated with the lodgement of planning and building approvals.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

The demand for CSRFF funding from the sport of Netball is significantly less than other sports. The CSRFF assessment process allows for the DSR to contribute either one third, one sixth of the total project costs or nothing at all. It should be noted that the ANC CSRFF Grant Application of fifteen thousand four hundred and eighty three dollars (\$15,483) represents one third of the total cost of the project.

The Council's normal practice for these requests would be to consider them as a single sporting club application. However, there are a number of benefits for the City to provide increased financial support for this application.

These include:

- High participation rates with low demands on infrastructure
- Encouragement of Junior and Senior Participants and
- A positive environment for women participants and their children

In 2005/2006 the City of Melville provided a full third support to the Attadale Junior Football Club floodlighting project on the condition that a summer season use was found at the Troy Park Reserve. Officers are recommending that the City of Melville contributes a full third to this project due to the additional benefits that lighting the netball courts will bring. Furthermore it is envisaged that there would be no further developments at the Troy Park Reserve. Should the project not receive CSRFF funding the City may consider placing the project as a priority in the forward works budget.

The ANC application indicates the following level of funding from the identified groups:

City of Melville	\$15,483
Cash /Labour(ANC)	\$15,484
CSRFF 1/3	<u>\$15,483</u>
TOTAL	\$46,450 (excl. GST)

KARDINYA TENNIS CLUB - RESITING OF FLOODLIGHTS

Detail

The Kardinya Tennis Club (KTC) is situated on the Morris Buzacott Reserve in Kardinya. It currently has nine (9) tennis courts which are synthetic surfaces. The KTC have submitted an application for the resiting of floodlighting to enable the club to make better use of the clubroom facilities they share with the CBC Football Club and the Melville Districts Tee ball Club.

Resiting the floodlights will allow the club to use the top five (5) tennis courts and allow for the demolition of the aging small clubrooms.

The club believes that these changes are necessary for its long term survival and will allow for the development and introduction of an established junior tennis programme at the facility. The introduction of the new Hockey facilities has placed a great demand on parking in the immediate area, and removing the old clubrooms will also allow for an additional car parking bays.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

The total cost of the project is fifty four thousand dollars (\$54,000) (incl. GST).

The resiting of the floodlights will provide for:

- Increased Club membership
- Increased income at the club
- Safer playing environment

Draft Community Sport and Recreation Policy

Within the draft policy review for Community Sport and Recreation there is a category for specialised sporting venues. This category aims to identify the level of support the City of Melville will provide to Community Sport and Recreation groups that require facilities above the standard of provision that is normally provided.

Because clubs/groups within this category are assigned single sporting group status they will not receive the same priority for financial assistance as groups whose playing surfaces are openly available or form part of public open space.

Funding

As part of the draft policy review the City of Melville would be responsible for the payment of fees and charges associated with the lodgement of planning and building approvals. However these charges are not required for this project.

The KTC has a relative small membership base and currently it stands at fifty eight (58) members. In order to fund this application the KTC are seeking a Self Supporting Loan of fourteen thousand dollars (\$14,000) (this excludes loan establishment fees). The club will contribute eighteen thousand dollars (\$18,000) from club funds and the remaining funding will be made up from CSRFF, eighteen thousand dollars (\$18,000) and a four thousand dollars (\$4,000) single sporting club donation from the City of Melville.

Statewide, the sport of Tennis places a high level of funding requests on the annual CSRFF budget. Because of this the CSRFF assessment process allows for the DSR to contribute either one third, one sixth of the total project costs or nothing at all.

It should be noted that the KTC CSRFF grant application of eighteen thousand dollars (\$18,000) is one third of the total cost of the project. Should there be a high number of applications for CSRFF funding the DSR may only support the application to a value of one sixth of the total project.

The club has requested that should any shortfall in grant funding occur, the shortfall be covered by increasing its Self Supporting Loan request from fourteen thousand dollars (\$14,000) to twenty three thousand eight hundred and thirty five dollars (\$23,835) (this excludes loan establishment fees).

The KTC application indicates the following level of funding from the identified groups:

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

OPTION 1

OPTION 2

City of Melville	\$ 4,000 (Single Sporting Club Status)		\$ 4,000
Cash (KTC)	\$21,330		\$21,330
CSRFF 1/3	\$19,670	(CSRFF 1/6)	\$ 9,835
SSL	<u>\$14,000</u>		<u>\$23,835</u>
TOTAL	\$59,000 (Inc GST)		\$59,000 (Inc GST)

SOUTHSIDE BMX CLUB – NEW CLUBHOUSE

Detail

The South Side BMX Club (SSBMX) is situated on the Bob Gordon Reserve in Bull Creek. The facilities have grown over the years and the course is seen as one of the best courses in Perth. The SSBMX have submitted an application to build a double brick and zinc roof clubhouse with veranda, which will include facilities such as canteen, toilets, first aid room, registration and scoring areas, storage and meeting/function areas.

None of these facilities are currently provided. Since 1992 the club have looked at a number of options to provide these basic facilities and have recently had a request to install an additional shipping container declined. The current shipping container is used as a canteen, registration point, first aid and store room.

Whilst there are some toilet facilities located nearby at the tennis club and the scout hall they are often not accessible to the club. SSBMX report growing memberships numbers which currently stand at one hundred (100) and growing.

The SSBMX club believes that the new building is necessary for the long term survival of the sport and will allow for the club to grow and provide more services to the BMX community. The BMX track at Bull Creek is open to the general public by arrangement and with some support from the City the SSBMX club maintains the course to the sports specific standards. This allows for non club members to use the track and is something the SSBMX club actively promotes. The track is also used by other clubs around the Perth area.

The SSBMX is a well run club that has active volunteers managing its operations. These volunteers assist in the promotion of increased bike skills for users of the track and contribute to the ongoing maintenance of the facility.

The total cost of the project is one hundred and four thousand eight hundred and two dollars (\$104,802) (excl. GST).

Funding

As part of the draft policy review the City of Melville would be responsible for the payment of fees and charges associated with the lodgement of planning and building approvals.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

In order to fund this application the SSBMX are seeking a Self Supporting Loan of twenty two thousand nine hundred and thirty four dollars (\$22,934) (this excludes loan establishment fees). The club will contribute twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) from club funds and the remaining funding will be made up from CSRFF of thirty four thousand nine hundred and thirty four dollars (\$34,934) and a thirty four thousand nine hundred and thirty four dollars (\$34,934) donation from the COM. Normally the City of Melville would fund only four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for a single sports club application, however given that the SSBMX Club have no existing facilities it is recommended to fund the thirty four thousand nine hundred and thirty four dollars (\$34,934).

There are a number of benefits for the City to provide increased financial support for this application.

These include:

- High participation rates with low demands on infrastructure
- Encouragement of Junior boys and girls in structured and non structured activities
- Is open daily to the general public
- A positive environment for family participation

Officers are recommending that the City of Melville contributes a full third to this project due to the additional benefits that the club room and toilet facilities will bring. Should the project not receive CSRFF funding the City may consider placing the project as a priority in the forward works budget.

The SSBMX application indicates the following level of funding from the identified groups:

City of Melville	\$34,934
Cash (SSBMX)	\$12,000
CSRFF 1/3	\$34,934
SSL	<u>\$22,934</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$104,802</u> (excl. GST)

APPLECROSS JUNIOR FOOTBALL CLUB

Detail

The Applecross Junior Football Club (AJFC) is situated at Gairloch Reserve in Applecross and has approximately one hundred and thirty (130) junior members. All training is conducted at the reserve but games for the U/13 age bracket and above are played at Shirley Strickland and Winthrop reserves due to the limited size of the Gairloch Reserve.

There are currently no lights on the reserve. By floodlighting the reserve the AJFC will be better able to manage training for their teams by way of extended hours and improve safety on the reserve and allow for small periodical fund raising events to be conducted on the oval. The intention is for half the oval only to be floodlit, by utilizing two (2) light towers which must conform to Australian Standards.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)**Draft Community Sport and Recreation Policy**

As part of the draft policy review the City of Melville would be responsible for the payment of fees and charges associated with the lodgement of Planning and Building approvals.

Funding

The quotation for the proposed lighting is forty seven thousand three hundred and thirty six dollars (\$37,336).

The AJFC has recently completed repayments on a Self Supporting Loan taken out to provide clubrooms and the club is well managed and viable.

It is current practice for the City to assist with a contribution of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) to single clubs for developments of this kind. The club are in a position to fund approximately twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) towards this project and are requesting the City fund eleven thousand five hundred and fifty four dollars (\$11,554) to enable the project to proceed. Whilst this is in excess of the normal practice it is considered a reasonable request given the potential for the club to increase its membership and for use of the oval by the wider community whilst the lights are in operation.

Accordingly the application indicates the following level of funding from the identified groups.

City of Melville	\$11,554
CSRFF	\$15,782
AJFC	<u>\$20,000</u>
TOTAL	\$47,336 (Ex GST)

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

None of these proposals have been canvassed with the wider community but where appropriate other reserve users have been advised of the applications.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As contained in the body of this report.

The 2007/2008 budget and forward works programs will be developed to accommodate this process and any approvals issued by the Council and the Department Sport and Recreation.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Each of these proposals has been assessed against a risk category of low, medium and high. Given the minor nature of any Self Supporting Loans considered necessary for these to proceed the financial risk to the City is considered low with a low impact.

COMMENT

As part of the assessment process Local Governments are required to prioritize the applications in accordance with the following criteria:

- a) Well planned and needed by Municipality
- b) Well planned and needed by applicant
- c) Needed by Municipality, more planning required
- d) Needed by applicant, more planning required
- e) Idea has merit, more preliminary work needed
- f) Not recommended

Should the Council agree with the Officers Recommendations the total contribution for all five (5) applicants will be sixty nine thousand nine hundred and seventy one dollars (\$69,971). In addition the applicants will be seeking self supporting loans to the value of thirty six thousand nine hundred and thirty four dollars (\$36,934). The level of funding required for the projects listed is considered realistic and reinforces our intention to improve and maintain our building and reserve infrastructure for the future.

Comments on each application are as follows:

APPLECROSS TENNIS CLUB

The Council's draft Strategic Sport and Recreation Plan has identified that the City of Melville is over serviced by the numbers of tennis clubs and courts provided. It would therefore be appropriate in the long term to rationalize the numbers of clubs and seek for some clubs to amalgamate. Viability of clubs will be an increasing concern and with the shift to more unstructured sports and changes to drinking laws continue to destabilize the club sports.

Never the less the ATC is managing to service its existing debt and appears to be well managed and viable. The improvement and maintenance of Council buildings and infrastructure is an ongoing concern and this proposal seeks to maintain the courts to an acceptable standard and sustain playing members. The development of a sinking fund to pay for future court replacements will ensure that these improvements are carried out and the asset maintained at a high level, without Council assistance.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

ATTADALE NETBALL CLUB

The ANC application is worthy of support and will see the finalization of developments at Troy Park with the Attadale Junior Football Club having new floodlights approved in the 2006/2007 funding round.

Whilst the level of funding being sought from the City is in excess of the normal practise the ANC is the largest netball club in the City and is an active and well managed club, providing sporting opportunities for women.

KARDINYA TENNIS CLUB

This proposal has been considered for some time and will allow for the demolition of the dysfunctional small clubrooms which will provide space for extra car bays on this reserve. The establishment of the synthetic hockey pitch and the extra parking necessary to accommodate the success of the venture has lead to a shortfall of parking. Should approval for this project not be forthcoming from the Department of Sport and Recreation the KTC are proposing to fund the works through increasing the value of the self supporting loan. The Councils contribution of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) is considered appropriate.

SOUTHSIDE BMX CLUB

This proposal is for the provision of basic facilities required by any club providing a recreation facility for its members and the wider community. The club has been utilizing a shipping container for many years and these new facilities are long overdue. The club has been very patient and it is considered the level of funding being sought from the City is appropriate. It is noted that “in kind” labour and material costs contributed from club members will assist in meeting the cost.

The construction of the Clubrooms may necessitate an excision of land from the reserve but this will be considered separately in conjunction with the Department of Land Information.

This application is considered the highest priority in this funding round.

APPLECROSS JUNIOR FOOTBALL CLUB

The AJFC are a well managed club who have sufficient funds to cover for their contribution towards this project. The Draft Community Sport and Recreation Plan will contain a concept plan for each reserve and this will include the provision of lighting for reserves of this kind.

Consultation with neighbours will be undertaken by the AJFC to ensure that minimum disruptions will be caused to residential areas.

The lighting of the reserve will allow greater flexibility for training purposes for the club and considering that the capital input required from the Council is not considered excessive that the project should be supported.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

1. THAT THE APPLICATION FROM THE SOUTHSIDE BMX CLUB FOR THE ERECTION OF A BRICK AND METAL CLUBROOM ON BOB GORDON RESERVE BE SUPPORTED ON A FULL ONE THIRD BASIS SUBJECT TO:

A. PRIORITY A
RANK 1

FUNDING PROGRAMME	2007/2008	\$34,934	COM	CAPITAL	WORKS
	2007/2008	\$12,000	SOUTHSIDE BMX CLUB		
	2007/2008	\$34,934	DEPT SPORT & RECREATION		
(CSRFF)	2007/2008	<u>\$22,934</u>	SELF SUPPORTING LOAN		
	TOTAL	<u>\$104,802</u>	(EX GST)		

- B. THE SOUTHSIDE BMX CLUB MAKE FORMAL APPLICATION TO THE CITY OF MELVILLE FOR A SELF SUPPORTING LOAN FOR AN AMOUNT OF TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND, NINCE HUNDRED AND THIRTY FOUR DOLLARS (\$22,934) SUBJECT TO NORMAL CONDITIONS APPLYING.

2. THAT THE APPLICATION FROM THE ATTADALE NETBALL CLUB FOR THE ERECTION OF FLOODLIGHTS AT TROY PARK BE SUPPORTED ON A FULL ONE THIRD BASIS SUBJECT TO:

A. PRIORITY A
RANK 2

FUNDING PROGRAMME	2007/2008	\$15,483	COM	CAPITAL	WORKS
	2007/2008	\$15,484	ATTADALE NETBALL CLUB		
	2007/2008	<u>\$15,483</u>	DEPT SPORT & RECREATION		
(CSRFF)	TOTAL	<u>\$46,450</u>	(EX GST)		

- B. THE LIGHTING COMPLYING WITH AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

3. THAT THE APPLICATION FROM THE APPLECROSS JUNIOR FOOTBALL CLUB FOR THE INSTALLATION OF LIGHTING AT GAIRLOCH RESERVE IN APPLECROSS BE ENDORSED AND THAT THE COUNCIL CONTRIBUTES IN EXCESS OF THE FOUR THOUSAND DOLLAR (\$4,000) SINGLE CLUB CONTRIBUTION IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR SUPPORT OF THIS PROJECT.

A. PRIORITY A
RANK 3

FUNDING	2007/2008	\$11,554	COM	CAPITAL	WORKS
	2007/2008	\$15,782	PROGRAMME		
	2007/2008	<u>\$20,000</u>	APPLECROSS JUNIOR FOOTBALL CLUB		
TOTAL		<u>\$47,336</u>	DEPT SPORT & RECREATION		

B. THE LIGHTING COMPLYING WITH AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS.

4. THAT THE APPLICATION FROM THE APPLECROSS TENNIS CLUB FOR THE RESURFACING OF TWO (2) TENNIS COURTS BE SUPPORTED ON THE BASIS OF A SINGLE CLUB CONTRIBUTION OF FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$4,000) FROM THE CITY WITH FUNDING AS FOLLOWS:

A. PRIORITY A
RANK 4
FUNDING

OPTION 1			OPTION 2
2007/2008	\$ 4,000	COM FORWARD WORKS PROGRAMME	\$ 4,000
2007/2008	\$29,700	APPLECROSS TENNIS CLUB	\$37,558
2007/2008	<u>\$16,170</u>	DEPT SPORT & RECREATION (CSRFF)	<u>\$ 8,312</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$49,870</u>	(INCL GST)	<u>\$49,870</u>

- B. THAT THE APPLECROSS TENNIS CLUB COMMIT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SINKING FUND FOR THE FUTURE REPLACEMENT OF ALL SYNTHETIC TENNIS COURTS.

C06/8007 – COMMUNITY SPORTS RECREATION FACILITY FUNDS 2006/2007 (REC)

5. THAT THE APPLICATION FROM THE KARDINYA TENNIS CLUB FOR THE RESITING OF FLOODLIGHTS AT MORRIS BUZACOTT RESERVE BE SUPPORTED ON THE BASIS OF A SINGLE CLUB CONTRIBUTION OF FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$4,000) FROM THE CITY AND WITH FUNDING AS FOLLOWS:

**A. PRIORITY A
RANK 5
FUNDING**

OPTION 1			OPTION 2	
2007/2008	\$ 4,000	COM FORWARD WORKS PROGRAMME		\$ 4,000
2007/2008	\$21,330	CASH KARDINYA TENNIS CLUB		\$21,330
2007/2008	\$19,670	DEPT SPORT & RECREATION (CSRFF)		\$ 9,835
2007/2008	<u>\$14,000</u>	SELF SUPPORTING LOAN		<u>\$23,835</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$59,000</u>			<u>\$59,000</u>

B. THAT THE KARDINYA TENNIS CLUB MAKES FORMAL APPLICATION TO THE CITY OF MELVILLE FOR A SELF SUPPORTING LOAN FOR AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO FINANCE ANY SHORTFALL IN FUNDING FROM THE DEPARTMENT SPORT AND RECREATION BEING EITHER FOURTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$14,000) OR TWENTY FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$24,000) SUBJECT TO NORMAL CONDITIONS APPLYING;

C. THAT THE LIGHTING COMPLY WITH AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS

6. THAT THE TOTAL FUNDING COMMITTED BY THE CITY OF MELVILLE THROUGH THIS PROCESS OF SIXTY NINE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY ONE DOLLARS (\$69,971) BE LISTED FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE FORWARD WORKS BUDGET FOR 2007/2008.

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/8008 - BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT (AMREC)

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Community Planning
Customer Index	:	Community Planning Unit
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	One hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000)
Responsible Officer	:	Christine Young Acting Director Strategic Community Development

SUMMARY

A budget variation is sought to provide operational funds for the newly created Community Planning Unit.

BACKGROUND

In July 2006 the Chief Executive Officer presented the Organisational Review and outlined his vision of strategic community planning for the City of Melville. As part of the organisational realignment a Community Planning Unit was to be created and located within the Strategic Community Development Division. A key objective for this Unit is the development of a Community Plan for the City of Melville with the first draft being delivered by June 2007.

DETAIL

In order to achieve the objective of the development of the Community Plan by June 2007 (and subsequent place based planning) it was determined to initially have three (3) Officers dedicated to the Community Planning Unit (CPU). The CPU is a self managed unit that is located within the Community Development operational area and works under direction from the Chief Executive Officer, Director Strategic Community Development, and the Manager Community Development. In the first instance Officers were identified within the organisation that had the necessary skills to work within the CPU.

The Business Improvement Manager has been seconded for a period of twelve (12) months to the Unit with eighty per cent (80%) of her time being dedicated to the CPU. This Officer has skills relevant to the required tasks and a comprehensive understanding of the City of Melville's corporate planning processes. Her salary costs will be paid through her existing salary account. The Community Development Coordinator (Special Projects) also demonstrated necessary skills for the tasks associated with community planning and has been seconded to the CPU for an initial twelve (12) month period. The salary costs associated with her usual role (15 hours per week) have been redirected to cover her absence in this role.

C06/8008 BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT (AMREC)

It has been identified that the CPU also requires the skills and knowledge of an Officer with comprehensive town and strategic urban planning experience. These skills are essential when dealing with community planning and the position will be required to research, analyse, provide recommendations and manage projects that will contribute to the development of a long term community plan for the City of Melville. A position description has been developed for a Special Projects Officer – Community Planning.

Work has commenced on the development of the Community Plan by the two (2) seconded Officers. A project plan has been developed, an internal reference group has been established, extensive research is being undertaken, and presentations have commenced to staff to increase their understanding of this project.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There is no Council Policy that relates to this matter.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

No Public Consultation/Communication is required for the proposed budget variation.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A proposed budget has been developed for costs associated with the Community Planning Unit and is costed at a total of one hundred and sixty-six thousand, two hundred and ninety-five dollars (\$166,295). Some costs are able to be met through existing budgets and the amount required in the budget variation is one hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000). Although no specific funding was allocated in the 2006-2007 budget for this purpose, funds are available from the former Development & Neighbourhood Amenities budget due to the position of Director Development & Neighbourhood Amenity not being required as a result of the CEO's recent Organisational Review.

C06/8008 BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT (AMREC)

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The development of a Community Plan for the City of Melville has a significant impact for our community, and for the organisation.

Risk Statement	Level of Risk	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Under resourced Community Planning Unit would result in being unable to meet objectives of Unit.	Moderate consequences which are likely, resulting in an extreme level of risk	Resource Community Planning Unit to an adequate level. Review effectiveness of Unit in 12 months time

- As derived from using the Risk Assessment Matrix

COMMENT

The proposed budget totals one hundred and sixty-six thousand, two hundred and ninety five dollars (\$166,295) and includes costs associated with the usual duties of the seconded Offices. Some of these funds can be met through existing budget allocations. The total of new funds sought is one hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000). The CEO's organisational review resulted in the previous position of Director Development & Neighbourhood Amenities not being retained. Funds are therefore available to transfer from that budget area to fund this new initiative.

The proposed budget is outlined below:

Item	Funds Required	Who will fund	New funds required
Salaries – Based on Level 7/8 LGOA			
Position One: - 26 hours (Community Development Coordinator)	\$52,000 (inclusion of on costs)	New funds	\$52,000
Position Two: .8 position (Business Improvement Manager)	Nil	Current budget	Nil
Position Three: Full time- Special Projects Officer (Community Planning)	\$75,200 (inclusion of on costs)	New funds	\$75,200
Other expenses			
Development of Web Page	\$1,000	Current budget	Nil

C06/8008 BUDGET VARIATION – COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT (AMREC)

Promotion/Venue hire/Office furniture/Printing	\$10,500	Current budget	Nil
Computer	\$1,800	New funds	\$1,800
Phone	\$500	New funds	\$500
Office Expenses	\$500	New funds	\$500
Related Costs			
Costs associated with projects previously undertaken by seconded Officers	\$25,000	Current budget	Nil
TOTAL	\$161,500		\$130,000

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION IN ORDER TO FUND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMUNITY PLANNING UNIT, A BUDGET VARIATION OF ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$130,000) BE APPROVED WITH THIS AMOUNT BEING FUNDED BY TRANSFERRING THE AMOUNT OF ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$130,000) FROM THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD AMENITIES DIRECTORATE BUDGET ITEM 500-25802.

CARRIED EN BLOC

CO06/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Tenders CO06/06
Customer Index	:	City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Not Applicable
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	2006/07 Budget
Responsible Officer	:	Doug Bartlett Fleet Manager

SUMMARY

This item is to accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) Only Side-Loading Waste Compactor Truck

BACKGROUND

Tenders for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) Only Side-Loading Waste Compactor Truck were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday, 9 August 2006, closing at 4.00 pm. on Thursday, 24 August 2006.

DETAIL

Seven (7) sets of tender documents were issued and four (4) tenders were received as follows:

Wastemaster
Skipper Trucks
Major Motors Pty Ltd
Brigold Pty Ltd

Tender Evaluation Process

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

CO06/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Fleet Manager, the Waste Manager, the Waste Coordinator and the Workshop Team Leader.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

1. Relevant Experience
2. Technical Skills
3. Resources
4. Management Systems
5. Methodology
6. References
7. Price
8. Relevance to Purchasing Policy (Business location and product content)

For the purpose of the evaluation matrix the price used was that for purchase only, without trade in.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

13 – 004 – Procurement of Goods or Services Through Direct Purchasing or Public Tendering.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

	Budget	Actual
Purchase of new Plant 420-80228-1575-000	\$268,780.00	\$284,640.00
Sale of existing Plant 93990	<u>\$ 42,100.00</u>	<u>\$ 59,100.00</u>
Net Cost	<u>\$226,680.00</u>	<u>\$225,540.00</u>

CO06/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

Risk factors were considered during the evaluation process of this tender and were not considered to be of extreme or high risk.

COMMENT

Skipper Trucks' tender is for an Iveco Acco F2350G/260 while Major Motors is offering an Isuzu FVY 1400. Both companies are offering a choice of either a MacDonald Johnston or a Wastemaster compactor body. Wastemaster also submitted a tender for the compactor body only but this was not evaluated as the cab chassis is also required and this was therefore a non-conforming tender.

The fourth tender was for purchase of the old plant only.

Compactor body selection: Make

The City of Melville has operated both compactor bodies submitted in the tenders. The Operators' experience is that both make of bodies perform similarly in collecting and transporting waste.

The main issue is the higher downtime experienced with the Wastemaster body through a lower level of service from Wastemaster, combined with some poor mechanical design and manufacture. The maintenance experience has been similar with particularly poor warranty response from Wastemaster. Technical back and parts have to come from Queensland while MacDonald Johnston has a better service history and parts available in WA. There is, therefore, a strong recommendation to decline the option for the Wastemaster body in the tenders and accept the options for the MacDonald Johnston Engineering body.

The Macdonald Johnston Engineering body is considered to provide a far greater benefit for operation and maintenance than would be provided by a lower cost of body.

Truck cab-chassis selection

From the year 2000 the City of Melville has operated waste compactor trucks in its waste collection services from both Iveco and Isuzu. A recent survey has shown the Operators to have a preference for the Iveco trucks, although with the improved specification and cab design of the Isuzu, it is possible that both vehicles would be considered to be at a similar level.

Operators also have a preference to the Iveco in regard to the cab ergonomics. Access from side to side within the cab is easier. This is used when changing from left hand steer to right hand steer operation, as is required whenever a truck goes from picking up bins to driving between streets.

CO06/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

The maintenance experience with both makes indicates that Isuzu trucks have an advantage over the Iveco. Based on previous costs the Isuzu has proved to be the more economical truck over the life of the vehicle. Fleet understand the operational needs of the vehicle and it is anticipated that known maintenance issues such as brake repairs can be better managed to assist in reducing maintenance costs of the Iveco.

Consultation was carried out with the City of Gosnells who operate seventeen (17) Iveco trucks in their waste fleet. They are happy with the maintenance costs they are experiencing on their trucks.

The recommendation is therefore to accept the Iveco truck with the MacDonald Johnston body from Skipper Trucks.

Trade or Outright Sale selection

The outright sale offer from Brigold and the trade in offer from Major Motors were similar. Skipper Trucks however has offered an extra twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) on the trade price. It is recommended that Skipper Trucks be accepted as the best trade option.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY SKIPPER TRUCKS FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY IVECO F2350G/260 TRUCK WITH MACDONALD JOHNSTON ENGINEERING SIDE-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR BODY AS SPECIFIED FOR THE SUM OF TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY FOUR THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY DOLLARS (\$284,640.00) WITH TRADE IN OF FIFTY NINE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$59,100.00) BEING A NET PURCHASE PRICE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FORTY DOLLARS (\$225,540.00) BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.

CARRIED EN BLOC

CO07/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Tenders CO07/06
Customer Index	:	City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Not Applicable
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	2006/07 Budget
Responsible Officer	:	Doug Bartlett Fleet Manager

SUMMARY

This item is to accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) Only Rear-Loading Waste Compactor Truck

BACKGROUND

Tenders for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) Only Side-Loading Waste Compactor Truck were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday, 9 August 2006, closing at 4.00 pm. on Thursday, 24 August 2006.

DETAIL

Eight (8) sets of tender documents were issued and four (5) tenders were received as follows:

Wastemaster
Major Motors Pty Ltd
WA Hino Sales and Services
Brigold Pty Ltd
Skipper Trucks

Tender Evaluation Process

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

CO07/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Fleet Manager, the Waste Manager, the Waste Coordinator and the Workshop Team Leader.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

1. Relevant Experience
2. Technical Skills
3. Resources
4. Management Systems
5. Methodology
6. References
7. Price
8. Relevance to Purchasing Policy (Business location and product content)

For the purpose of the evaluation matrix the price used was that for purchase only, without trade in.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

13 – 004 – Procurement of Goods or Services Through Direct Purchasing or Public Tendering.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

	Budget	Actual
Purchase of new Plant 420-80228-1575-000	\$266,330.00	\$277,680.00
Sale of existing Plant 93912	<u>\$ 70,400.00</u>	<u>\$ 92,004.00</u>
Net Cost	<u>\$195,930.00</u>	<u>\$185,676.00</u>

CO07/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

Risk factors were considered during the evaluation process of this tender and were not considered to be of extreme or high risk.

COMMENT

Skipper Trucks' tender is for an Iveco Acco F2350G/260 and WA Hino have offered a Hino Ranger Pro 14 Auto Long. Both of these are with a MacDonald Johnston body while Major Motors is offering an Isuzu FVY 1400 with a choice of either a MacDonald Johnston or a Wastemaster compactor body. Wastemaster also submitted a tender for the compactor body only but this was not evaluated as the cab chassis is also required and this was therefore a non-conforming tender.

The fourth tender was for purchase of the old plant only.

Compactor body selection: Make

The City of Melville has operated both compactor bodies submitted in the tenders. The Operators' experience is that both make of bodies perform similarly in collecting and transporting waste.

The main issue is the higher downtime experienced with the Wastemaster body through a lower level of service from Wastemaster, combined with some poor mechanical design and manufacture. The maintenance experience has been similar with particularly poor warranty response from Wastemaster. Technical back and parts have to come from Queensland while MacDonald Johnston has a better service history and parts available in WA. There is, therefore, a strong recommendation to decline the option for the Wastemaster body in the tenders and accept the options for the MacDonald Johnston Engineering body.

The Macdonald Johnston Engineering body is considered to provide a far greater benefit for operation and maintenance than would be provided by a lower cost of body.

CO07/06 – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR TRUCK (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**Truck cab-chassis selection**

The tender documents specified that the torque be a minimum of 1000nm. The truck offered by WA Hino only has a torque of 745nm which is not sufficient for the requirements. The payload of this truck is also the lowest and it is therefore not recommended.

The Iveco has the highest payload. Operators also have a preference to the Iveco in regard to the cab ergonomics.

The maintenance experience with both makes indicates that Isuzu trucks have an advantage over the Iveco. Based on previous costs the Isuzu has proved to be the more economical truck over the life of the vehicle. Fleet understand the operational needs of the vehicle and it is anticipated that known maintenance issues such as brake repairs can be better managed to assist in reducing maintenance costs of the Iveco.

Consultation was carried out with the City of Gosnells who operate seventeen (17) Iveco trucks in their waste fleet. They are happy with the maintenance costs they are experiencing on their trucks.

The recommendation is therefore to accept the Iveco truck with the MacDonald Johnston body from Skipper Trucks.

Trade or Outright Sale selection

The outright sale offer from Brigold and the trade in offers from Major Motors and WA Hino were similar. Skipper Trucks however has offered an extra eight thousand five hundred dollars (\$8,500) on the trade price. It is recommended that Skipper Trucks be accepted as the best trade option.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY SKIPPER TRUCKS FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE (1) ONLY IVECO F2350G/260 TRUCK WITH MACDONALD JOHNSTON ENGINEERING REAR-LOADING WASTE COMPACTOR BODY AS SPECIFIED FOR THE SUM OF TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY SEVEN THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY DOLLARS (\$277,680.00) WITH TRADE IN OF NINETY TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR DOLLARS (\$92,004.00) BEING A NET PURCHASE PRICE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY FIVE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND SEVENTY SIX DOLLARS (\$185,676.00) BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.

CARRIED EN BLOC

CO10/06 – SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Tenders CO10/06
Customer Index	: City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Not Applicable
Works Programme	Not Applicable
Funding	2006/07 Budget
Responsible Officer	: Chris Curd A/Fleet Manager

SUMMARY

This item is to accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the supply of one (1) only Road Sweeper

BACKGROUND

Tenders for the supply of one (1) only Road Sweeper were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday, 30 August 2006, closing at 4.00 pm. on Thursday, 14 September 2006.

DETAIL

Four (4) sets of tender documents were issued and three (3) tenders were received as follows:

Rosmech Sales and Service Pty Ltd
MacDonald Johnston
Wel-Quip

Tender Evaluation Process

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

CO10/06 – SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the A/Fleet Manager, the Works Manager, the Road Maintenance Coordinator and the Workshop Team Leader.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

1. Relevant Experience
2. Technical Skills
3. Resources
4. Management Systems
5. Methodology
6. References
7. Price
8. Relevance to Purchasing Policy (Business location and product content)

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

13 – 004 – Procurement of Goods or Services Through Direct Purchasing or Public Tendering.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states “A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The amount of two hundred and seventy five thousand dollars (\$275,000) was provided in the 2006/2007 budget.

STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

Risk factors were considered during the evaluation process of this tender and were not considered to be of extreme or high risk.

CO10/06 – SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COMMENT

Each of the three tenderers gave a choice of options.

Rosmech Sales & Service Pty Ltd recommended either a Scarab Merlin or a Scarab Mistral, both to be mounted on a Nissan cab chassis.

The Scarab Merlin was not evaluated as it only had manual transmission.

The Scarab Mistral met most of the specifications and was evaluated. Scarab Sweepers are manufactured in the UK and are fitted to the Nissan chassis by Rosmech at their Adelaide production facility. Although the Nissan chassis can be serviced by a local company, spare parts and service for the sweeper are only available through Rosmech's South Australian store. Some of the items required in the specifications are not provided as standard but can be included at extra cost. City of Melville has never used a Scarab Sweeper and although there are a couple of Councils in WA who use them the majority are in the eastern states. The Scarab Mistral fell in the middle of the price range but due mainly to the lack of local support for spare parts and service this option is not recommended.

MacDonald Johnston Engineering Company Pty Ltd put forward three options.

The RT570 Sweeper mounted on a Hino Ranger Pro-7 does not comply in several areas and was not evaluated.

The VT605 Sweeper is offered on either a Hino Ranger Pro-7 or Pro-9. Both of these meet the specifications and are suitable vehicles.

MacDonald Johnston is located in WA and has provided City of Melville with good service and support in the past.

The two vehicles proposed by **Wel-quip** are the Schwarze A6500XL Sweeper mounted on an Isuzu FFR 500 cab chassis and the Schwarze A8500 Sweeper mounted on a Hino Ranger Pro-9.

The only other sweeper the City of Melville operates is a Schwarze which has performed to a high standard.

The operators' assessment of the trucks favoured the Isuzu as it is easier to operate the sweeper internally and has a better turning circle.

Wel-quip is based in WA and is known to the City of Melville. Their Option 1, the Schwarze A6500XL Sweeper mounted on an Isuzu FFR 500 cab chassis, is the most economical of the vehicles that were evaluated and as the highest scorer on the matrix it is the recommended option.

CO10/06 – SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY WEL-QUIP FOR THE SUPPLY OF ONE (1) ONLY ROAD SWEEPER SCHWARZE A6500XL SWEEPER ON ISUZU FRR 500 AS SPECIFIED FOR THE SUM OF TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THREE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY DOLLARS AND FIFTY SIX CENTS (\$253,440.56) EXCLUDING GST BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/5000 - COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Administration
Strategy/Policy/Operational	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Common Seal Register
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Standard Item
Works Programme	:	Not applicable
Funding	:	Not applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Bruce Taylor Manager information & corporate support

SUMMARY

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville common seal has been applied and recommends that the information be noted.

BACKGROUND

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995 states that a Local Government is a Body Corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal. A document is validly executed by a Body Corporate when the common seal of the Local Government is affixed to it by the Chief Executive Officer, and the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer attest the affixing of the seal.

DETAIL

Document Type	Party	Description	File Ref
Deed of Licence	Marmion Reserve Sporting Association	Portion of Marmion Reserve	1478287
Transfer of Land Section 70A Notification Easement	Multiplex Christian Marriott and Karen Marriott Primewest (Hometown Melville) PTY LTD	Raffles Public Carpark 13 Bowling Place, Melville Leach Highway, Booragoon	1510295 1510486 1491996
Deed of Variation	Multiplex Raffles PTY LTD and Baseland Holdings PTY LTD	Deed of Variation to Development Deed (Raffles Hotel)	1515419
Deed	W L Timms, C J Timms, C R Stagg, R L Stagg, D R Stagg and N C Stagg	Parking Deed – Kearns Crescent, Ardross	1477537
Deed of Licence	Kardinya Sports Association	Portion of Morris Buzzacott Reserve	1175912

C06/5000 - COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)

Deed of Licence	Bluewater PTY LTD	Courtyard Premises, Outside Public Toilets, Carpark and Carpark Premises	1521582
Deed of Licence	Blue Gum Child Car Association Inc	Building contained within portion of Crown Reserve 38857, Moolyeen Road, Brentwood	1510152

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Not applicable.

COMMENT

Nil.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE ACTION OF HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER IN EXECUTING THE DOCUMENTS LISTED UNDER THE COMMON SEAL OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE, BE NOTED.

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Financial Statements and Investments
Customer Index	: Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Standard item
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	: Bob Searle Manager Financial Services

SUMMARY

This report presents the investment statements for the month of August 2006 and recommends that the information detailed in the attachments be noted.

BACKGROUND

The investment of surplus cash holdings is undertaken in accordance with Council's investment policy, with the objective of maximising returns whilst maintaining acceptable levels of risk exposure.

DETAIL

[6000A October 2006.pdf](#) and [6000B October 2006.pdf](#) the Investment Statements for the month of August 2006, form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 11 October 2006.

The Investment of Surplus Funds is undertaken in accordance with the Finance Investment Policy document for the City of Melville. [6000D October 2006.pdf](#) a graph showing the total levels of funds invested forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 11 October 2006.

Reports prepared by Grange Securities have again been included for members' information. [6000C October 2006.pdf](#) The reports form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 11 October 2006.

C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate Policy C14.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 19 – Management of Investments.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As at the end of August 2006, total interest, including Reserve Fund interest, earned was five hundred and eighty thousand five hundred and twenty one dollars (\$580,521) against a budget year to date of four hundred and twenty one thousand four hundred dollars (\$421,400). The full year budget is two million seven hundred and eight thousand and seven hundred dollars (\$2,708,700).

Reserve Fund interest earned was two hundred and seventy three thousand three hundred and forty two dollars (\$273,342) against a budget year to date of one hundred and thirty nine thousand, six hundred dollars (\$136,600). The full year budget is eight hundred and thirty seven thousand seven hundred dollars (\$837,700).

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

COMMENT

Base interest rates moved a little in the month, with an increase of zero point two eight percent (0.28%) in the rates for thirty (30) day bank bills. Longer term returns showed a similar increase, although the ninety (90) rate actually reduced marginally. The performance of the City of Melville portfolio managed by Grange Securities exceeded the agreed benchmark of the UBS Bank Bill Index plus zero point three five percent (UBS plus 0.35%) by zero point eight four per cent (0.84%) in the month of August 2006 and by one point one six per cent (1.16%) over the last twelve (12) months.

C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE INVESTMENT STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2006, AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE NOTED:

[6000A October 2006.pdf](#)

[6000B October 2006.pdf](#)

[6000C October 2006.pdf](#)

[6000D October 2006.pdf](#)

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Financial Statement and Investments
Customer Index	: Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Standard item
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: 2005/2006 Budget
Responsible Officer	: Bob Searle Manager Financial Services

SUMMARY

This report presents details of the payments made to suppliers for the provision of goods and services for the month of August 2006 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts be noted.

BACKGROUND

Delegated Authority CE23 has been granted to the Chief Executive Officer to make payments from the Municipal and Trust Funds. This authority has then been on-delegated to the Director Customer and Corporate Services. In accordance with Regulation thirteen (13), two (2) and three (3) of the Local Government (Financial Administration) Regulations 1996 where this power has been delegated, a list of payments for each month is to be compiled and presented to the Council. The list is to show each payment, payee name, amount and date of payment and sufficient information to identify the transaction.

DETAIL

[6001 October 2006.pdf](#) The Schedule of Accounts for the period ending 31 August 2006 including Warrant of Payments Nos. 654 to 656 were distributed to the Members of Council on Wednesday, 11 October 2006.

C06/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Management Procedure 1.8 - Certification of Accounts.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

This report meets the requirements of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 11 - Payment of Accounts, Regulation 12 - List of Creditors and Regulation 13 - Payments from the Trust Fund and the Municipal Fund.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Expenditures were provided for in the 2006/2007 Budget.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

COMMENT

This is a regular monthly report for Elected Members information.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

THAT THE SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 AUGUST 2006, AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR CUSTOMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELEGATED AUTHORITY CE23, AND DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6001 October 2006.pdf](#) BE NOTED.

CARRIED EN BLOC

C06/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Financial Statements and Investments
Customer Index	: Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Standard Item
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	: Bob Searle Manager Financial Services

SUMMARY

This report presents the financial statements to the end of August 2006 and recommends that they be noted by Council.

BACKGROUND

The Financial Statements for the end of the month of August 2006 have been prepared and tabled in accordance with Regulation thirty-four (34) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 as amended in March 2005, which requires that:

- (1) A local government is to prepare each month a statement of financial activity reporting on the sources and applications of funds, as set out in the annual budget under regulation 22(1)(d), for that month in the following detail-
 - (a) annual budget estimates, taking into account any expenditure incurred for an additional purpose under section 6.8(1)(b) or (c);
 - (b) budget estimates to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
 - (c) actual amounts of expenditure, revenue and income to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
 - (d) material variances between the comparable amounts referred to in paragraphs (b) and (c); and
 - (e) the net current assets at the end of the month to which the statement relates.
- (2) Each statement of financial activity is to be accompanied by documents containing-
 - (a) an explanation of the composition of the net current assets of the month to which the statement relates, less committed assets and restricted assets;
 - (b) an explanation of each of the material variances referred to in subregulation (1)(d); and
 - (c) such other supporting information as is considered relevant by the local government.

C06/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)

- (3) The information in a statement of financial activity may be shown-
 - (a) according to nature and type classification;
 - (b) by program; or
 - (c) by business unit.

- (4) A statement of financial activity, and the accompanying documents referred to in subregulation (2), are to be-
 - (a) presented to the council-
 - (i) at the next ordinary meeting of the council following the end of the month to which the statement relates; or
 - (ii) if the statement is not prepared in time to present it to the meeting referred to in subparagraph (i), to the next ordinary meeting of the council after that meeting; and
 - (b) recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which it is presented.

- (5) Each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with AAS 5, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

DETAIL

A computer hardware failure relating to the old General Ledger system has meant that it has not been possible so far to complete the year end processes for 2005/2006 and to bring the relevant opening balances into the new system before the preparation of these reports. This same problem also means that the development of the normal reports for Council from the new system has been delayed and that the reports cannot be comprehensive at this stage. The hardware and software problems on the old system have now been mostly remedied and work on the completion of the year end is well underway.

The attached reports have been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the legislation, but should again be treated with caution. Whilst they give a fair indication of the situation for the month of August, they again lack opening balances. So far as material variances are concerned, at this stage all items are driven by budget phasing, and a detailed report would not be helpful to elected members. It is planned that the normal detailed analysis will be resumed for the September month information.

The following attachments form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 11 October 2006.

C06/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)

DESCRIPTION	LINK
Statement of Financial Activity	6002A October 2006.pdf
Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 31 August 2006	6002B October 2006.pdf
Representation of Working Capital as at August 2006	6002E October 2006.pdf
Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 31 August 2006.	6002F October 2006.pdf
Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of August 2006	6002J October 2006.pdf
Summary of Rates debtors for the month of August 2006	6002L October 2006.pdf
Graph showing Rates Collections for August 2006	6002M October 2006.pdf
Summary of Debtors aged 90 days old or greater as at 31 August 2006	6002N October 2006.pdf

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable.

STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Local Government Act 1995 Division 3 – Reporting on Activities and Finance Section 6.4 – Financial Report.

Local Government (Financial Regulations) 1996 Part 4 – Financial Reports

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Amendments to the 2006/2007 Budget have been included in the budget amendment report.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

C06/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)

COMMENT

It should be noted that the attached financial statements are preliminary and do not reflect the final end of year financial position and carry forwards. The end of year financial statement accruals and reserve transfers and the subsequent audit are yet to be undertaken. It is expected that these tasks will have been completed by the end of October 2006.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

1. THAT THE STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY AND THE OPERATING STATEMENTS FOR THE PERIODS ENDING 31 AUGUST 2006, AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE ADOPTED:

DESCRIPTION	LINK
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY	<u>6002A October 2006.pdf</u>
OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31 AUGUST 2006	<u>6002B October 2006.pdf</u>
REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT AUGUST 2006	<u>6002E October 2006.pdf</u>
RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 31 AUGUST 2006	<u>6002F October 2006.pdf</u>
SUMMARY OF RATES DEBTORS FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2006	<u>6002L October 2006.pdf</u>
GRAPH SHOWING RATES COLLECTIONS FOR NOVEMBER AND AUGUST 2006	<u>6002M October 2006.pdf</u>
SUMMARY OF DEBTORS AGED 90 DAYS OLD OR GREATER AS AT 31 AUGUST 2006	<u>6002N October 2006.pdf</u>

2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION, THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS, AS LISTED IN THE BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORTS FOR AUGUST 2006, AS DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6002J October 2006.pdf](#) BE ADOPTED

CARRIED EN BLOC

12. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

13. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL

Nil.

14. CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the Meeting closed at 8.07pm.