

**MINUTES
OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
HELD IN THE
CONFERENCE ROOM, MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE
AT 8.30PM ON
WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 2016**



MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM, MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE, 10 ALMONDBURY ROAD, BOORAGOON, COMMENCING AT 8.30PM ON WEDNESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2016.

1. PRESENT

His Worship the Mayor, Russell Aubrey

COUNCILLORS

Cr R Aubrey (Deputy Mayor)
Cr D Macphail
Cr N Pazolli
Cr J Barton, Cr G Wieland
Cr C Robartson
Cr P Phelan
Cr N Foxtton, Cr T Barling

WARD

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

2. IN ATTENDANCE

Dr S Silcox
Mr M Tieleman
Mr J Christie
Mr S Cope
Mr L Hitchcock
Ms K Johnson

Mr J Clark

Mr T Cahoon
Ms L Reid
Mr M Duncan (departed 8:35pm)

Mr N Fimmano
Ms C Newman

Ms S Williams

Chief Executive Officer
Director Corporate Services
Director Technical Services
Director Urban Planning
Executive Manager Legal Services
Executive Manager Organisational
Development
Governance and Compliance
Program Manager
Manager Healthy Melville
Manager Cultural Services
Manager Information and
Communications Technology
Governance and Property Officer
Executive Support and Governance
Officer
Administration Officer - Specialist

At the commencement of the meeting there were 110 Electors of the City of Melville and one member of the press in attendance.

3. APOLOGIES

Cr C Schuster
Cr L O'Malley

Applecross/ Mount Pleasant
Palmyra/Melville/Willagee

4. LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr M Woodall

Bull Creek/Leeming

5. INTRODUCTION OF ELECTED MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

His Worship the Mayor, R Aubrey, introduced individual Elected Members and Senior Staff to the meeting.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

6.1 FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Nil.

6.2 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST THAT MAY CAUSE A CONFLICT

Nil.

7. BUSINESS**7.1 NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS**

The following Notice of Meeting was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper on Tuesday 22 November 2016 and the Melville Times Community Newspaper on Tuesday, 29 November 2016 in addition to being displayed on public notice boards at all the City of Melville libraries and the Civic Centre. The notice read:

“Special Meeting of Electors”**Wednesday, 7 December 2016**

A Special Meeting of Electors of the City of Melville will be held at the Civic Centre, 10 Almondbury Road, Booragoon **commencing 8.30pm on Wednesday 7 December 2016** to consider a request signed by 201 electors to discuss -

The proposed Relocation of the Melville Bowling Club Inc.

Should you require further information, please contact Corporate Support on 9364 0607.

Electors and Ratepayers of the City are welcome to attend. The Council Meeting Schedule, Agendas and Minutes of all meetings are available at www.melvillecity.com.au

**Marten Tieleman
Acting Chief Executive Officer”**

His Worship the Mayor read out the Manner of Conduct of the Meeting.

7.2 MANNER OF CONDUCT OF THE MEETING

1. It is a requirement to advise that in the event of an emergency, everyone should take direction from officers who will guide you to the exit points of the building.
2. Toilets are located immediately before the entry to the Council Chambers.
3. All present are required to sign the attendance register at the entry to the Conference Room.
4. Speakers must be Electors of the City of Melville.
5. The proceedings are being taped for the purpose of production of the minutes and speakers are requested to use the microphones each time they speak.

The Minutes will include a summary of any questions asked and a summary of the response provided.

6. No other audio or visual recording is to be undertaken without the permission of the Presiding Member.
7. Speakers are asked to clearly give their name and address each time they speak.
8. Upon a motion being proposed, each speaker is to address the Chair.
9. All addresses are to be limited to a maximum of five (5) minutes. Extension of time is permissible only with the agreement of a simple majority of Electors present (*Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 Regulation 17*).
10. No persons are to use offensive or objectionable expressions in reference to any Member, employee of the Council, or any other person (8.3 of Standing Orders).
11. All Elected Members and Directors attend this meeting to observe the proceedings and hear comments from Electors. All questions and comments should be directed to the Mayor who may invite a response from the Chief Executive Officer, Presiding Members of Committees, Directors or Elected Members.

The Mayor gave an overview of the order of business of the meeting, for the benefit of attendees and that motions would be presented to the meeting in the order they had been received.

8. QUESTIONS

8.1 Mr G Gear, Alfred Cove

Question 1

Did not believe the two motions before the meeting were diametrically opposite and whether it was possible to hear the first motion from Mr Campbell and then for him to put forward his motion?

Response

Further detail was provided on the motion from Mr Campbell to clarify the order of business.

His Worship the Mayor read out questions that were received in writing prior to the meeting.

8.2 Mr G Gear, Alfred Cove

Question 1

Has the sustainability matrix used in the City of Melville Bowls Strategy been designed specifically for this report and if so how were the assumptions used in the report arrived at?

Response

No. As highlighted in the report the matrix used was from the Bowls WA Facility Review and Development Plan 2010 published by Bowls WA.

Question 2

As the measure of sustainability is nothing more than a ratio between pennant players and the number of greens, would it not be more cost efficient to remove two greens at the Melville Bowling Club to maintain/improve the sustainability of the combined bowling clubs?

Response

Overall sustainability (for both clubs and the City) is not just based on the number of greens. The shared use of facilities brings much efficiency which results in the provision of community and sport facilities being more financially sustainable for both the Clubs and the City.

Question 3

Using the more conventional use of the term sustainable i.e. economically sustainable, are the Mt Pleasant and Melville Bowling Clubs economically sustainable to date?

Response

The future economic sustainability under the current model is an identified issue for both the Clubs and the City. The estimated subsidy for bowls clubs in the City is far greater than other clubs where there is shared use of facilities. The City has a clear strategy in regards to the establishment of community hubs being the preferred model.

Question 4

What is the total leased area, occupied area (greens, access space, buildings), total actual greens area and total floor area of buildings (under the main roof) used for all bowling club activities for;

- (a) *The current Melville Bowling Club site*
- (b) *The current Mt Pleasant Bowling Club site*
- (c) *The proposed combined bowling clubs at Tompkins Park?*

Response

The benefit of the hub model is that the area required to conduct club activities is flexible due to the ability to be able to utilise other shared spaces for larger events. The City is working closely with both Melville and Mount Pleasant Bowling Clubs to ensure that the facilities at Tompkins Park will meet the merged Club's requirements, as well as the other Clubs at Tompkins Park. The Bowls relocation committee have already highlighted that 4 greens will be able accommodate the relocation of the two clubs.

8.3 Mr G Sandford, ApplecrossQuestion 1

Why is the Melville Bowls Club being moved?

Response

The Council has endorsed the City of Melville Lawn Bowls Strategy 2016 in October 2016 which included the recommendation for both Melville and Mt Pleasant Bowls Club to merge and be located at a redeveloped Tompkins Park facility. The outcome for the Strategy is to ensure the sport of lawn bowls is sustainable long term within the City of Melville for Clubs and the City. Further details of the research and data informing this outcome are available in the Lawn Bowls Strategy which is in the minutes of the October 2016 Ordinary Meeting of Council. This decision by the Council is in line with both the Melville and Mt Pleasant Clubs' positions and the City's Strategic Plan.

Question 2

What is the justification for the move to Tompkins Park as opposed to the amalgamation with the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club and remaining at the current Melville Bowling Club site?

Response

Please note the previous response which is applicable for this question,

8.4 Mrs C Kelers, Alfred CoveQuestion

*Melville City has an excellent policy in regard to the urban environment –
“Urban Forest and Green Space Policy”*

Precious Green Space and Trees are to be sacrificed to make way for large areas of asphalt to accommodate the car parking bays necessary for the relocating of the Melville Bowling Club; and the proposed commercialisation of the present Melville Bowling Club Venue, if this project goes ahead.

In answer to my previous question on this subject I have been told in writing by Christine Young Director Community Development that:

“The parking adjacent to the main Tompkins Park building is required to be expanded regardless of the Wave Park proposal. This has always been a key part of the Tompkins Park Concept Plan which would see approx. 210 parking bays in the immediate area and approx. another 50 bays along Dunkley Avenue (~260 bays in the Eastern part of the Park) This improvement in parking will cater for the variety of uses at Tompkins Park including the new bowls facility (should Council endorse the Bowls Strategy).

Whilst all efforts will be made to reduce tree loss when expanding the car park and constructing the bowling greens, unfortunately there will be some that will require removal. Should this be essential more trees will be planted at the Park than what is existing, effectively increasing the total number of trees in the Park. The Wave Park proposal appears to impact 1 tree”.

It is not obvious from the answer that the Relocation of the Bowling Clubs goes strongly against Councils “Urban Forest and Green Space Policy” Why is it that the Council is going against its own publicised Policy?

Response

These actions are not inconsistent with the Urban Forest and Green Space Policy.

The previous response does highlight that all efforts will be made to minimise tree loss and any tree removal will see further additional tree plantings undertaken and conversion of an open drain to a living stream.

8.5 Mr M Kalkhoven, ApplecrossQuestion 1

Although the council claims in its letter to residents dated 24 August 2016 “no net loss in playing fields”, does the Council acknowledge that there would be a significant net loss of freely accessible public open space (i.e. at no cost) as a result of the proposed commercial lease or sale of the current Melville Bowls Club site and the amalgamated Mt Pleasant and Melville bowling club relocation to the proposed Tompkins Park redevelopment? If so please quantify? If not, please justify?

Response

There is no net loss of playing fields. The Wave Park proposal does indicate improvements to the public space connecting to Atwell Arts Association including the development of a living stream.

The current Melville Bowling Club does not provide freely available accessible open space – membership is required to attend and participate.

There is also proposed improved public open space on the far eastern side of the Tompkins Park precinct with the development of a new cricket field.

Question 2

Why didn't the Council establish a stakeholder working group to develop the draft Tompkins Park Redevelopment Plan SK01 and will a working group of all representative stakeholders be included in future planning process?

Response

The concept planning is not finalised. The initial draft was developed following engagement with sporting groups and the community. Currently consultation is occurring on a regular basis with all key sporting stakeholders to ensure the design is appropriate. Prior to the concept plan being finalised it will be made available for community comment in early 2017.

Question 3

What is the status of the proposed merger of the Mount Pleasant and Melville Bowling Clubs? What is the process and timeline for finalising this decision?

Response

Both Clubs have established a joint Relocation Committee that is meeting regularly, and also meeting regularly with City Officers. The decision to merge and relocate was endorsed by the Council at the Ordinary Meeting of Council in October to support the Recommendations of the Bowls Strategy. Both Clubs have voted to work with the City in terms of the merger and relocation.

8.6 Mr R Baker, Applecross

These questions relate to the Proposed Redevelopment of the Tompkins Park Sports Area. Reference DRAFT Concept Plan SK01.

Question 1

Does the Council acknowledge that the above Plan shows a vast array of proposed sporting facilities compressed into a relatively small area which will give rise to inherent problems such as traffic volume and management, personal and spectator access and viewing difficulties, noise and increased antisocial behaviour to name a few? Is the Council undertaking an updated concept design for this location and, if so, when will it be available?

Response

The City is confident that all activities can be accommodated in this already significant regional hub location. Concept planning is currently underway with extensive consultation with sporting stakeholders. Once this phase is completed the concept plan will be available for community comment in early 2017.

Question 2

The proposed moving of the Melville Bowling Club to the Tompkins Park area clearly contributes to the congested design as mentioned above. Why is the Council proposing to move the Bowling Club (merged with the Mt Pleasant Club?) to this location – particularly as the space, design, amenities, security and ease of parking at the existing site (s) cannot be replicated at the new proposed site?

Response

The City sees this as an opportunity to design and provide improved contemporary, fit for use facilities for the community.

9. PRESENTATION

A presentation was provided by Ms C Young, Director Community Development – [AGM Electors City of Melville Bowling Presentation`](#)

The City's primary priority is the sport of bowls and dealing with those clubs and setting up to ensure that the people committed to that sport have a sustainable future.

His Worship the Mayor invited questions from the meeting attendees on the presentation.

9.1 Mr R Looten, Ardross

Question 1

Requested a copy of the Presentation and the opportunity to formally respond?

Response

The City of Melville deals closely with the Executives of both the Mount Pleasant and the Melville Bowling Clubs. It is suggested that if there are concerns on this matter, that these be discussed with the Executives of the Clubs who are able to raise the issues with the City. A copy of the presentation would be made available to Mr Looten.

9.2 Mr D Maynier, Attadale.Question

The Pelican Cove Community, is a community of approximately 100 residents. The Pelican Cove Community are regular users, for functions, official meetings and some residents are members and use it for social activities. To what extend has the City taken into consideration the fact that use and amenity of the Melville Bowling Club extends beyond its members? And will it be taken into future consideration?

Response

Opportunities for meetings, functions and social activities of groups such as yours would be easily accommodated and welcomed in a new facility slightly to east of the existing club.

9.3 Mr R Baker, ApplecrossQuestion

Referred to a newspaper article dated Sunday 27 November 2016:

“Club President (Melville Bowling Club) Ted Atkins, conceded that most members did not want to move but stressed that the Council had given them no choice and the only option was to ensure the best outcome in the relocations”

Is that a true statement?

Response

The President of the Melville Bowling Club would be the best person to speak to with regard to that statement.

The information provided to the City by the Executive of the Bowling Club was that 85% of voting members did support working with the City. It was advised that some members were not happy but were willing to work with the City to achieve a good outcome.

9.4 Mr K Adamson, ApplecrossQuestion 1

Main Roads WA has refused to install traffic lights at Dunkley Road, Applecross. Based on the number of car parking bays to be provided in the draft, it is likely to increase traffic at least four-fold into residential streets not designed for that volume and to an intersection of a busy highway that is already a dangerous one with many accidents. The only proposal I have heard to date is to limit the traffic turning either on to the highway or off the highway. This will at best have minimal improvement and still result in creating congestion and increase the chance of an accident and at worst will exacerbate this intersection. How can the Council consider such a development without first resolving the issue of traffic management?

Response

The City is aware that there are difficulties at the intersection and investigations are currently underway in consultation with Main Roads WA and at the end of the day it is a Main Roads WA decision, the City is wanting to influence a good outcome for traffic movements at that location.

Consultation with Main Roads WA with respect to the intersection of Dunkley Avenue and Canning Highway has considered alternative treatments such as a roundabout, however advice from Main Roads WA indicated there is insufficient traffic flow from Dunkley Avenue. Additionally, the installation of traffic lights has been considered, but these would cause an impact to traffic on Canning Highway if installed that close to the North Lake Road intersection. Currently cul-de-sacing of Norma road to limit to access to Canning Highway is being investigated.

Question 2

Surely traffic management is one of the basic questions that need to be answered before anything is done. How can the residents be assured that this already dangerous intersection will be properly addressed as part of any proposal?

Response

Main Roads WA have the ultimate approval for any upgrades or changes to those roads that have access or egress to Canning Highway. The City will continue to work with Main Roads WA to achieve the most suitable solution for the location.

9.5 Mr W McCulloch, Applecross

Question

What consideration has been given to the residents of Dunkley Avenue and Frances Road and the impact of the proposed new facility and the associated additional car parking?

Response

The concept plan isn't finalised. When it is finalised the City will be seeking comment from the community and at this point in time we are working with the key sporting stakeholders on the design. This is a major regional sporting hub and it has operated in this manner for 20 - 25 years in terms of the number of different sports that are accommodated in this precinct. This is an important centre for the City and the City will be engaging with the community around the traffic movements.

9.6 Ms K Miller, ApplecrossQuestion

It has been stated that there will be no loss of playing fields, but the proposal will put four bowling greens on the one of the front ovals that is currently being used by the community to walk dogs and play with their children – this will be lost to the community. There is also a proposal to put two function centers right next to each other. Already on a Saturday night the existing centre generates a lot of noise from weddings and functions

There is a bowling green at the end of the hub – it is ridiculous to think that moving the bowling club further up is making a better hub, what is being created is two bar facilities very close together, which will cause social conflict.

Response

The current Tompkins Park sporting facility currently relies on large commercial type functions to support the operational costs of the site. The proposed future model is community based and would see a decline in the need for those types of functions to support the operational costs of the building.

The City plays a key role in the governance structure that will be established at the site and work on this has commenced. Concerns that are raised around alcohol consumption and associated issues will be addressed through the governance model including liquor licensing.

9.7 Mr N Williams, Mount PleasantQuestion

Has concerns with the parking issues associated with changing the location and creating more parking, it almost needs more parking now. Has underground parking been considered? Also moving the bowling club and using synthetic turf will decrease the ground water recharge for the site. The City already has issues with the groundwater decreasing.

Also has some concerns associated with the duplication of the function centre when the current one is under-utilised.

Response

Clarification that the proposal does not include a duplicate function centre. The “Hub” refers to shared spaces that are used at different times by different groups.

The proposal is for expansion of the existing site to accommodate additional amenities and space for the merged Bowling Club.

Question 2

What are the environmental impacts of having alternative activities incorporated into that facility - Climbing Wall, Skate Park, an additional Bar, a Café?

Response

The Tompkins Park Sporting Facility and the relocation of the Melville Bowling Club is being discussed tonight and not any other proposals for the site.

9.8 Mrs C Kelers, Alfred CoveQuestion

Asked a previous question and would like further clarification on the Urban Forestation and Green Policies for the City. These don't just include trees, they include open green spaces and we will lose open green spaces with the construction of bowling greens with covers and carparks for some 500 cars for the facilities being developed.

Green space is valuable to the growing City, given the amount of subdivision occurring, for the health of the City. It is not appropriate to take away large amounts of green space.

I question the City on the influence of these green policies on these developments?

Response

The proposal is the refitting of current playing fields with a different type of playing field.

9.9 Mr T Earle, Alfred CoveQuestion

The eastern end of Tompkins Park will be used for cricket. This site has a history of problems as it is on a rubbish dump and there is no ability to level it for a cricket field.

Response

The current investigative work being undertaken shows that eastern end of Tompkins Park can accommodate a cricket oval, a proper pitch may not be suitable, but an oval is possible.

At 9:24pm the Mayor closed questions from the meeting attendees.

For the purpose of Governance, the Executive Manager Legal Services advised the meeting that the request for this meeting had not been raised by the Executive of the Melville Bowling Club.

The Mayor read both motions to the meeting advising that the motion, presented by Mr Campbell would dealt with first and the motion presented by Mr Gear would be taken as a foreshadowed motion should the first motion be lost.

MOTION (Mr Campbell)

That the electors hereby support and endorse the decision of Melville Council made on 18 October 2016 in relation to matter CD16/8089 - that the Melville Bowling Club and the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club amalgamate and relocate to a new bowls facility at the expanded Tompkins Park Hub.

FORESHADOWED MOTION (Mr Gear)

Council not proceed with the proposal to shift the Melville Bowling Club from its present premises as it will:

- 1. Lead to the demolition of the historic Melville Bowling Club (MBC) which has operated on its current site for 60 years.**
- 2. Cause the MBC to breach its fundamental objectives in its constitution namely clauses 6 (a), (b) and (e).**
- 3. The proposed premises for the Melville Bowling Club at Tompkins Park severely disadvantages the club with less than 50% of its current space to carry out their own activities, less autonomy and having to share facilities such as a common kitchen.**
- 4. Will lead to further traffic congestion at the intersection of Dunkley Avenue and Canning Highway which experiences major delays at present and frequent accidents. It will also lead to increased traffic flow in local streets.**
- 5. As the proposed move is intended to happen even if there is no development on the current Melville Bowling Club site the projected \$2.5m cost of relocating is an unnecessary use of ratepayers money.**
- 6. The Mount Pleasant Bowling Club can much more easily be absorbed into the current premises of the MBC which is larger and has more social and community amenities than the proposed smaller premises at the proposed Tomkins Park site.**

MOTION BY MR A BARTON, BICTON

At 9.30pm moved Mr A Barton of Bicton, seconded Ms E Nicholson, Applecross

Motion 1

That the meeting dissent with the Chairs acceptance of this motion on the basis that it refers to the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club and therefore falls outside of the purpose of the meeting which is the proposed relocation of the Melville Bowling Club.

At 9:32pm the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

LOST (24/76)

MOTION BY MR CAMPBELL. ALFRED COVE

At 9.38pm moved Mr L Campbell of Alfred Cove, seconded Mr B Koontz, of Booragoon

At 9.51pm the Mayor called for a show of hands for and against extension of time for Mr Gear to continue to speak against the motion.

LOST (39/58)

Motion 2

That the electors hereby support and endorse the decision of Melville Council made on 18 October 2016 in relation to matter CD16/8089 - that the Melville Bowling Club and the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club amalgamate and relocate to a new bowls facility at the expanded Tompkins Park Hub.

At 9:57pm the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

CARRIED (63/43)

On behalf of the Elected Members and Staff of the City of Melville, His Worship the Mayor thanked everyone for their attendance and wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a Healthy New Year.

10. CLOSURE

There being no further business, His Worship the Mayor, R Aubrey, declared the Meeting closed at 9:58pm.