



ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL  
MINUTES

27 OCTOBER 2015

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF OPENING.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING – AS CIRCULATED .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR (WITHOUT DISCUSSION).....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<i>IS107 CHARGING OF GREEN WASTE FOR COMMERCIAL OPERATORS - MERU.....</i>	<i>19</i>
	<i>IS108 BERESFORD FORESHORE COASTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT - ENGINEERING DESIGN SOLUTION.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<b>12</b>	<b>REPORTS OF CORPORATE &amp; COMMERCIAL SERVICES .....</b>	<b>35</b>
	<i>CCS136 MEETING SCHEDULE – JANUARY 2016 - DECEMBER 2016 .....</i>	<i>35</i>
	<i>CCS137 2014/2015 ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON.....</i>	<i>40</i>
	<i>CCS138 STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2015.....</i>	<i>43</i>
	<i>CCS142 EXTRAORDINARY ELECTION TARCOOLA WARD.....</i>	<i>46</i>
<b>13</b>	<b>REPORTS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES .....</b>	<b>51</b>
	<i>CS224 APPOINTMENT OF THE HMAS SYDNEY II MEMORIAL WARDEN AND SUB-WARDEN.....</i>	<i>51</i>
	<i>CS229 MOVING FORWARD COMMUNITY SUMMIT IAP2 AWARD.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<b>14</b>	<b>REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY SERVICES .....</b>	<b>61</b>
	<i>DRS231 MINOR MODIFICATION TO GLENFIELD STRUCTURE PLAN.....</i>	<i>61</i>
	<i>DRS232 DONGARA TO NORTHAMPTON COASTAL ROUTE CORRIDOR ALIGNMENT SELECTION STUDY.....</i>	<i>66</i>
	<i>DRS233 NOMINATION FOR MID WEST/WHEATBELT (CENTRAL) JOINT DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANEL MEMBERSHIP .....</i>	<i>72</i>
<b>16</b>	<b>REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>79</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 1 – ATTACHMENTS AND REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED .....</b>	<b>80</b>

---

**CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON**  
**ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2015 AT 5.30PM**  
**CHAMBERS, CATHEDRAL AVENUE**

**MINUTES**

**DISCLAIMER:**

The Chairman advises that the purpose of this Council Meeting is to discuss and, where possible, make resolutions about items appearing on the agenda. Whilst Council has the power to resolve such items and may in fact, appear to have done so at the meeting, no person should rely on or act on the basis of such decision or on any advice or information provided by a Member or Officer, or on the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the meeting. Persons should be aware that the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 (Section 5.25(e)) and Council's Standing Orders Local Laws establish procedures for revocation or rescission of a Council decision. No person should rely on the decisions made by Council until formal advice of the Council decision is received by that person. The City of Greater Geraldton expressly disclaims liability for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of relying on or acting on the basis of any resolution of Council, or any advice or information provided by a Member or Officer, or the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the Council meeting.

**1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

The Mayor respectfully acknowledged the Yamaji people who are the Traditional Owners and First People of the land on which we met. The Mayor paid respects to the Elders past, present and future for they hold the memories, the traditions, the culture and hopes of the Yamaji people.

**2 DECLARATION OF OPENING**

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 5.30pm.

**3 ATTENDANCE**

Present:

Mayor S Van Styn  
Cr G Bylund  
Cr D J Caudwell  
Cr J Critch  
Cr S Douglas  
Cr R Ellis  
Cr L Graham  
Cr L Freer  
Cr R D Hall  
Cr S Keemink  
Cr M Reymond  
Cr N McIlwaine  
Cr V Tanti  
Cr T Thomas

Officers:

K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer  
P Melling, Director of Development & Regulatory Services  
B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Enterprises  
R McKim, Director of Infrastructure Services  
S Smith, Acting Director of Community Services  
S Moulds, PA to the Chief Executive Officer  
P Radalj, Manager Finance and Treasury  
M Wong, Manager Waste and Energy Services  
M Atkinson, Manager Infrastructure Planning and Asset Management  
M McGinity, Manager, Communications, Events and Engagement  
J Kopplhuber, Coordinator Communications & Engagement  
A Patterson, Senior Asset Engineer  
A Boska, Asset Management Project Officer  
M Dufour, Coastal Infrastructure Planning Officer, Infrastructure Planning and Asset Management

Others:

Members of Public: 8  
Members of Press: 1

Apologies:

A Selvey, Director of Community Services

Leave of Absence:

Nil.

**4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

*Questions provided in writing prior to the meeting or at the meeting will receive a formal response. Please note that you cannot make statements in Public Question Time and such statements will not be recorded in the Minutes.*

*Our Local Laws and the Local Government Act require questions to be put to the presiding member and answered by the Council. No questions can be put to individual Councillors.*

*Public question time commenced at 5.31pm*

**Andrew Outhwaite – 9 Whitfield Street, Beachlands WA 6530**

*Question relates to Item CC137 2014/2015 Annual Report for The City of Greater Geraldton*

Question

The annual report focuses on the activities and achievements of the organisation only, and I think it understates what CGG achieves in the community. Every committee, strategy and co-delivered service are done in collaboration with other organisations but very few are highlighted in the report: Digital First, Public Arts, Local Biodiversity, Disability Advocacy, MWAS, Goodness Festival etc. If those initiatives were highlighted the annual report might then seem more aligned with Councils' approach to community engagement, Council-lead community-owned. I just wonder if the resulting report may be 'owned' and appreciated by a wider audience.

*Are any aspirations or initiatives whereby Council may expand Annual Reporting to encompass more about the 'community' rather than just the organisation in 2015-16?*

Response by Chief Executive Officer

In addition to reporting our outcomes in the Annual Report we also report to Council on our performance in achieving the outcomes of the Corporate Business Plan. There are presently no immediate plans to extend our reporting beyond what we presently have in place.

Whilst I am personally supportive of increasing our public accountability through improved reporting, this matter would need to be considered as part of the budget process as we do not have sufficient resources or processes to capture and report on the types of information that you have identified

Question

*This question relates to Items CCS137 2014/2015 Annual Report For The City of Greater Geraldton; and CCS138 Statement of Financial Activity to 30 September 2015*

The values, vision and mission of CGG all refer to accountability and sustainability. Progress towards financial sustainability is accounted for in detail and external audited.

There is no quantifiable Annual reporting on KPIs under the other pillars. CCS138 (Monthly Management Report) - has KPIs that could be a foundation for more quantifiable Annual Reporting on other pillars. However even those measures seem focused on CGGs own internal operations rather than community outputs or outcomes, and 'culture' is missing entirely?

I just wonder if other measures and relationships could contribute to true 'community sustainability reporting', as is done in other leading regional cities.

Examples of more strategic and holistic community measures might be things like: number of homes connected to the NBN, kilometres of cycle path, hectares of bushland in good condition, square metres of occupied commercial space in the CBD, carbon emissions from Council operations, percentage of waste recycled, number of tourist bed-nights linked to Signature events, or even key Economic Development measures for the region that could be measured and reported in collaboration with other organisations.

*Can you please explain a little more about the Monthly and Annual Reporting on quantifiable KPIs for each pillar, and any aspirations to expand or improve them in 2015-16?*

Response by Chief Executive Officer

As previously stated, whilst I am personally supportive of increasing our public accountability through improved reporting, this matter would need to be considered as part of the budget process as we do not have sufficient resources or processes to capture and report on the types of information that you have identified on a monthly basis.

Question

*This question relates to Item IS108 - Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project - Engineering Design Solution*

The Beresford Foreshore protection project may set a precedent for coastal management and climate change adaptation policies and projects in the future. Previous CGG reports suggest that areas of Drummonds Cove, Sunset Beach, Cape Burney, Point Moore and even the CBD are likely to be affected by changes in sea level, storminess and sediment supply. Both public and private assets (commercial and residential) in all these areas may warrant investment in protection.

It could be perceived that those with private assets in the immediate vicinity will receive immediate lifestyle and long-term financial benefits from the protection and enhancement in a way that residents of other locations do not. If that were true and there were real private benefits, it could be reasonable that the beneficiaries contribute to the financial cost of such measures so as to reduce the burden on Council and other ratepayers?

*Can you please explain if and how consideration was given to mechanisms for owners of private assets to contribute financially to the capital expenditure and operational cost of the protection and enhancement measures?*

Response by Chief Executive Officer

The coastal protection measures will provide protection to local and state government owned infrastructure such as roads, electricity, water supply, sewerage and telecommunications. This infrastructure provides

---

benefits to all residents – not just those in the immediate vicinity. Similarly any improvement in amenity will also benefit all residents and visitors to our City.

Where there is a consequential benefit to residents in the nearby vicinity, this will be reflected in an increase in their Gross Rental Valuation which will increase their proportional share of total rates collected by the City.

For these reasons no consideration was given to requiring a direct contribution from nearby residents for the capital and operational costs associated with the infrastructure.

**Max Correy, PO Box 202, Geraldton WA 6530**

Question

Is it true that Council have a non-transparency policy with respect to Tender Information release i.e. all tenderers and tendered amounts?

Response by Director of Corporate & Commercial Services

No, it is not the case that the City has a policy of “non-transparency” in relation to tenders. The City has a clear policy of Regulatory compliance, and that policy demonstrably meets City obligations in relation to public accountability in relation to tender processes.

As advised in previous responses to questions from Mr Corey on this subject, the statutory duty of the City is to make decisions on tenders based on *best value for money*. Price is only one factor in tender assessment decision making.

Every tender issued by the City specifies other mandatory criteria against which respondents must provide information, and specifies the weighting that each criteria will have in the tender appraisal process.

Depending on the nature of the tender, and to illustrate the significance of matters that may apply other than price in appraising best value for money, a respondent may be required to provide information demonstrating their past success in delivery of similar projects, their professional and operational capacity to deliver the particular project, their fiscal capacity to sustain the project to completion, the engineering methods they propose to employ, their holding of necessary licences, or insurances, and so on. Any tender received failing to provide the information required for appraisal against these other criteria may be deemed non-compliant and excluded from the appraisal process. This is no different from tender processes applied by Federal and State agencies.

Tender assessment panels are established for every tender, with membership including experienced technical specialists in the relevant field (which may include external specialists), and where appropriate a finance specialist. For every tender assessment undertaken by the City, a staff member of the Corporate Services Branch Governance & Risk

team is a non-voting panel member, overseeing flow of information, and present at all panel meetings to directly monitor and advise on regulatory compliance and probity matters throughout the whole process. No tender assessment report is put to Council for deliberation prior to close scrutiny of the tender process and recommendations by the CEO and Executive Management Team, and all tender assessments are scrutinised by the elected Council as part of their deliberation process.

In relation to award of contracts from tender processes that are considered by the Council, a confidential report is provided to all Councillors detailing the tender appraisal process, providing information on each tender, and assessments against every specified criteria. That report is necessarily confidential because it contains assessments and a recommendation to Council for deliberation. The public agenda report to Council never includes the name or price of the recommended tenderer. The tender assessment report is confidential, and winning tender details are excluded from public agenda reports, to ensure that Councillors are not lobbied by tenderers prior to their deliberation and decision. The name of the winning tenderer and the price for contract award are subsequently published in the Minutes. That is a fundamental public probity procedure control. Any tenderer lobbying or endeavouring to influence Council deliberations on a tender process may be excluded from deliberations.

A key part of tender process transparency is the post-decision briefings to which all losing tenderers are entitled under City policy. Each tenderer failing to achieve contract award is able to meet privately with the City for discussion of reasons for failure of their tender to succeed, including dialogue on how their tender might have been improved. For example, if the nature, scope and quality of information provided against a particular assessment criterion was markedly weak relative to the information provided by other tenderers, that might be discussed, to assist the losing tenderer to improve their chances of future success. Importantly, these briefing sessions provide opportunity for every losing tenderer to raise any concerns they may have about the efficacy or probity of the tender process, and every losing tenderer is able to make formal representations to the City about any such concerns. Examination of any such representations is undertaken under the direct oversight of the CEO, by the Governance & Risk team, at arms-length from the line department responsible for the particular project. Most members of the community will appreciate that the vested interests of commercial firms submitting tenders makes them strongly interested in the efficacy and probity of public tender processes, and businesses are highly conscious of their right to make formal representations about any concerns that they may have. The City welcomes this legitimate interest from losing tenderers, and ensures that every losing tenderer is offered the opportunity for a post-tender briefing, as an essential part of the tender transparency process.



As Mr Correy has previously been advised, nobody argues about the matter of publication of details of a winning tender bid.

However, it is actually the case that some commercial tenderers do not want publication of details of their losing tender. They regard their tenders and prices as commercial-in-confidence. In highly contested market segments some tenderers assert a view that publication of their losing price position relative to their competitors in that field puts them at a competitive disadvantage for future business in the private or public sectors. They question how deliberately putting them in a situation of ongoing competitive disadvantage in their market might serve the public interest. This is a legitimate business perspective and, while the City may not necessarily agree in every case, the City is and should be sensitive to the views of commercial entities in that position.

Mr Correy is aware that any member of the public may at any time make a Freedom of Information (FOI) request for disclosure of the losing tender details in which Mr Correy is interested – the tendered price of every tenderer. The City processes such requests in strict compliance with the FOI legislation. From his own recent requests under FOI, Mr Correy is also aware that, consistent with regulatory requirements, before the City releases such information related to losing tenders, the City consults the losing tenderer and seeks their views on release of the information to the requesting party.

Where a losing tenderer has no objection to release of the requested information under FOI, the information is released by the City. If the losing tenderer objects to release of the information, with reasons, the City then advises the person seeking the information under FOI, and that person has the discretion to exclude that information from their request – or to still request it. In one recent case, illustrating how the process operates, Mr Correy was advised of an objection by one losing tenderer to such a request, and Mr Correy elected to exclude that entity from the tender information he had requested. The City is not bound to agree with the objection of a losing tenderer, but the City is required under FOI processes to consider it. The rules for such consideration under FOI are very tight, and reinforced by precedent decisions of the State's Information Commissioner responsible for FOI oversight. In the event that the City might choose to decline to release information for a particular losing tender, the person who submitted the FOI request is able to appeal that decision to the Information Commissioner, and the City becomes bound by the Commissioner's determination.

The key point here is that, demonstrably, the City always meets its regulatory disclosure obligations in relation to public tenders. Businesses who submit tenders are legitimate stakeholders in the commercial information they submit. In cases where any 3<sup>rd</sup> party seeks information about price of a losing tender, the City respects the need to consult that tenderer before releasing the losing tender information, and advising the person seeking the information if the tenderer objects. Generally, the

---

City will release the requested information, but in any case of dispute, a public interest determination by the Information Commissioner ultimately determines the appropriate level of disclosure, on a case by case basis. The City sees this as a fair and balanced approach, respecting on one hand the rights of businesses with losing tenders to be consulted, and on the other hand also respecting the rights of people to seek information and giving them opportunity to consider the views of any business objecting to release of their information.

Response by Chief Executive Officer

Having provided what I consider to be a sufficiently detailed explanation with respect to our current position, I am also pleased to advise that I will list this matter for consideration by the committee established between the City and the Midwest Chamber of Commerce and Industry to review the City's procurement policies, procedures and practices.

Question

Now that we have a new Council can I ask that the Council embark on the next 2 year period with a clean slate – to that end can I ask the Mayor to activate a forensic financial audit and also a productivity and efficiency audit of Council operations?

Response by Mayor Shane Van Styn

I thank Max Correy for his first question to me as Mayor and I am sure to look forward to many more.

We do indeed have a new, vastly different Council from when I was first elected in 2011. We have a new CEO and a brand new Director of Infrastructure Services. Tonight I sit here as the Mayor, but I am also a Fellow of CPA Australia and Chairperson of the City of Greater Geraldton Audit Committee. I note we also have an Accountant as CEO.

With this background I can assure Max that the level of financial review by both staff and the Audit Committee is above what may have been the case in years gone by.

In my role as Chairperson of the Audit Committee, we for example engaged Deloitte in 2013 to conduct accounts payable and payroll system reviews to satisfy ourselves as to the accuracy and adequacy of these systems. These midyear reviews are ongoing and are not new. On top of these midyear interim audits, we are audited by a separate external auditor who reviews our financial accounts and systems in compliance with the Local Government Act. In 2015 we have received an unqualified audit opinion.

Max's desire to conduct an efficiency review is in my opinion premature and currently unwarranted. Over the last three budgets we have identified more than \$5.5 million in sustainable savings and efficiencies; \$3.6 million in this financial year alone.

Given we are really talking about staff jobs (recently reduced by 13%) we must be mindful of staff morale and wellbeing when going about these reviews. We need time to let the financial results of this most recent wave of reform be measured and evaluated.

We benchmark our organisational effectiveness in terms of Culture and Behaviour, Business Processes and Strategic intent against a data set of more than 5,000,000 respondents from hundreds of leading private sector companies and have consistently shown improvement in our performance to the extent that we now exceed their benchmark in across nearly all of the 27 business drivers of an effective organisation

As a member of the CEO selection Committee, my main focus for selection of our new CEO was whether or not the CEO had the ability to drive efficiencies here at the City. I note the CEO has an ongoing continuous improvement program in place to drive further efficiencies and business improvement. I assure you the results of this will be in the forefront of my mind at all times.

From my persistent pursuit of budget expense reductions, reflected consistently in my performance as a Councillor since 2011, I have demonstrated my commitment to pursuing efficiency improvement and reducing costs, and ratepayers can expect me to continue down that path. Led by the CEO, the Executive Team, during its work in recommending cuts for the 2015-16 budget, has demonstrated the same commitment.

*Mr Correy was advised that a further question he had submitted would be Taken on Notice and would be provided with a written response.*

*The response is now provided below:*

#### Question

Has there been a variation to the tendered price to the lighting at Wonthella Oval and if so how much and what for?

#### Response by Director of Infrastructure Services

The Wonthella Oval Lighting Project is proceeding on program and well within the budget.

The total project budget is \$1.5 million. A breakdown of the project budget is as follows:

The City of Greater Geraldton	\$351,000
CLGF	\$229,000
Department of Sport and Recreation	\$590,000
Midwest Development Commission	\$230,000
AFL	\$100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>

The total project cost estimate is as follows:

Project Design Costs:	\$ 68,750.00
Western Power Costs:	\$110,115.27
Tender (Construction) Costs:	\$850,587.17
Additional works:	\$ 48,531.39
Project Management Costs:	\$ 18,431.82
<b>Total Forecast Project Cost</b>	<b>\$1,096,415.65 (Exc GST)</b>
<b>Remaining unallocated grant funds:</b>	<b>\$ 403,584.35 (Exc GST)</b>

The \$48,531.39 of additional works referred to above are made up of the following items:

Concrete and Fencing at New Transformer – Western Power Requirement.

Supply of Western Power Pad Locks – Western Power Requirement.

Installation of Zone Diagrams – Western Power requirement.

Concrete Path Upgrade - The original designed route of the conduit went through the actual sporting field playing surface. The designed route was realigned to reduce disturbance of the playing surface and placed under an existing slab path. This pathway is being replaced with concrete.

Supply and Install GPO's at each Tower - The intention under the grant is to improve the venue so it can be used for major sporting and social events. The conduit for the GPO's was incorporated into the Light Tower trenches. This will alleviate the need for generators and also provide power sources for stall holders/vendors when there are major events. If the GPO's were not installed at this time, re-trenching across the grounds would have been required.

Dugout Services - The existing team dugouts had no power and water services. As the intention under the grant is to utilise the venue for major sporting and social events it made both practical and financial sense to run both power and water to the dugouts while the trenches for the conduit between the towers was open. If these water and power services were not installed at this time, re-trenching across the grounds would have been required.

The additional works to date have either been associated with Western Power requirements or utilising lighting tower trenches to efficiently construct venue enhancements.

The City is now approaching the funding bodies to determine if the remaining unallocated grant funds (\$403,584.35) can be utilised on

additional associated improvements to the venue or if they need to be returned to the funding bodies.

The additional works being discussed with the funding bodies include:

- Upgrade of lighting in the existing car park.
- Resurfacing of bitumen in the existing car park
- Upgrades to the existing grandstand (access and inclusion improvements)
- Additional protection for the new lighting towers

**Sean Hickey – PO Box 2966, Geraldton WA 6530**

Question

Would Council outline the measures it considers necessary to bring this Point Moore precinct into a state of readiness for tourist development considering the significantly degraded state of a once pristine location.

In a response would you please refer to strategies that will:

- Satisfy the requirements of the State (The Department of Environmental Regulation) to do further testing for asbestos and other materials and ascertain their nature and source. Significant amounts of materials being visibly exposed for some hundreds of meters along dunes and shoreline at Greys Beach .
- be used to bring about a remediation of the area that has lost a lot of natural beach because of this use of these heavy building materials of concrete steel rock and similar - materials that have been shown to degenerate sandy beach shorelines.
- out line the estimates already modelled that give quantities and rates of sand required in 'sand nourishment , required to the north/west of the Greys seawall (revetment )

Response by Director of Infrastructure Services

The City is in engaging an environmental consultant to undertake a site investigation at Greys Beach as requested by DER. The site investigation will identify the presence and distribution of asbestos materials. This site investigation will inform the type and extent of any remediation required.

Under prevailing coastal conditions it is not anticipated that that any sand nourishment will be required. Sand is currently accreting in front of the structure.

Question

In light of The Worley Parsons, 2010 report/ risk assessment program of the Greys Beach to Sunset Beach and in consideration of the many current and similar Coastal analysis- Australian and world locations- will Council outline the points that were taken into account prior to deciding to build a seawall/revetment at Greys Beach inclusive of a consideration that there were four alternatives at least - do nothing, nourish about ??

/m3/yr., construct a sea wall and nourish similar amounts, remove road infrastructure and consider new unfolding information about climate change and recently completed research showing that the climatic period La Nina is associated with dramatic periods of increased surge and ocean storms.

#### Response by Director of Infrastructure Services

Three options were presented for coastal management at Greys Beach: Managed Retreat; Nourishment of 2000m<sup>3</sup>/yr and Construction of a buried seawall + nourishment of 2000m<sup>3</sup> year. The community's preference was for managed retreat through closure of the carpark and moving the road infrastructure. Nourishment operations have been undertaken previously but the protection offered has only been temporary. The City has partially implemented the managed retreat option through the closure of the car park. However, the City does not have the funds to realign the road and as an important coastal road to the community and tourists some protection measures were required. A partially exposed revetment was constructed to help prevent erosion of the dune front. The dune front has been rehabilitated with geotextile and planted with coastal vegetation to stabilise it and mitigate further erosion. In addition stormwater management works have been undertaken on the road to minimise surface water runoff from the road eroding the dune front.

#### Question

Further to Greys Beach, but also applicable to most of Geraldton's coast: What consideration was given to:

- Worley Parsons maps and estimates that show a significant amount of inundation occurring by 2030 and effecting the southern sector of the housing estate opposite Greys and stretching along other sections of Geraldton's coast.
- a final estimate- that by 2110 very significant inundation will likely have taken on a permanency along our coast.

#### Response by Director of Infrastructure Services

Coastal Erosion and Inundation is an issue impacting the majority of coastal communities not just in Western Australia, but globally. The WorleyParsons study and maps focussed on the risk of erosion of the coastline from physical processes and not inundation risk. However, the City is undertaking an coastal inundation study and CHRMAP - Coastal Hazard Risk Mapping and Adaptation Planning exercise for the coastal between Point Moore and Drummond Cove.

The coastal inundation study and CHRMAP exercise will inform the risks and identify mitigation options

**Warren Kalajzich – PO Box 1861, Geraldton WA 6530**

*Question to Council concerning the unused Railway Reserve running along the rear of the business's in Flores Road Webberton.*

I represent several land owners who back onto the railway reserve running parallel to Flores Road. We have been pursuing the Public Transport Dept. re selling land to adjoining owners to allow us to expand our business. The PTA have investigated the sale of the land in the reserve to adjoining owners and are taking steps to allow the sale.

We understand there are other issues which may bring some difficulties to the proposed sale of the land to existing businesses. Flores Road is and has been a vital cog in the Industrial area and council should support the move by the Public Transport Authority to sell the land to adjoining owners. Currently it is a fire and security hazard and the land serves absolutely no purpose as is. Heritage issues have been dealt with further along the reserve where it crosses Chapman Road in Bluff Point adjacent to the new subdivision.

Question

Does Council support the move by the PTA to sell the land in the Railway Reserve in the section between Place Road and Webberton Road to adjoining land owners or are you seeking an alternative use?

Response by Director of Development & Regulatory Services

The submitters comments are noted and in the draft Council October Agenda Forum there was a report addressing the former rail corridor from Bluff Point to Narngulu, the purpose of that item was to recommend to Council a position on the various sections of the former corridor. The report was withdrawn and will now be presented to the November 2015 round of Council forum's/ meetings. It is intended that the report will recommend a number of different outcomes on various sections of the corridor for consideration by Council and the comments raised are part of the background detail that will be provided.

**Mr Roy Purcher – 107 Glendinning Road, Tarcoola Beach, Geraldton**Question

What are the plans or action is the council going to take particularly with the land between Place Road and North West Highway.

Response by Director of Development & Regulatory Services

The future use of the former rail corridor between Bluff Point and Narngulu (including the section mentioned) is intended be the subject of a report to Council's November round of meetings. It is intended that the report will recommend a number of different outcomes on various sections of the corridor for consideration by Council and the comments raised will be part of the background detail that will be provided.

---

*Public question time concluded at 6.04pm*

## 6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

### Existing Approved Leave

Councillor	From	To (inclusive)
Nil.		

### COUNCIL DECISION

#### MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE

Cr S Keemink request leave of absence for the period 24 November 2015 to 05 December 2015 be approved.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**6:05:45 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

## 7 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS

Mayor Shane Van Styn Presented Cr Robert Hall with the WALGA Award for Long and Loyal Service award which was won recently by Robert Hall through nomination by the City of Greater Geraldton.

## 8 DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Cr Steve Douglas declared an impartiality interest in *Item IS108 Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project - Engineering Design Solution* as the item is one involving his employer, Mid West Development Commission, but in which he has no involvement.



**9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING – as circulated**

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 22 September 2015 and the Special Meeting of Council Held on 19 October 2015, as previously circulated, be adopted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE**

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 22 September 2015 and the Special Meeting of Council Held on 19 October 2015, as previously circulated, be adopted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**6:10:18 PM**

<b>Mayor Van Styn</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Douglas</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Bylund</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Ellis</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Keemink</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Hall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Critch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Graham</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Tanti</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Reymond</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Mcllwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>YES</b>

**10 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR***Events attended by the Mayor or his representative*

<b>DATE</b>	<b>FUNCTION</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIVE</b>
22 September 2015	Ordinary Meeting of Council	Mayor Ian Carpenter
23 September 2015	Interview – Radio Mama – Outcomes of Council Meeting	Mayor Ian Carpenter
23 September 2015	E Quotes Launch	Mayor Ian Carpenter
23 September 2015	Sydney Memorial Photo with Rotary Club	Mayor Ian Carpenter
23 September 2015	ABC Interview – Outcomes of Council Meeting	Mayor Ian Carpenter
24 September 2015	Midwest Development Commission Meeting – Moresby Range Regional Park	Mayor Ian Carpenter
25 September 2015	Police Remembrance Day Ceremony	Mayor Ian Carpenter
25 September 2015	Geraldton Sailors, Soldiers & Airmen's Trust – Annual Meeting	Mayor Ian Carpenter
26 September 2015	Legend of the Seas – Plaque Hand Over	Mayor Ian Carpenter
29 September 2015	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Ian Carpenter
29 September 2015	Regular Catch Up – CEO & Mayor	Mayor Ian Carpenter
29 September 2015	ABC Interview – City Seeking Mandarin Speaking Volunteers	Mayor Ian Carpenter
29 September 2015	ABC Bunbury – Radio Interview – Container Restaurants	Mayor Ian Carpenter
29 September 2015	Visit to Arcadia Waters Retirement Village – footpath discussions	Mayor Ian Carpenter
30 September 2015	Meeting with Ron Shepherd - Abrolhos Islands Emergency Management	Mayor Ian Carpenter
30 September 2015	GWN Interview – Festivals on the Foreshore	Mayor Ian Carpenter
1 October 2015	Photo Opportunity – Geraldton Visitors Centre Award	Mayor Ian Carpenter
1 October 2015	RCDP Meeting – Growth Plan	Mayor Ian Carpenter
2 October 2015	Official Festival Launch and Moulin Rouge Masquerade party	Mayor Ian Carpenter
2 October 2015	Spirit FM Interview -	Mayor Ian Carpenter
2 October 2015	Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Working Group	Mayor Ian Carpenter
4 October 2015	Festivals on the Foreshore – Parade	Mayor Ian Carpenter
5 October 2015	ABC Interview -	Mayor Ian Carpenter
5 October 2015	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Ian Carpenter
5 October 2015	Regular Catch Up – CEO & Mayor	Mayor Ian Carpenter
5 October 2015	70 <sup>TH</sup> Anniversary of the Independence of the Republic of Indonesia	Mayor Ian Carpenter
6 October 2015	Concept Forum – October 2015	Mayor Ian Carpenter
6 October 2015	Geraldton Audit Committee Meeting	Mayor Ian Carpenter
8 October 2015	Meeting with the Mayor of City of Bunbury	Mayor Ian Carpenter
9 October 2015	Hope Community Farm Visit	Mayor Ian Carpenter
9 October 2015	Individual Citizenship Ceremony	Mayor Ian Carpenter
9 October 2015	Photo Opportunity – Bridge Over Southern Transport Corridor	Mayor Ian Carpenter
12 October 2015	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Ian Carpenter
15 October 2015	Green Army Volunteer Thank you Celebration	Mayor Ian Carpenter
16 October 2015	Launch – Clubs Pack	Mayor Ian Carpenter

17 October 2015	Local Government Elections 2015	Mayor Ian Carpenter
19 October 2015	Special Meeting of Council – Swearing in of New Mayor & Councillors	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 October 2015	Breast Cancer Morning tea	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 October 2015	GWN Interview - Greenough River Contamination	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 October 2015	Agenda Forum	Mayor Shane Van Styn
24 October 2015	Jet Pack Adventures Have a go	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 October 2015	Meet Minister for Agriculture and Food; Fisheries: Hon Ken Baston MLC	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 October 2015	Wonthella Skate Park Opening with Hon Mia Davies	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 October 2015	Meet Minister for Transport: Hon Dean Nalder MLA	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 October 2015	Meet Minister for Education; Aboriginal Affairs; Electoral Affairs: Hon Peter Collier	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 October 2015	Community Reception with State Cabinet Ministers	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Breakfast with Premier Colin Barnett and Ministers	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Presentation to Regional Cabinet	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Lunch with Regional Cabinet	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Cheque Presentation by Hon John Day to CGG: Lotterywest grant application towards performing arts over 2015/2016	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Meeting with Minister for Housing - Hon Colin Holt MLC	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Meet Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Tourism- Hon Dr Kim D Hames	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Hon Tony Simpson, Minister for Local Government; Community Services; Senior - Tour of QEII Centre.	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Meet Minister for Regional Development; Lands; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development - Hon. Terry Redman MLA	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 October 2015	Meet with Minister for Local Government; Community Services; Seniors: Hon. A. J. Simpson MLA	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 October 2015	Minister Holt - Tour of Mullewa Public Housing	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 October 2015	Lunch with Senator Wang	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 October 2015	Photo Session - Official Photos of Councillors and Mayor	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 October 2015	Ordinary Meeting of Council	Mayor Shane Van Styn

## 11 REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

IS107	CHARGING OF GREEN WASTE FOR COMMERCIAL OPERATORS - MERU
-------	---

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-60949</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Wong, Manager Waste &amp; Energy Services</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>6 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>WM/3/0001</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>No</b>

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report seeks Council's consideration and endorsement to implement a fee structure for the charging of commercial quantities of green waste, an area where a gap exists within the current pricing mechanism.

### EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ADOPT the rates for charging commercial operators on clean, uncontaminated green waste; and
2. REVIEW the charge rate prior to adopting the 2016/17 financial year's Budget.

### PROPONENT:

The proponent is The City of Greater Geraldton.

### BACKGROUND:

Council at its Special Meeting on 2 July 2015 resolved as follows:

*That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 6.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:*

#### C. 2015-16 FEES AND CHARGES

15. ADOPT the 2015 / 2016 Schedule of Fees and Charges whereby.

General waste		
Minimum Charge – under 300kg	\$25	per entry
300kg - 500kg (including bulk bins)	\$46	per entry
Above 500kg (all other vehicles)	\$80	per tonne

At the time, a commercial rate for the disposal of clean green waste had not been determined.

Council considered the issue of free tipping at its meeting on 22 September, 2015 and resolved as follows:

*Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:*

1. *ENDORSE one (1) week of free tipping for City of Greater Geraldton residents on all domestic waste in trailers; utilities and light trucks to 3 tonne every 6 months of the calendar year;*
2. *ENDORSE two (2) additional weekends during each 6 month period of the calendar year for the free tipping of clean domestic green waste alone for residential clients;*
3. *ADOPT the Pensioner Bulk Bin Program;*
4. *REVIEW the Charging of Domestic Trailers, and the Pensioner Bulk Refuse Bin collection program prior to adopting the 2016/17 financial year's Budget;*
5. *APPLY previously endorsed fees and charges for 2015/16 financial year;*
6. *WAIVE the landfill fees for eligible Not-For-Profit organisations on General Waste, Builders Waste and Green Waste throughout the year; and*
7. *REVIEW in six months and provide a report to Council.*

It has been identified that there is a gap within the endorsed 2015/16 Schedule of Fees and Charges for the charging of commercial quantities of green waste. There is a fee schedule (i.e. \$80 per tonne) that exists for green waste that was unsuitable for processing to be recycled as mulch, (this was because this material was landfilled instead of being processed in preparation for sale).

In light of the existing rates for General Waste, it was determined that the figures shown in the table below are justifiable. It is varied sufficiently from the General Waste charge to encourage source separation, and yet priced correctly to cover the processing costs. These prices shown include GST.

<b>Commercial Green waste (Clean, uncontaminated Green waste)</b>	
Minimum Charge - Under 300kg	\$5 Flat fee per entry
300kg - 500kg	\$20 Flat fee per entry
Above 500kg	\$40 per tonne

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

There is the potential for the City of Greater Geraldton to produce clean, good quality mulch product that is saleable to both residential and commercial client.

### **Social:**

This proposal ensures that City residents and commercial clients are differentiated and not disadvantaged by the service level changes.

### **Environmental:**

Clean green waste has the potential to be processed into mulch which will align with the City's Environmental Strategy of implementing green practices.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

Fees and Charges were addressed at the Special Meeting of Council on 2 July 2015, as well as the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 22 September, 2015.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

In the past months, Councillors and the Community have been enquiring about charges for commercial clients.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

One of the objectives of the State Waste Strategy developed pursuant to the *Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2007* was to use existing economic instruments to assist the financial viability of actions that divert waste from landfill and recover it as a resource.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

Implementing a charge to commercial clients for green waste will provide some equality between domestic and commercial clients. Notably, these differential fees cater for clients ranging from the small business owners, right through to substantial, multi-national industries as they will all contribute to the cost of turning a waste material into a valued product.

Seeing that this was a new item to be charged, figures on the revenue in the Meru Waste Disposal Facility (MWDF) are unobtainable.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.8	Continuously improving business and governance frameworks to support a growing community.

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

The MWDF functions as a Regional Facility. Implementing a user pay system may have impacts on both the City and neighbouring Shires as well as regional businesses.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

Implementing a commercial green waste charge may cause some disagreements with local, small to medium businesses owners within the community. There is a potential for those businesses to challenge the new pay system under the precedents that the fees are too high.

However, this tiered fee structure is designed to alleviate that risk; whereby the smaller businesses can enter the facility on the lower rate and the medium and large enterprises are charged accordingly.

A financial risk exists in the form of contract variations from the landfill contractor. The landfill contractor may approach the City for additional resources to cope with the work scope's change.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

After investigating a few options, one of the likely alternatives would be to introduce a flat fee for all commercial clients. However, without the differential pricing, there is a likelihood that small to medium business will be financially strained.

Alternatives notwithstanding, the Executive Recommendation is still deemed the preferred option.

***The Mayor declared a short break at 6.14pm to enable staff to correct a technical problem.***

***The Meeting resumed at 6.17pm***

*Cr G Bylund moved the following alternative motion.*

### **COUNCIL DECISION**

#### **MOVED CR BYLUND, SECONDED CR REYMOND**

**That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:**

1. **DEFER** the introduction of the proposed new domestic and commercial waste collection fees, for both green waste and general waste, as endorsed by the previous Council at the meeting of 22 September 2015 until the finalisation of the mid-year budget review; and
2. **REVIEW** all new domestic and commercial waste collection fees, for both green waste and general waste be subjected to a full review by Council during the mid-year budget review, prior to being introduced.

#### **CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY 14/0**

**6:26:32 PM**

<b>Mayor Van Styn</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Douglas</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Bylund</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Ellis</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Keemink</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Hall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Critch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Graham</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Tanti</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Reymond</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. McIlwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>

<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>YES</b>

**REASON FOR VARIATION TO THE EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**  
That Council defer the introduction of the proposed new domestic and commercial waste fees and conduct a full review by Council during the mid-year budget review, prior to being introduced.



IS108	BERESFORD FORESHORE COASTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT - ENGINEERING DESIGN SOLUTION
-------	--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-62571</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Dufour, Coastal Infrastructure Planning Officer</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>14 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>PM/4/0003</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes x4 (x1 Confidential)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This report seeks Council endorsement of the detailed construction design for prevention, mitigation and remediation of erosion on the Beresford Foreshore the Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ACKNOWLEDGE the process undertaken under the auspices of the multi-agency Working Group established by the Minister for Transport, supported by a Technical Working Group, to oversee development of concept and detailed engineering designs associated with solutions to erosion of the Beresford Foreshore resulting from State-developed Port and Marina structures;
2. ENDORSE the detailed construction design adopted by the Working Group for the preferred solution for prevention, mitigation and remediation of erosion on the Beresford Foreshore;
3. NOTE that the detailed construction design has been prepared to implement the preferred concept design formally adopted by Council in June 2012, with the detailed construction design informed by subsequent wave, current and sediment studies, and optimised to deliver the most practicable outcomes;
4. NOTE that the detailed construction design to prevent, mitigate and remediate erosion of the Beresford Foreshore is a combination of coastal management options appropriate for this section of coastline:
  - a. Groynes modification;
  - b. Offshore breakwater modification;
  - c. Capital sand nourishment;
  - d. Ongoing sand bypassing through the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Program;
5. ENDORSE the Concept Landscaping Design that was prepared for the Ministerial Working Party for the purposes of preparing preliminary estimates of costs of remediation of Beresford Foreshore areas damaged by erosion, including replacement or

- rehabilitation of pathways, landscaping and amenities, for the purposes of advice to Government on overall costs of the project;
6. NOTE that Mid West Ports Authority , MWDC and the City have committed funds in their budgets towards this project;
  7. NOTE that the Department of Transport, which has to date been unable to seek funding commitments from the State for its portion of responsibility for meeting costs of erosion prevention and remediation, pending completion of the detailed construction design and cost estimates for the erosion solution, and preparation of adequately robust estimates (P90) for the foreshore remediation works including replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to date, is now positioned to make submissions to State Government for associated funding;
  8. NOTE that foreshore works associated with replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to date have potential to be staged, have only been planned at concept level, and that opportunity for Community and Stakeholder Consultation and staging will be provided during future detail design processes;
  9. NOTE that the detailed construction design and cost estimates for the erosion solution, and the preliminary estimates (P90) for the foreshore remediation works including replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to date, will form the basis for submissions to the State Government by the Department of Transport, supported as necessary by Midwest Ports Authority and MWDC, for funding to deliver the project;
  10. NOTE that the State may elect to stage funding for project delivery over more than one financial year;
  11. REAFFIRM the commitment of Council to confining the use of City funds (\$1.8M) for the Beresford Foreshore Project to rehabilitation or replacement of community amenities; and
  12. ENDORSE
    - a. Informing the community regarding the specifics of the detailed engineering solution; and
    - b. Consulting the community regarding the concept landscaping (amenity) design.

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City, Department of Transport (DoT) and Mid West Ports Authority (MWPA), assisted with funding contributions by the Mid West Development Commission (MWDC); have collaborated over the past seven years on development of a coastal protection strategy for the foreshore areas north of the Geraldton Port and Marina structures.

A full briefing on background to the Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project, undertaken since 2008, is provided as an attachment to this report.

Pivotal stages of this work have been publicly reported, and key documents are available as follows:

- **WorleyParsons – Coastal Processes Study 2010 - via the EPA website**  
<http://www.epa.wa.gov.au/EIA/referralofProp-schemes/Lists/Proposal/Attachments/146/A472606%20Coastal%20Vulnerability%20and%20Risk%20Assessment%20Program.pdf>
  
- **Cardno – Beresford Concept Options - via the CGG website**  
[http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council-Meetings/73/ATT-CI016---REPORT---Beresford-Foreshore-Coastal-Protection-Project---FINAL-REPORT---OPERATIONAL\\_Part1.pdf](http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council-Meetings/73/ATT-CI016---REPORT---Beresford-Foreshore-Coastal-Protection-Project---FINAL-REPORT---OPERATIONAL_Part1.pdf)  
[http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council-Meetings/73/ATT-CI016---REPORT---Beresford-Foreshore-Coastal-Protection-Project---FINAL-REPORT---OPERATIONAL\\_Part2.pdf](http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Documents/Council-Meetings/73/ATT-CI016---REPORT---Beresford-Foreshore-Coastal-Protection-Project---FINAL-REPORT---OPERATIONAL_Part2.pdf)

At its ordinary meeting of 26 June 2012, Council formally adopted a preferred concept design for erosion protection, mitigation and remediation, as follows:

*That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) RESOLVES to:*

1. *ADOPT the Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project Report prepared by Cardno (March 2012) as the preferred concept for the development of the Beresford Foreshore;*
2. *SEEK additional funding for the implementation of the project from the State and Federal Governments and government agencies as appropriate;*
3. *FORWARD the report to the Minister for Transport, as the responsible Minister for the Geraldton Port Authority and Department of Transport, and seek commitment for the preferred concept and for both authorities to provide initial funding for the detailed design and a commitment to the implementation of the project in recognition of their impact on the northern beaches coastal foreshore; and*
4. *PROCEED to detailed design and documentation for the entire project in accordance with the preferred concept plan subject to availability of funding.*

A copy of the preferred concept design solution, adopted by Council, is attached to this report.

The State Minister for Transport subsequently established a Ministerial Working Group with high-level representation from DoT, MWPA, MWDC and the City, supported by a Senior Project Technical Group, as outlined in the attached briefing note. The Working Group first met in early 2013.

---

Subsequently, reporting through the Senior Project Technical Group, specialist consultants undertook additional studies of wave, current and sediment movements along the foreshore, using best available technologies, to inform the engineering design process for the preferred solution. Of their nature, these studies took time to compile sufficient data to establish confidence in understanding of the coastal processes in action along the foreshore areas north of the Marina. Throughout the process, the consultants reported progress via the project Technical Group.

### **Foreshore Erosion Prevention/Mitigation**

From those studies, engineering designs were developed for delivery of the adopted concept design. Additional studies were commissioned during the process as required, to enable optimisation of the design to deliver the most effective result.

A copy of the engineering design, for the erosion protection, mitigation and remediation works, endorsed by the Ministerial Working Group, is attached to this report.

Councillors will note the difference between the adopted concept design, and the engineering construction design, of the groyne immediately north of the marina. That change was informed by focused studies of water and sediment movements not previously undertaken in the Cardno study, and is a change at design detail level, still conforming with the adopted concept design.

The engineering design for the erosion prevention/mitigation solution includes three revetments sited further north along the foreshore. Their construction will also require earthworks to remediate and stabilise areas damaged to date by erosion, and that will give rise to subsequent repair or replacement of damaged paths, landscaping and amenities.

A key issue emerging from community and stakeholder consultation and Council discussions in 2012 was ensuring that, in relation to the proposed revetments along the foreshore, the engineering design would deliver them out of sight from Chapman Road. Representation on the Ministerial Working Group by the Mayor and the City CEO has ensured that the adopted engineering design meets those City requirements.

DoT raised in the Ministerial Working Group the question of staging of the project. In relation to the Erosion prevention/mitigation solution, and the associated earthworks for remediation/stabilisation of the adjacent landforms along the foreshore, while staging of some of the northern revetments may be possible, to do so would add considerable costs. These works require heavy machinery, and staging would add significant additional mobilisation and demobilisation costs to the project. Staging may also result in further erosion damage to sections of the foreshore. City officers understand that representatives from MWPA, MWDC and the City on the Ministerial Working Group did not support staged construction.

The Ministerial Working Group considered the potential for the proposed erosion prevention/mitigation solution to also solve the problem of sand bypass, in the context of current requirements for replenishment of sand being lost from the northern beaches. The studies indicate that replenishment of sand being lost from the northern beaches will be an ongoing requirement. The expectation of the City is that the costs for sand replenishment will continue to be met by the Port Authority.

### **Remediation, Stabilisation and Replacement of Damaged Paths, Landscaping, Amenities**

For the purposes of establishing cost estimates for the overall project (ie for construction of the erosion prevention/mitigation solution, plus works for remediation and stabilisation of erosion-damaged foreshore, and replacement of damaged paths, landscaping and amenities), a concept design was prepared and has been adopted by the Ministerial Working Group, enabling provision of advice to DoT and to the Government on likely overall funding requirements for the full project. While only designed at concept level, sufficient detail has been included of indicative paths, landscaping and amenities for the land areas in question, to enable compilation of cost estimates, to 90% confidence level.

A copy of the concept design for paths, landscaping and amenities is attached to this report and generally conforms to the original foreshore concept plan adopted by Council, adjusted to reflect the landform shapes resulting from the adopted erosion prevention/mitigation solution.

Note that the actual location of replacement paths, landscaping and amenities and the nature of amenities (to be funded by the City) will be determined at later design stage, hence there will be opportunity for community and stakeholder consultation before construction designs are completed.

Opportunity also exists for staging of pathways, landscaping and amenities. Note however, that landscaping and planting elements necessary to stabilise earthworks undertaken to remediate areas adjacent to the new revetments need to be included as part of those works. Hence staging will be limited to pathways and community amenities. The extent to which staging is feasible will be examined when detailed design work is undertaken, noting again the opportunities for community and stakeholder consultation in that process.

In relation to erosion of the coastal areas north of the Marina, resulting from State construction of the Port and Marina structures, City expectation since 2012 has been that the State Government (via DoT and/or MWPA) should fund:

- costs of construction of a foreshore erosion prevention/mitigation solution; plus
- costs of remediation and stabilisation of foreshore land and replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities, lost or damaged by the erosion to date; plus
- costs of ongoing sand replenishment necessary for northern beaches.

Council has consistently held the view that City funds for this project will be confined to amenities. Council has already committed funds for those purposes, for this project. This report does not seek Council commitment to any additional City funds or resources.

Endorsement of the engineering design solution for erosion prevention and mitigation, and the concept plan for pathways, landscaping and amenities, as adopted by the Ministerial Working Group, will signify:

- City acknowledgement that the adopted designs conform with the overall concept plan for Beresford Foreshore formally adopted by Council in June 2012;
- Council support for submissions to the State Government by Department of Transport – supported as necessary by MWPA and MWDC – for funding to enable the project to proceed.

This report notes that the Mid West Leaders Forum recently identified solving the Beresford Foreshore erosion problem amongst its top five priorities – which were:

1. Oakajee to Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor / Bypass Project
2. Expansion of Geraldton Health Campus & Precinct Accommodation Facilities
3. 330 kV powerline extension to Geraldton
4. Beresford Foreshore Erosion
5. Geraldton Airport runway extension

Accordingly, briefing notes for both the Beresford and Airport projects were provided to MWDC, identified as priority projects for consideration by the Government. The briefing note on Beresford was based on the designs adopted by the Ministerial Working Group, and the associated cost estimates. These will be discussed when State Cabinet visits Geraldton during October.

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

The detailed construction design will mitigate the risks of damage to or loss of about \$55M worth of State and City infrastructure assets, from Beresford Foreshore erosion resulting from construction by the State of the Geraldton Port and Marina structures. The detailed construction design for erosion prevention and mitigation will cost about \$15M to implement, expected to be funded by the State.

### **Social:**

The detailed construction design ensures the preservation of recreational public open space and shared pathway connecting the CBD (Central Business District) and the northern suburbs. The landscaping concept design aims to enhance the amenity and recreational values of the foreshore areas for the community.

---

**Environmental:**

The detailed construction design follows recommendations made through the Coastal Processes Study and develops the concept design produced for this project. The detailed construction design has been reviewed by the EPA (Environmental Protection Authority) and their position is unchanged from the formal assessment undertaken on the concept design.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

Within the project area the Geraldton Stock Fence (Bicentennial Heritage Trail) and the site of the Chapman Smelting Works (Municipal Inventory Item 067) are located. Both sites are located outside the construction areas and will not be impacted by the project.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

The detailed construction design is based on a decision by Council on 26 June 2012 to endorse the concept design and proceed with detailed design for the project.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

Councillor, and Community and Stakeholder consultation was undertaken during the Coastal Processes Study and the Concept Design on the available coastal management options and the progression of a design solution. Councillors were updated on the detailed construction design after the completion of the design and validation process. Further public consultation will occur after Council's decision on this report.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

The project is consistent with State Coastal Planning Policy 2.6 which advocates protection where there is a need to preserve the foreshore reserve, public access and public safety, property and infrastructure that is not expendable.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

The City has allocated \$1.8M towards the implementation of the project. The City has received funding through Royalties for Regions (\$4.325M) and the Mid West Investment Fund (\$1M). The Mid West Port Authority has committed \$4M towards the implementation of the project. The Department of Transport will be making submission to State Government, seeking additional funds towards implementation of the adopted design.

The breakdown of the concept amenity enhancement (landscaping design) is as follows:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>\$</u>
• Recreational Pathways	1,000,319.00
• Carpark	209,250.00
• Hard Landscaping & Structures	1,101,236.00
• Soft Landscaping	1,107,177.00
• Associated Works & Contingency	<u>2,121,937.00</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,539,919.00</b>

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Environment	A sustainable built form and natural environment
Strategy 2.1.5	Preserving and managing the coastal environment in three distinct types based on high, moderate and low degrees of human interaction.
Strategy 2.3.2	Delivering projects utilising best practice to ensure timely, cost effective and quality outcomes.
Title: Social	A strong healthy community which is equitable, connected and cohesive
Strategy 3.1.2	Encouraging informal recreation through well planned and developed public open spaces, cycle/walk paths and green streetscapes

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

The project aligns with the objectives of the Mid West investment Plan 2011-2021.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

The detailed construction design will mitigate the risk to \$55M worth of infrastructure assets when compared to a 'do nothing' approach. Optimisation testing to determine the optimum length for the groyne and offshore breakwater coastal protection structures has been undertaken. Modelled data establishing the dimensions and orientation of the coastal protection structures has been validated through the acquisition of additional real-time data, supplementing information from previous studies.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

Through the engagement of coastal engineering consultants the following options were considered and not progressed for Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project:

- Do-Nothing/Managed Retreat. Net Present Value analysis indicated that \$55M worth of infrastructure assets would be at risk.
- Dune Management. Dune management is successful where there is a wide foreshore reserve. The Beresford Foreshore is a heavily modified and narrow section of foreshore with little primary dune.
- Artificial Reefs. There have been both successes and failures in the use of artificial reefs. Typically require ongoing sand nourishment and it has been documented in referenced studies that, contrary to expectations, the majority of submerged structures constructed to date have resulted in shoreline erosion in their lee.
- Beach Drainage. The greatest benefit is restricted to the beach environment and this management option is not effective in preventing damage to backshore infrastructure during storms. Ongoing maintenance and management commitments are high.

Identification and evaluation of design options was undertaken by Cardno consultants, subsequent to the Worley Parson study of Coastal Processes reported in 2010. In late 2011 information on the design options for a solution



to the erosion problem, and a preferred solution design, were publicly exhibited and public consultation sessions were undertaken. As noted in this report, from the Cardno study of solution design options, following community and stakeholder consultation, Council formally adopted a preferred solution concept design, in June 2012. Subsequent studies (wave, currents, sediment) informed the design development to deliver the detailed engineering design

*Cr Steve Douglas declared an impartiality interest in Item IS108 Beresford Foreshore Coastal Protection and Enhancement Project - Engineering Design Solution as the item is one involving his employer, Mid West Development Commission, but in which he has no involvement, therefore did not leave Chambers.*

*Cr S Douglas moved the Executive Recommendation but proposed the following amendment – to follow on from Point 3*

Note that the detailed construction design differs from the preferred concept design adopted by Council in June 2012. It includes extensions to the two breakwaters encircling Marina Beach and three revetments running parallel to Chapman Road, rather than two headlands and two groynes running parallel to Chapman Road as previously proposed. The optimised design has been informed by additional wave, current and sediment studies conducted since concept design approval by Council in 2012.

*The seconder agreed to the amendment.*

*Cr M Reymond foreshadowed an alternative motion should the amended motion be lost, to DEFER this matter to a later date.*

## **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **MOVED CR DOUGLAS, SECONDED CR BYLUND**

**That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:**

- 1. ACKNOWLEDGE the process undertaken under the auspices of the multi-agency Working Group established by the Minister for Transport, supported by a Technical Working Group, to oversee development of concept and detailed engineering designs associated with solutions to erosion of the Beresford Foreshore resulting from State-developed Port and Marina structures;**
- 2. ENDORSE the detailed construction design adopted by the Working Group for the preferred solution for prevention, mitigation and remediation of erosion on the Beresford Foreshore;**
- 3. NOTE that the detailed construction design has been prepared to implement the preferred concept design formally adopted by Council in June 2012, with the detailed construction design**

- informed by subsequent wave, current and sediment studies, and optimised to deliver the most practicable outcomes;
4. **NOTE** that the detailed construction design differs from the preferred concept design adopted by Council in June 2012. It includes extensions to the two breakwaters encircling Marina Beach and three revetments running parallel to Chapman Road, rather than two headlands and two groynes running parallel to Chapman Road as previously proposed. The optimised design has been informed by additional wave, current and sediment studies conducted since concept design approval by Council in 2012.
  5. **NOTE** that the detailed construction design to prevent, mitigate and remediate erosion of the Beresford Foreshore is a combination of coastal management options appropriate for this section of coastline:
    - a. Groynes modification;
    - b. Offshore breakwater modification;
    - c. Capital sand nourishment;
    - d. Ongoing sand bypassing through the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Program;
  6. **ENDORSE** the Concept Landscaping Design that was prepared for the Ministerial Working Party for the purposes of preparing preliminary estimates of costs of remediation of Beresford Foreshore areas damaged by erosion, including replacement or rehabilitation of pathways, landscaping and amenities, for the purposes of advice to Government on overall costs of the project;
  7. **NOTE** that Mid West Ports Authority , MWDC and the City have committed funds in their budgets towards this project;
  8. **NOTE** that the Department of Transport, which has to date been unable to seek funding commitments from the State for its portion of responsibility for meeting costs of erosion prevention and remediation, pending completion of the detailed construction design and cost estimates for the erosion solution, and preparation of adequately robust estimates (P90) for the foreshore remediation works including replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to date, is now positioned to make submissions to State Government for associated funding;
  9. **NOTE** that foreshore works associated with replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to date have potential to be staged, have only been planned at concept level, and that opportunity for Community and Stakeholder Consultation and staging will be provided during future detail design processes;
  10. **NOTE** that the detailed construction design and cost estimates for the erosion solution, and the preliminary estimates (P90) for the foreshore remediation works including replacement of pathways, landscaping and amenities damaged by erosion to
-

date, will form the basis for submissions to the State Government by the Department of Transport, supported as necessary by Midwest Ports Authority and MWDC, for funding to deliver the project;

11. NOTE that the State may elect to stage funding for project delivery over more than one financial year;
12. REAFFIRM the commitment of Council to confining the use of City funds (\$1.8M) for the Beresford Foreshore Project to rehabilitation or replacement of community amenities; and
13. ENDORSE
  - a. Informing the community regarding the specifics of the detailed engineering solution; and
  - b. Consulting the community regarding the concept landscaping (amenity) design.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**6:48:38 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Mcllwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

**REASON FOR VARIATION THE EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:** That Council note the changes from the preferred concept design adopted by Council in June 2012.

**12 REPORTS OF CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES****CCS136 MEETING SCHEDULE – JANUARY 2016 - DECEMBER 2016**

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-60774</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Adam, Executive Assistant</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>B Davis, Director Corporate &amp; Commercial Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>3 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/6/0012</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>No</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this report is to adopt the Council meeting schedule for the period January 2016 to December 2016.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. ADOPT The schedule of ordinary meetings for 2016 as follows;

	<b>Concept Forum 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday</b>	<b>Agenda Forum 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday</b>	<b>Ordinary Meeting 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday</b>
<b>January 2016</b>	No Meeting	19 January 2016	25 January 2016 *Monday*
<b>February 2016</b>	2 February 2016	16 February 2016	23 February 2016
<b>March 2016</b>	1 March 2016	15 March 2016	22 March 2016 **MULLEWA**
<b>April 2016</b>	5 April 2016	19 April 2016	26 April 2016
<b>May 2016</b>	3 May 2016	17 May 2016	24 May 2016
<b>June 2016</b>	7 June 2016	21 June 2016	28 June 2016
<b>July 2016</b>	5 July 2016	19 July 2016	26 July 2016
<b>August 2016</b>	2 August 2016	16 August 2016	23 August 2016
<b>September 2016</b>	6 September 2016	20 September 2016	27 September 2016 **MULLEWA**
<b>October 2016</b>	4 October 2016	18 October 2016	25 October 2016
<b>November 2016</b>	2 November 2016 *Wednesday*	15 November 2016	22 November 2016
<b>December 2016</b>	6 December 2016	13 December 2016	20 December 2016

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

**BACKGROUND:**

Section 5.3 of the Local Government Act 1995 allows Council to hold ordinary and special meetings. It further requires ordinary meetings to be held not more than 3 months apart. Section 12 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 requires Council to give public notice of the dates, times and location of its ordinary and committee meetings to be held in

the next 12 months. Public notice is also required for any changes to these elements.

It is proposed that the following ordinary meetings be held over the next 12 months.

- Concept Forum (Closed to Public) to be held on the first Tuesday of the month commencing at 5.30pm in the Council Chambers at Cathedral Avenue.
- Agenda Forum to be held on the third Tuesday of the month commencing at 5.30pm in the Council Chambers at Cathedral Avenue.
- Ordinary Meeting to be held on the fourth Tuesday of the month commencing at 5.30pm in the Council Chambers at Cathedral Avenue.
- March and September Ordinary Meetings to be held in Mullewa.
- The date for the January Ordinary meeting is to be brought forward to Monday 25 January 2016 as Tuesday 26 January 2016 is Australia Day and a Public Holiday.
- The date of the November Concept Forum will be changed to Wednesday 2 November as Tuesday 1 November 2016 is Melbourne Cup day.
- The dates of the December meetings are to be brought forward as follows: Agenda Forum to be held on the second Tuesday of the month and Ordinary meeting on the third Tuesday of the month due to the Christmas holiday period.

	<b>Concept Forum 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday</b>	<b>Agenda Forum 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday</b>	<b>Ordinary Meeting 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday</b>
<b>January 2016</b>	No Meeting	19 January 2016	25 January 2016 *Monday*
<b>February 2016</b>	2 February 2016	16 February 2016	23 February 2016
<b>March 2016</b>	1 March 2016	15 March 2016	22 March 2016 **MULLEWA**
<b>April 2016</b>	5 April 2016	19 April 2016	26 April 2016
<b>May 2016</b>	3 May 2016	17 May 2016	24 May 2016
<b>June 2016</b>	7 June 2016	21 June 2016	28 June 2016
<b>July 2016</b>	5 July 2016	19 July 2016	26 July 2016
<b>August 2016</b>	2 August 2016	16 August 2016	23 August 2016
<b>September 2016</b>	6 September 2016	20 September 2016	27 September 2016 **MULLEWA**
<b>October 2016</b>	4 October 2016	18 October 2016	25 October 2016
<b>November 2016</b>	2 November 2016 *Wednesday*	15 November 2016	22 November 2016
<b>December 2016</b>	6 December 2016	13 December 2016	20 December 2016

**ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:****Economic:**

There are no economic impacts.

**Social:**

There are no social impacts.

**Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

This has been determined as an annual requirement by Council, under the Local Government Act 1995.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Section 12 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 requires Council to advertise its ordinary and committee meeting schedule for the ensuing 12 months.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

The cost of advertising the schedule of meetings is contained within the 2015/16 budget.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Community Engagement
Strategy: 5.1.2	Promoting community involvement in decision making so it is collaborative and transparent.

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

Council is required under Section 12 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 to give public notice of its schedule of ordinary meetings for the next 12 months.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

No alternative options have been considered.

*Cr T Thomas has proposed an amendment to the Motion.*

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR CRITCH**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **ADOPT** The schedule of ordinary meetings for 2016 as follows;

	Concept Forum 1 <sup>st</sup> Tuesday	Agenda Forum 3 <sup>rd</sup> Tuesday	Ordinary Meeting 4 <sup>th</sup> Tuesday
January 2016	No Meeting	19 January 2016	25 January 2016 *Monday*
February 2016	2 February 2016	16 February 2016	23 February 2016
March 2016	1 March 2016	15 March 2016	22 March 2016 **MULLEWA**
April 2016	5 April 2016	19 April 2016	26 April 2016
May 2016	3 May 2016	17 May 2016	24 May 2016
June 2016	7 June 2016	21 June 2016	28 June 2016
July 2016	5 July 2016	19 July 2016	26 July 2016
August 2016	2 August 2016	16 August 2016	23 August 2016
September 2016	6 September 2016	20 September 2016	27 September 2016 **MULLEWA**
October 2016	4 October 2016	18 October 2016	25 October 2016
November 2016	2 November 2016 *Wednesday*	15 November 2016	22 November 2016
December 2016	6 December 2016	13 December 2016	20 December 2016

2. **NOTE** that Council proposes to review the commencement times of Forums and Meetings with the view to optimising opportunity for community members to attend, while accommodating the needs of Councillors who have to travel to attend meetings; and
3. **COMMENCE** Concept Forums in 2016 at 5pm in the Function Room, Civic Centre.

**CARRIED 14/0**

6:53:04 PM

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

**REASON FOR VARIATION TO EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION: That Council review the commencement times of Forums and meetings at their November Concept Forum and commence the Concept Forums at 5pm in 2016.**



---

CCS137 2014/2015 ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON
--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-60784</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>P Radalj, Manager of Treasury &amp; Finance</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>B Davis, Director of Corporate &amp; Commercial Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>7 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/3/0002</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (x2)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's adoption of the 2014/2015 Annual Report for the City of Greater Geraldton.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;**

That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 5.54 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. ADOPT the City of Greater Geraldton Annual Report (including Audited Annual Financial Report and Auditors Report) for the financial year ending 30 June 2015; and
2. REQUIRE the CEO to make the Annual Report publicly available and to give public notice of an Annual Electors Meeting to be held on 1 December 2015 pursuant to section 5.27(2) of the Act.

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

**BACKGROUND:**

The 2014/2015 Annual Report (attached) has been prepared in accordance with Section 5.53 of the Local Government Act and includes the Audited Annual Financial Report.

The Annual Report highlights the City of Greater Geraldton's achievements in 2014/2015 under each of the five key goal areas contained within the City's Strategic Community Plan.

**ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:****Economic:**

There are no economic impacts.

**Social:**

There are no social impacts.

**Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

The acceptance of the Annual Report is a standard statutory requirement.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

Audit Committee has reviewed and recommended the adoption of the Annual Financial Report at its meeting held on 6 October 2015. Once the Annual Report has been adopted by Council, the CEO will give local public notice of its availability to the public and will call an annual electors meeting to be held on 1 December 2015.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Section 5.53 of the Local Government requires the preparation of an Annual Report and details what has to be contained within.

Section 5.54 requires that the Annual Report for a financial year be accepted no later than 31 December after that financial year or within 2 months of receiving the auditor's report. Council is required to hold an Annual Electors Meeting within 56 days of acceptance of the Annual Report. Pending adoption of the Annual Report, the Annual Electors Meeting will be scheduled 1 December 2015.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial or resource implications.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning & Policy
Strategy 5.2.7	Ensuring efficient and effective delivery of service

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

The related risk is associated with complying with the timelines identified within Section 5.54 of the Local Government Act.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Options are limited as the Annual Report is required by legislation to be adopted by Council by 31 December 2015.

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR FREER**

That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 5.54 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **ADOPT** the City of Greater Geraldton Annual Report (including Audited Annual Financial Report and Auditors Report) for the financial year ending 30 June 2015; and
2. **REQUIRE** the CEO to make the Annual Report publicly available and to give public notice of an Annual Electors Meeting to be held on 1 December 2015 pursuant to section 5.27(2) of the Act.

**CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY 14/0**

6:54:16 PM

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Mcllwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

CCS138 STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2015
--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15- 61396</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Jones, Financial Business Planner</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>07 September 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>FM/17/0001</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (x1)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The attached financial reports provide a comprehensive report on the City's finances to 30 September 2015. The statements include no matters of variance considered to be of concern.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 RESOLVES to:

1. RECEIVE the September 2015 monthly financial activity statements as attached.

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

**BACKGROUND:**

The financial position at the end of September is detailed in the attached report and summarised as follows relative to year-to-date budget expectations:

Operating Income	\$326,811	0.6%	Negative Variance
Operating Expenditure	\$348,812	1.8%	Positive Variance
Net Operating	\$22,001		
Capital Expenditure	\$224,539	1.1%	Positive Variance
Capital Revenue	\$890,431	167.9%	Positive Variance
Cash at Bank – Municipal	\$24,270,323		
Cash at Bank – Reserve	\$16,816,900		
Total Funds Invested	\$37,906,692		
Net Rates Collected	65.27%		

The attached report provides explanatory notes for items greater than 10% or \$50,000. This commentary provides Council with an overall understanding of how the finances are progressing in relation to the adopted budget.

The financial position represented in the September financials shows a positive variance of \$22,001 in the net operating result.

The closing funding surplus is due to year to date expenditure being less than YTD budget, as a result of there being some vacant positions, timing of works for buildings, roads, plant & equipment

### **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

#### **Economic:**

There are no economic impacts.

#### **Social:**

There are no social impacts.

#### **Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

#### **Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

### **RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

Council is provided with financial reports each month.

### **COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

### **LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 require that as a minimum Council is to receive a Statement of Financial Activity.

### **FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

Any issues in relation to expenditure and revenue allocations or variance trends are identified and addressed each month.

### **INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.7	Ensuring efficient and effective delivery of service

### **REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT**

There are no risks to be considered.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

There are no alternative options to consider.

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 **RESOLVES** to:

1. **RECEIVE** the September 2015 monthly financial activity statements as attached.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**6:57:03 PM**

<b>Mayor Van Styn</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Douglas</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Bylund</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Ellis</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Keemink</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Hall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Critch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Graham</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Tanti</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Reymond</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. McIlwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>YES</b>

CCS142 EXTRAORDINARY ELECTION TARCOOLA WARD
---

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-64296</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Adam, Governance Advisor</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>B Davis, Director Corporate &amp; Commercial Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>20 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/8/0006</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>WA Electoral Commission</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (x1)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's endorsement of the proposed election date for the extraordinary election for the Tarcoola Ward, following the election of Shane Van Styn to the position of Mayor, and grant approval for the appointment of the WA Electoral Commission to carry out the extraordinary election as a postal election.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 4.20(4) and 4.61(2) of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. APPROVE the date of the Extraordinary Election for the Tarcoola Ward as 15 January 2016;
2. DECLARE, in accordance with section 4.20(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the extraordinary election; and
3. DECIDE, in accordance with section 4.61(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* that the method of conducting the election will be as a postal election.

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is David Kerslake, Electoral Commissioner, WA Electoral Commission (WAEC), Perth.

**BACKGROUND:**

Mr Shane Van Styn was elected Mayor of the City of Greater Geraldton at the Ordinary Election on 17 October 2015. Pursuant to section 2.32 (f) of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) the office of Mr Van Styn as Councillor of the Tarcoola Ward became vacant.

**2.32. How extraordinary vacancies occur in offices elected by electors**

*The office of a member of a council as an elector mayor or president or as a councillor becomes vacant if the member —*

- (a) *dies; or*
- (b) *resigns from the office; or*
- (c) *does not make the declaration required by section 2.29(1) within 2 months after being declared elected to the office; or*
- (d) *advises or accepts under section 2.27 that he or she is disqualified, or is declared to be disqualified by the State Administrative Tribunal acting on an application under section 2.27; or*

- (a) *is disqualified by an order under section 5.113, 5.117 or 5.119 from holding office as a member of a council; or*
- (e) *becomes the holder of any office or position in the employment of the local government; or*
- (f) *having been elected to an office of councillor, is elected by the electors to the office of mayor or president of the council.*

Pursuant to Division 4 of the Act the City is therefore required to hold an extraordinary election to fill the office. *Division 4 — Extraordinary elections*

*Division 4 — Extraordinary elections*

**4.8. Extraordinary elections**

- (1) *If the office of a councillor or of an elector mayor or president becomes vacant under section 2.32 an election to fill the office is to be held.*

**4.9. Election day for extraordinary election**

- (1) *Any poll needed for an extraordinary election is to be held on a day decided on and fixed —*
  - (a) *by the mayor or president, in writing, if a day has not already been fixed under paragraph (b); or*
  - (b) *by the council at a meeting held within one month after the vacancy occurs, if a day has not already been fixed under paragraph (a).*
- (2) *The election day fixed for an extraordinary election is to be a day that allows enough time for the electoral requirements to be complied with but, unless the Electoral Commissioner approves or section 4.10(b) applies, it cannot be later than 4 months after the vacancy occurs.*
- (3) *If at the end of one month after the vacancy occurs an election day has not been fixed, the CEO is to notify the Electoral Commissioner and the Electoral Commissioner is to —*
  - (a) *fix a day for the holding of the poll that allows enough time for the electoral requirements to be complied with; and*
  - (b) *advise the CEO of the day fixed.*

Section 4.20 (4) of the Act provides that the City may appoint the Electoral commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the election.

**4.20. CEO to be returning officer unless other arrangements made**

- (1) *Subject to this section the CEO is the returning officer of a local government for each election.*
- (2) *A local government may, having first obtained the written agreement of the person concerned and the written approval of the Electoral Commissioner, appoint\* a person other than the CEO to be the returning officer of the local government for —*
  - (a) *an election; or*
  - (b) *all elections held while the appointment of the person subsists.*



*\* Absolute majority required.*

- (3) *An appointment under subsection (2) —*
- (a) *is to specify the term of the person's appointment; and*
  - (b) *has no effect if it is made after the 80th day before an election day.*
- (4) *A local government may, having first obtained the written agreement of the Electoral Commissioner, declare\* the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of an election, or all elections conducted within a particular period of time, and, if such a declaration is made, the Electoral Commissioner is to appoint a person to be the returning officer of the local government for the election or elections.*

*\* Absolute majority required.*

- (5) *A declaration under subsection (4) has no effect if it is made after the 80th day before election day unless a declaration has already been made in respect of an election for the local government and the declaration is in respect of an additional election for the same local government.*
- (6) *A declaration made under subsection (4) on or before the 80th day before election day cannot be rescinded after that 80th day.*

Section 4.61 provides that a Local Government may conduct an election as a postal election.

#### **4.61. Choice of methods of conducting election**

- (1) *The election can be conducted as a —*
- postal election** *which is an election at which the method of casting votes is by posting or delivering them to an electoral officer on or before election day; or*
  - voting in person election** *which is an election at which the principal method of casting votes is by voting in person on election day but at which votes can also be cast in person before election day, or posted or delivered, in accordance with regulations.*
- (2) *The local government may decide\* to conduct the election as a postal election.*
- \* Absolute majority required.*
- (3) *A decision under subsection (2) has no effect if it is made after the 80th day before election day unless a declaration has already been made in respect of an election for the local government and the declaration is in respect of an additional election for the same local government.*
- (4) *A decision under subsection (2) has no effect unless it is made after a declaration is made under section 4.20(4) that the Electoral Commissioner is to be responsible for the conduct of the election or in conjunction with such a declaration.*
- (5) *A decision made under subsection (2) on or before the 80th day before election day cannot be rescinded after that 80th day.*

- (6) *For the purposes of this Act, the poll for an election is to be regarded as having been held on election day even though the election is conducted as a postal election.*
- (7) *Unless a resolution under subsection (2) has effect, the election is to be conducted as a voting in person election.*

### **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

#### **Economic:**

There are no economic impacts.

#### **Social:**

There are no social impacts.

#### **Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

#### **Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

### **RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

Historically, the postal voting method has been adopted to conduct ordinary elections.

### **COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

### **LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Part 4 –Division 4 governs the process for the holding of extraordinary elections and Section 4.20 (4) refers to the appointment of the Electoral Commissioner as being responsible for the election.

### **FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

The WAEC has advised that their estimate to undertake the extraordinary postal election will be approximately \$19,000 (incl GST). Additional electoral expenditure of \$5,000.00 will also be set aside to cover any local advertising and promotion, hire costs and some staff costs. This will be budgeted for in the 2015/16 financial year.

### **INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.7	Ensuring efficient and effective delivery of service

### **REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Australian Electoral Commission will be responsible for management of the Risk if appointed as per the Executive Recommendation.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

There were no alternative options considered by City officers as pursuant to the *Local Government Act 1995*, Division 4, 4.9:

- (1) *Any poll needed for an extraordinary election is to be held on a day decided on and fixed —*
- (a) *by the mayor or president, in writing, if a day has not already been fixed under paragraph (b); or*
  - (b) *by the council at a meeting held within one month after the vacancy occurs, if a day has not already been fixed under paragraph (a).*
- (2) *The election day fixed for an extraordinary election is to be a day that allows enough time for the electoral requirements to be complied with but, unless the Electoral Commissioner approves or section 4.10(b) applies, it cannot be later than 4 months after the vacancy occurs.*

Previous Council decisions to appoint the Western Australian Electoral Commissioner to conduct postal elections have proven effective.

### **COUNCIL DECISION**

#### **MOVED CR ELLIS, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE**

**That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 4.20(4) and 4.61(2) of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:**

1. **APPROVE** the date of the Extraordinary Election for the Tarcoola Ward as 15 January 2016;
2. **DECLARE**, in accordance with section 4.20(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the extraordinary election; and
3. **DECIDE**, in accordance with section 4.61(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* that the method of conducting the election will be as a postal election

#### **CARRIED BY ABOSLUTE MAJORITY 14/0**

7:02:23 PM

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Mcllwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

### 13 REPORTS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

CS224	APPOINTMENT OF THE HMAS SYDNEY II MEMORIAL WARDEN AND SUB-WARDEN
-------	--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-60983</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>A Selvey, Director Community Services</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>A Selvey, Director Community Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>20 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/6/0015-05</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (x1)</b>

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This report seeks a Council resolution on the appointment of an HMAS Sydney II Memorial Warden and Sub-Warden based on recommendations by the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee and in accordance HMAS Sydney II Conservation Framework.

#### **EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.18 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. APPOINT Mr Don Rolston to the role of HMAS Sydney II Memorial Warden;
2. APPOINT Mr Stephen Butler to the role of HMAS Sydney II Memorial Sub-Warden;
3. RESOLVE that both appointments commence on 19 November 2015 and cease on 19 November 2016; and
4. SET the role and responsibilities of the Warden and Sub-Warden as per the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Conservation Plan.

#### **PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 27 August 2013 Council resolved to adopt the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Conservation Framework.

1. *ADOPT the draft HMAS Sydney II Memorial Conservation Framework.*

One of the key recommendations of the Conservation Framework was that the City appoint a Warden. The Warden's role is confined to the commemorative space as defined in the Conservation Framework and is to offer support and advice to City staff in relation to the following;

- a. all matters of customs, traditions and protocols for the overall conduct of commemorative ceremonies;
- b. any concerns regarding maintenance or any significant issues arising from daily care; and

- c. determining approval for any requests from ex-service organisations wishing to honour the men of HMAS Sydney II.

The Conservation Framework allows for any number of Sub-Wardens to assist the Warden and the Advisory Committee recommends the appointment of one Sub-Warden. The role of the Sub-Warden is similarly confined to the commemorative space and in assisting the Warden in carrying out his/her duties as specified above.

The Conservation Framework recommends a 12 month appointment period for the Warden and Sub-Warden and that the handover occurs as part of the HMAS Sydney II Commemorative Service held annually on 19 November.

The Conservation Framework clearly articulates that the City retains primary responsibility for the overall care, control and management of the Mount Scott site and all areas of the Memorial including the commemorative space. Appointment of a Warden and Sub-Warden in no way negates or dilutes management control and responsibility.

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

The economic value of heritage tourism is recognised globally. Experience in Geraldton shows that the HMAS Sydney II Memorial attracts large numbers of visitors to our City. Therefore, it would stand to reason that there are positive economic outcomes from ensuring the Memorial is well managed and protected to ensure it remains a tourism icon for the City.

### **Social:**

The HMAS Sydney II Memorial is a source of great pride in the community. There is a strong level of community ownership and therefore interest. The Conservation Framework acknowledges the social value of the Memorial and includes avenues for continued community involvement, one such avenue being the appointment of a Warden and Sub-Warden.

### **Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

### **Cultural & Heritage:**

The Memorial is listed on the Municipal Inventory as follows:

Management Category '1X';

Level of Significance being 'EXCEPTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE: Essential to the heritage of the locality.'

The Management Recommendation given in the Municipal Inventory is as follows; 'Conservation of the place is considered essential. Any proposed change should not unduly impact on the significance of the place and be in accordance with either a Conservation Plan or Heritage Impact Statement.'

---

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 26 August 2014, Council resolved to appoint Mr Rolston to the role of Warden and Mr Hayward to the role of sub-warden.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

The Conservation Framework recommends that the City consults with the Naval Association of Australia, Geraldton Sub Section and the Returned and Services League (RSL). Both these organisations are represented on the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee.

Councillors Hall and De Trafford were Council representatives on the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee, noting that all Council Committees dissolve on 17 October 2015 due to the Local Government Elections. Other key stakeholder organisations represented on this Committee are the Rotary Club of Geraldton and the Volunteer Tour Guide Association.

The appointments recommended to Council in this item have the unanimous support of the Committee.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no legislative or policy implications.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial or resource implications.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Community Engagement
Strategy 5.1.2	Promoting community involvement in decision making so it is collaborative and transparent.

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

The HMAS Sydney II Memorial is recognised as a significant national asset. It attracts attention to the Mid West and Geraldton bringing tourism and associated benefits to the Region.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

Not approving the appointment of the Warden and Sub-Warden as recommended by the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee carries a risk of alienating a group of individuals and organisations who volunteer their time, skills and expertise on the Committee. It would also be contrary to the Council adopted Conservation Framework and therefore carry a risk that the value of the entire Framework could be questioned. Therefore the Executive Recommendation is consistent with the Committee recommendation.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

No other options were considered.

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR GRAHAM**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.18 of the Local Government Act **RESOLVES** to:

1. **APPOINT** Mr Don Rolston to the role of HMAS Sydney II Memorial Warden;
2. **APPOINT** Mr Stephen Butler to the role of HMAS Sydney II Memorial Sub-Warden;
3. **RESOLVE** that both appointments commence on 19 November 2015 and cease on 19 November 2016; and
4. **SET** the role and responsibilities of the Warden and Sub-Warden as per the HMAS Sydney II Memorial Conservation Plan.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**7:04:57 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Mcllwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

<b>CS229</b>	<b>MOVING FORWARD COMMUNITY SUMMIT IAP2 AWARD</b>
--------------	---

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-62972</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>A Selvey, Director Community Services</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>A Selvey, Director Community Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>20 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/6/0015-05</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>No</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This report is to advise Council of a recent prize for public participation that was awarded to the City for the Moving Forward Community Summit and to provide Council with background to the award and to the Community Summit.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. NOTE the IAP2 Australasian Core Values Smart Budget Category Award for the City's Moving Forward Community Summit.

**PROPONENT:**

The City of Greater Geraldton.

**BACKGROUND:**

In 2013/14 the City undertook an in-depth community engagement process to prioritise capital works and review City services. This feedback was invaluable in the City's decision making processes. However, community engagement is an on-going process and because there had been some significant changes such as reduced State and Federal Government funding, escalating utility costs and a growing backlog of infrastructure renewals since 2013/14, it was important to continue that conversation.

These factors that were impacting on the City's financial situation, combined with a desire to ensure rates increases were kept as low as possible, meant it was important to review and cease some non-mandatory services to achieve financial sustainability. This required Council to make difficult decisions about which non-mandatory services the City could continue to offer and which should be discontinued or reduced.

To assist Council in its decision making processes, the City held a Community Summit. The purpose of the Summit was to prioritise the non-mandatory services the City delivers within the context of budget constraints. The Community Summit was developed to provide an opportunity for the community to have informed and considered input thereby ensuring services align with community need, aspiration and importantly, community willingness and capacity to pay. The two-part summit involved over 90 people, including invited stakeholders and randomly selected community members. The primary outcome from the summit was a prioritised list of non-mandatory



services which was used to inform the Executive Management Team's recommendations to Council about which services to continue and which services to reduce or cease. The list was also provided to Council to assist them in their budget deliberations.

In recognition of the innovative approach to involving the community in the budget process, the City has been awarded an IAP2 Australasian Award in the Smart Budget category. The IAP2 Australasia Core Value Awards recognise outstanding projects and organisations that are at the forefront of public participation and community engagement. They were created to encourage excellence and innovation in the field of public participation. Applicants are assessed on their demonstration of leading practice and evidence that community engagement values are clearly embedded within their organisations.

The Smart Budget award was one of 18 awards presented at the IAP2 Australasian Conference on 14 October, 2015. The conference is the premier event for this sector and was attended by national and international delegates. In her opening address to the 2015 IAP2 Australasian Conference, the Governor of Western Australia, Her Excellency the Honourable Kerry Sanderson AO singled out the City of Greater Geraldton for our innovative approach to involving the community in decision-making.

This award follows previous national and international awards to the City for public engagement and participation as follows:

- The Reinhard Mohn Prize 2011 – shortlisted in the top five projects from over 130 projects internationally for “Vitalising Democracy”;
- United Nations International Liveable Communities Award ‘LIVCOM’ 2011 – overall “World Winner for Community Participation and Engagement”;
- 2011 Premier’s Award for Excellence in Public Sector Management - short listed as one of the finalists in the “Improving Government” category; and
- International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Core Value Awards 2014 – overall winners of the "Australasian Project of the Year", “Best Research Award” and the "Planning Award”.

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

There are no economic impacts.

### **Social:**

Positive social impacts arising from this project included:

- Clearer and stronger alignment between services and community priorities;
- Increased transparency in decision-making which increases the trust between the City and Community;

- Improved understanding in the community of the range of services provided by the City and funded via their rates – i.e. people would have a greater appreciation of how their rates are being used; and
- Shared ownership of the difficult decisions facing Council in balancing community need and expectations with the budget.

Positive social impacts arising from this award includes:

- Fostering a sense of pride within the organisation; and
- Recognition and appreciation within the Community, the sector and potential employees of the City's efforts and achievements in this field.

**Environmental:**

There are no environmental impacts.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

There are no relevant precedents.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

All Councillors were invited to the Community Summit. Councillors were provided with updates via Briefing Notes and provided with the Final Report from the Summit.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

The Community Summit was delivered in a manner consistent with CP042 Community Engagement Policy.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial or resource implications arising from receiving this award.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Community Engagement
Strategy 5.1.2	Promoting community involvement in decision making so it is collaborative and transparent.

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

There is no risk arising from receiving this award.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

As this report simply recommends that Council notes that this award has been won by the City, no alternative options were considered.

**MOTION****MOVED CR ELLIS, SECONDED CR HALL**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act **RESOLVES** to:

1. **NOTE** the IAP2 Australasian Core Values Smart Budget Category Award for the City's Moving Forward Community Summit.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION****MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR DOUGLAS**

That the motion be put.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**7:15:42 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR ELLIS, SECONDED CR HALL**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act **RESOLVES** to:

1. **NOTE** the IAP2 Australasian Core Values Smart Budget Category Award for the City's Moving Forward Community Summit.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**7:16:23 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES

<b>Cr. McIlwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>YES</b>

**14 REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO**  
Nil.

## 15 REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY SERVICES

DRS231 MINOR MODIFICATION TO GLENFIELD STRUCTURE PLAN	
---	--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-60902</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>K Elder, Coordinator Strategic Planning</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>P Melling, Director Development &amp; Regulatory Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>22 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>LP/9/0032</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>LandWest</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (x2)</b>

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The City has received a request for a minor modification to the Glenfield Structure Plan to incorporate a proposed private school site onto Lot 2 Alexander Drive, Glenfield.

This report recommends that the modified Structure Plan be approved by the WA Planning Commission.

### EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Part 4, clause 20, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, RESOLVES to:

1. RECOMMEND the modified Glenfield Structure Plan be approved by the WA Planning Commission;
2. ADVISE the applicant that satisfactory arrangements are to be made for appropriate pick up / set down area(s) and car parking to be provided to the approval of the local government.

### PROPONENT:

The proponent is Landwest on behalf of the Leaning Tree Community School.

### BACKGROUND:

The Leaning Tree Community School (LTCS) is an independent school based in Geraldton. LTCS commenced in 2006 and was started by a group of parents and community members to establish a primary school offering further options for school education in Geraldton.

The LTSC is currently leasing a premises at St. Patrick's College in Bayley Street, Geraldton. However this year-to-year lease is not expected to be renewed beyond 2016 and thus a more permanent school site needs to be secured.

Lot 2 Alexander Drive has been selected by the LTSC as a site for a proposed school due to its location on the existing road network which provides efficient connection to Chapman Road and North West Coastal Highway via Macedonia Drive. The size of the landholding is sufficient and consistent with

the anticipated smaller number of students which is typical of private independent schools. The expected student catchment of the school will be drawn from the wider Greater Geraldton area however it will provide additional education facilities for the northern corridor of Sunset Beach, Glenfield and Drummonds Cove.

In order for the LTCS to pursue the option of establishing a school at Lot 2 Alexander Drive minor modifications are required to be made to the Glenfield Structure Plan as follows:

- Amending the structure plan for Lot 2 by adding a road which runs on the southern boundary of the lot and incorporating the proposed school site into the structure plan map;
- Designing a new local road layout over Lot 62 (No. 60) Macedonia Drive and Lots 131 and 130 (No. 405 & 389) Alexander Drive, Glenfield.

Tables 4, 5 and 6 of the Structure Plan text will also be modified to reflect the additional school site within the structure plan area including small variations to the gross subdivisible area and public open space calculations across the structure plan area.

Clause 4.6 of the Structure Plan text will also be modified to reflect the addition of a private school site within the structure plan area.

The existing and proposed Structure Plan maps are included as Attachment No. 231A.

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

The Structure Plan will potentially facilitate the development of a residential area with a mixed use area which accommodates the establishment of a mix of residential development with small “boutique type” retail and commercial businesses.

At full development the Structure Plan proposes an approximate total of 5,365 lots and the area could generate around 580 job opportunities.

### **Social:**

The projected population for the Structure Plan area is around 13,690 people.

The Structure Plan proposes a wide range of residential densities from R5 to R80 which provides for greater housing and lifestyle choice.

### **Environmental:**

All environmental issues were dealt with via the approval of the existing Structure Plan. There are no further environmental issues as a result of the proposed modification to the Structure Plan.

**Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural and heritage issues.

**RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

Council at its meeting held on 23 November 2010 resolved to adopt the existing Structure Plan which was subsequently endorsed by the WA Planning Commission on 16 February 2011.

Council at its meeting held on 25 August 2015 resolved to adopt the modified Glenfield Structure Plan which proposed to incorporate a proposed public primary school site onto Lot 3, Bluefin Drive. The modified Glenfield Structure Plan is currently with the WA Planning Commission.

The author is not aware of any other relevant precedents.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

The modified Structure Plan was publicly advertised in accordance with the provisions of the City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough).

The advertising period was for 21 days and commenced on 04 September 2015 and concluded on the 24 September 2015 and involved the following:

1. A notice appeared in the Geraldton Guardian on the 04 September 2015;
2. A sign was erected on-site;
3. Adjoining landowners within a 100m radius were written to and advised of the proposed modification;
4. The affected landowners being Lot 62 (No. 60) Macedonia Drive and Lots 131 and 130 (No. 405 & 389) Alexander Drive, Glenfield were specifically written to and advised of the proposed amendment;
5. The modified Structure Plan details were available on the City's website; and
6. The modified Structure Plan details were publically displayed at the Civic Centre.
7. The modified Structure Plan was referred to the following:
  - ATCO Gas
  - Department of Education;
  - Main Roads Western Australia;
  - Telstra;
  - Water Corporation;
  - Western Power;
  - Waggrakine-Glenfield Progress Association.

**Submissions**

As a result of the advertising a total of 6 submissions were received. There were no objections received however there were some comments and concerns were raised which included;

---



- The lack of consultation regarding the purchase of the property for a future school site,
- How safety and security at the school would be managed; and
- Main Roads WA made comments regarding the need for any development of a school on the site to provide a Transport Impact Assessment.

A 'Schedule of Submissions' is included as Attachment No. 231B and copies of the actual submission are available to Council upon request.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Part 4, clause 29, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 allows for amendments to a structure plan.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial and resource implications related to the modification to the structure plan.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.1	Responding to community aspirations by providing creative yet effective planning and zoning for future development.

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

Geraldton Region Plan 1999:

This plan seeks to provide a framework for the future management, protection and coordination of regional planning in the region. The Region Plan incorporates a structure plan for the Greater Geraldton area which identifies the subject land as 'Urban'.

Residential Development Strategy (2013):

The Strategy is a response to the changing local and regional economic environment and the need to provide a logical, coherent, highly liveable and sustainable model for residential development in the City to meet the needs of all residents and build strong communities. It broadly indicates the extent of residential and future residential land along with existing and proposed rural living areas.

The subject land is identified as a 'Single Density Residential (R10-R25)' area.

Draft Local Planning Strategy:

The purpose of this document is to guide the long-term land use planning and provide the rationale for land use development controls. The Glenfield locality is identified as 'Urban'.

**RISK MANAGEMENT:**

There are no inherent risks to the City in approving this modification to the Structure Plan.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:**

The minor modification to the Glenfield Structure Plan is required to potentially accommodate a proposed private school on Lot 2 Alexander Drive, Glenfield. The modifications provide a local road network that will support the possible development of a future school site. Further design and transport assessment at the development stage will ensure that any issues with vehicle access and safety are minimised and appropriately dealt with. As a result, the option to refuse the modification is not supported.

The option to defer the matter is not supported as there is considered sufficient information for Council to determine the matter.

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR GRAHAM, SECONDED CR FREER**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Part 4, clause 20, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, RESOLVES to:

1. **RECOMMEND** the modified Glenfield Structure Plan be approved by the WA Planning Commission; and
2. **ADVISE** the applicant that satisfactory arrangements are to be made for appropriate pick up / set down area(s) and car parking to be provided to the approval of the local government.

**CARRIED 14/0**

**7:21:38 PM**

Mayor Van Styn	YES
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Ellis	YES
Cr. Keemink	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Graham	YES
Cr. Tanti	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Freer	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Thomas	YES

<b>DRS232 DONGARA TO NORTHAMPTON COASTAL ROUTE CORRIDOR ALIGNMENT SELECTION STUDY</b>
---

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-61570</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>P Melling, Director Development and Regulatory Services</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>P Melling, Director Development and Regulatory Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>12 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>TT/1/0012</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>Main Roads WA</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes x4 (x3 Confidential)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This report provides Council with the background on the Dongara to Northampton Coastal Route – Corridor Alignment Selection Study options and seeks Council's resolution on preferred options including interim requirements.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.18 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. ADVISE Main Roads WA of its position on the Dongara to Northampton Coastal Route – Corridor Alignment Study as outlined in this report.

**PROPONENT:**

Main Roads WA.

**BACKGROUND:**

Main Roads WA have released a Corridor Alignment Selection Study for the possible partial or whole relocation of Brand Highway / North West Coastal Highway to an alignment further east to effectively bypass Dongara, Geraldton and Northampton primarily for heavy haulage vehicles.

Within the City of Greater Geraldton there are two components with three possible route options south of Geraldton. It also confirms that the Oakajee-Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor (ONIC) will be utilised from the Geraldton – Mt Magnet Road through to the City's northern boundary with the Shire of Chapman Valley. It is noted that there are also three options north of the ONIC that connect with the Northampton By-pass alignment which will be discussed below.

It is acknowledged that the road is a long term vision for the Greater Geraldton area (upwards of 50+ years). However, for the City it is important that proposals such as this receive consideration given the longer term nature of strategic land use planning where a degree of certainty is required by the private sector when investment decisions have to be made.

**Route Options (Southern) 1, 2 & 3.**

Overall each alignment does have its merits, however Option 1 (a new alignment from Dongara to the ONIC) would effectively separate heavy vehicles away from light vehicles for a greater length and allow the existing Brand Highway to function in a similar manner to Indian Ocean Drive. In the longer term as both the local population and visitor numbers increase the diversion away of heavy vehicles will be a significant advantage to road users. A separate route will also overcome the current delays that occur when accidents or natural events take place that close the Brand Highway giving an alternate route into Geraldton. A Confidential plan of the south alignment option is attached as Attachment No. DRS232A.

Focussing on location specific matters, all three alignment options from Walkaway north are in the same corridor alignment and in the vicinity of the current Arthur Road / Moonyoonooka-Narngulu Road intersection the City's primary concern is how that alignment will connect into the ONIC corridor without impacting on the airport / Aurizon service centre and railyards and the potential for an multimodal transport hub in this area. It is noted that in the same time period the City could realistically see airport expansion as having occurred. The City's submission will include the information previously provided to Main Roads WA in this regard, verbally, Main Roads WA have acknowledged these concerns and believe that those issues can be accommodated.

In addition there are also concerns around the intersection of Geraldton-Mount Magnet Road and the Moonyoonooka-Narra Tarra Road which is more to do with interim road alignments / height, again relating to the Geraldton Airport, this information will also be included in the City's response.

**Oakajee- Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor (ONIC)**

The ONIC alignment is not up for consideration in this study as that project is actually progressing as a separate component with land acquisition scheduled to commence this year.

**Route Options (Northern) 4, 5 & 6.**

All three of these options are located in the Shires of Chapman Valley and Northampton. Option 5 offers a completely separate alignment for its entire length thereby separating heavy and light vehicles and in terms of the longer term vision would be the City's preferred option. However in the shorter term alignment Option 6 (if developed as a single stage) would require links into the ONIC road component and would be extremely beneficial to both the Oakajee Industrial area and Oakajee Port. The City's submission would identify Option 6 as a preferred short term option and Option 5 as the longer term preferred option. A Confidential plan of the northern alignment option is attached as Attachment No. DRS232B.

**Interim Arrangements**

The size and scale of this road corridor is such that it is most likely that it will be constructed in stages. For the City of Greater Geraldton it is critical that

---

Main Roads WA / State Government do not hold off from progressing interim opportunities for addressing heavy haulage vehicles through the Geraldton Urban area. The City has an adopted Position Statement on the Geraldton North South Transport Corridor (Webborton Road extension that runs from Webborton through to the Brand Highway near Devlin Pool Road).

The Position Statement is attached for Councillor reference (see Attachment No. DRS232C) and a number of key points from the statement will be utilised in the City's submission to Main Roads WA. Any future upgrades to North West Coastal Highway and or North South Road construction would be beyond the financial resources of the City given that the required works alone on North West Coastal Highway would be in the vicinity of \$200-250 million dollars.

The position on the absolute need for funding on interim road upgrade measures (including new roads) should be strongly presented to Main Roads WA to address existing and short to medium term issues on Brand Highway / North West Coastal Highway and the proposed North-South Road.

#### **General matters for consideration.**

In determining a final alignment and then progressing to a Route Definition Study Main Roads should give some consideration to the following:

- Limiting where possible the severing of property on a specific landowner.
- Giving full consideration to alternate access to landowner's properties / local road network prior to any construction works taking place, recognising the cumulative impacts that can occur on local communities when building/when operational major roads are constructed.
- Recognising the impact on individual property owners the defining of a road corridor can have on existing use / operations of a site by making provision for compensation at an early stage before a corridor is formally "reserved" / recognised. The City noting the years of uncertainty created by the non-reservation of land for the North – South Road / Oakajee-Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor (can be a decade or more).

#### **Conclusion**

Given the above comments, the key points to be included in the City submission to Main Roads WA are:

- City support for Option 1 alignment as a longer term vision.
- Identification of potential conflict points with Geraldton Airport / Intermodal Hub.
- Identification of the early need for the ONIC road alignment to Oakajee.
- City support for Option 6 in the short term and Option 5 as a longer term vision.
- Comment on City requirements relating to interim road options including upgrades of North West Coastal Highway and construction of Geraldton North-South Road.

- Addressing landowner needs in any future corridor by early acquisition.

A copy of the City's draft submission to Main Roads WA is confidential attached as Attachment No. DRS232D.

## **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

### **Economic:**

Potentially any road upgrades / new alignments or lack thereof would impact broadly across the Greater Geraldton region, good road access between activity areas is essential and contribute to the economic vitality of the area.

### **Social:**

If the existing road network were to remain as is, socially there would be increasing traffic volumes (especially heavy haulage vehicles) traversing City roads impacting on local communities causing issues such as community severance and amenity issues. Any new road bypassing the City could create severance issues for farmers / lot owners, but if undertaken properly can be mitigated against.

### **Environmental:**

The selection / creation of a new road alignment will be required to go through the environmental assessment and review process.

### **Cultural & Heritage:**

At this early phase of the planning process there has been no cultural or heritage impacts identified and again through the process will need to address these matters.

## **RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

There are no relevant precedents.

## **COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

Main Roads WA have provided a briefing to Councillors, distributed a pamphlet to Geraldton householders and businesses, had displays at various locations and met with some of the potentially impacted land owners.

## **LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no legislative issues however there are policy implications for the City relating to existing and proposed road network planning / construction.

## **FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

This project would be a state funded project, however should Main Roads WA no longer progress with North West Coastal Highway upgrades or the North South Road this could create an expectation that the City would be responsible to deliver these projects at a significant financial cost.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Economy	4.2 Transportation
Strategy 4.2.1	Developing more efficient transport options that are secure and safe to sustain our lifestyle

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

The creation of a new road link between Dongara and Northampton would greatly assist heavy haulage between Perth and the Northwest and places in between. In addition, the separation of heavy haulage vehicles from light vehicles away from the urban area will also assist in duplicating the Indian Ocean Drive concept of a predominantly tourism focussed road (also having more positive benefits for local road users as well).

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

Risks for the City of the new road alignment concerns primarily future decision making on upgrading existing road infrastructure and the cost thereto. The timeframe for delivery also could be outside of acceptable limits for City residents and businesses creating safety and access issues.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS**

The City does not have to lodge a submission on the Corridor Alignment Study and just let the Main Roads process run its course and accept whatever alignment Main Roads WA ultimately selects. This approach would not allow the City to at least have its views considered especially where there are potentially impact(s) on areas of City responsibility.

*Cr R Ellis left Chambers at 7.22pm*

*Cr R Ellis returned to Chambers at 7.23pm*

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR KEEMINK**

**That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.18 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:**

- ADVISE Main Roads WA of its position on the Dongara to Northampton Coastal Route – Corridor Alignment Study as outlined in this report.**

**CARRIED 13/1****7:29:54 PM**

<b>Mayor Van Styn</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Douglas</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Bylund</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Ellis</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Keemink</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Hall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Critch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Graham</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Tanti</b>	<b>YES</b>

<b>Cr. Reymond</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Mcllwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>NO</b>



<b>DRS233 NOMINATION FOR MID WEST/WHEATBELT (CENTRAL) JOINT DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANEL MEMBERSHIP</b>	
---	--

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-63562</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>M Connell, Manager Urban &amp; Regional Development</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>P Melling, Director Development &amp; Regulatory Services</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>19 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>LP/9/0017</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>Development Assessment Panels</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes (1x Electronic only)</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

As a result of the recent local government elections, the City is required to nominate a replacement member to the Mid West/Wheatbelt (Central) Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP).

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Regulation 26 of the Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011, RESOLVES to:

1. ADVISE the Minister for Planning that it nominates ..... as the City of Greater Geraldton local government representative on the Mid West/Wheatbelt (Central) Joint Development Assessment Panel: and
2. ADVISE the Minister for Planning that it nominates Councillor ..... as the City of Greater Geraldton alternate local government representative.

**PROPONENT:**

The proponent is the Development Assessment Panels who report directly to the Minister for Planning.

**BACKGROUND:**

On 1 July 2011, Development Assessment Panels (DAP) came into operation in order to determine development applications that meet a certain threshold value.

In the case of the City of Greater Geraldton for development applications with an estimated cost of \$7 million or more, it is mandatory that they are determined by a DAP. For applications \$3 million or more and less than \$7 million, the applicant has the option of having the application determined by a DAP or the local government.

Each DAP comprises 5 members; 3 specialist members, one of which is the presiding member, and 2 local government members. Appointments of all local government DAP members expire on 26 April 2017.

Council is required, at all times, to have 4 elected members (comprising 2 local members and 2 alternate local members) to sit on the JDAP as required.

The City's current members on the JDAP are (former) Mayor I Carpenter and Councillor N McIlwaine. Alternate members are Councillors S Van Styn and L Graham.

As a result of the local government elections the City is now required to nominate a replacement alternate member. It should be noted that there is also a training requirement provided by the Department of Planning for this role. Please see the DAP Member Training Notes attached as Attachment No. DRS233A (via electronic version only).

### **ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**

#### **Economic:**

There are no economic issues.

#### **Social:**

There are no social issues.

#### **Environmental:**

There are no environmental issues.

#### **Cultural & Heritage:**

There are no cultural and heritage issues.

### **RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:**

Council at its meeting held on 22 November 2011 nominated Mayor I Carpenter and Councillor N McIlwaine as the City's local government representatives on the JDAP, and also nominated Councillor R Ramage and Councillor N Messina as alternate local government representatives.

Council at its meeting held on 29 January 2013 nominated Mayor I Carpenter and Councillor N McIlwaine as the City's local government representatives on the JDAP, and also nominated Councillor L Graham and Councillor S Van Styn as alternate local government representatives.

Council at its meeting held on 27 January 2015 nominated Mayor I Carpenter and Councillor N McIlwaine as the City's local government representatives on the JDAP, and also nominated Councillor L Graham and Councillor S Van Styn as alternate local government representatives.

### **COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

### **LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Part 11A of the Planning and Development Act (2005) introduced Development Assessment Panels into the Act and this is supported by the

---

Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011.

**FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial and budget implications other than staff time required in processing applications. Local DAP members are entitled to be paid for their attendance at DAP training and at DAP meetings.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:**

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.6	Supporting decisions to create a long term sustainable city

**REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**

There are no regional outcomes.

**RISK MANAGEMENT:**

If Council fails to nominate any elected members the Minister for Planning can appoint any representative of the local government who is an eligible voter and who the Minister considers has relevant knowledge or experience. This would further remove any decision making power from the Council.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:**

The option to not nominate any elected member is not supported as the City is required, under Regulation 26 of the Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011, to nominate elected members to sit on the JDAP as required.

The option to defer the matter is not supported as nominations are required to be provided by Friday, 30 October 2015.

*Cr N McIlwaine nominated Mayor Shane Van Styn as the City of Greater Geraldton local Government Representative*

*Cr R Ellis nominated for Cr L Graham for 1<sup>st</sup> alternate.*

*Cr J Critch nominated Cr S Douglas for 2<sup>nd</sup> alternate*

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**MOVED CR MCILWAINE, SECONDED CR ELLIS**

**That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Regulation 26 of the Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011, RESOLVES to:**

- 1. ADVISE the Minister for Planning that it nominates Mayor Shane Van Styn as the City of Greater Geraldton local government representative on the Mid West/Wheatbelt (Central) Joint Development Assessment Panel: and**
- 2. ADVISE the Minister for Planning that it nominates Councillor Laurie Graham as 1<sup>st</sup> alternate proxy and Cr Steve Douglas as the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternate proxy as the City of Greater Geraldton alternate local government representative**

**CARRIED 14/0**  
**7:36:19 PM**

<b>Mayor Van Styn</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Douglas</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Bylund</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Ellis</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Keemink</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Hall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Critch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Graham</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Tanti</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Reymond</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Mcllwaine</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Freer</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Caudwell</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Cr. Thomas</b>	<b>YES</b>

**REASON FOR VARIATION TO THE EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**  
That Council appoint Cr Laurie Graham has 1<sup>st</sup> alternate proxy, as he was previously the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternate proxy.

**16 REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED****REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED**

<b>AGENDA REFERENCE:</b>	<b>D-15-61626</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE:</b>	<b>K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer</b>
<b>DATE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>9 October 2015</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>GO/6/0012-04</b>
<b>APPLICANT / PROPONENT:</b>	<b>City of Greater Geraldton</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

To receive the Reports of the City of Greater Geraldton.

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:****PART A**

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.22 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to

1. RECEIVE the following appended reports:
  - a. Reports – Community Services
    - i. CS225 – Public Arts Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 3 September 2015
    - ii. CS226 – HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 7 September 2015
    - iii. CS227 – Geraldton Regional Art gallery Committee Meeting Minutes – 16 September 2015
    - iv. CS228 – QEII Seniors & Community Centre Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 16 September 2015
  - b. Reports – Development & Regulatory Services
    - i. DRSD103 – Delegated Determinations

**PART B**

That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Sections 5.13 and 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 RESOLVES to:

1. RECEIVE the following appended reports:
  - a. Reports – Corporate and Commercial Services;
    - i. CCS139 – Audit Committee Meeting Minutes – 6 October 2015
    - ii. CCS140 – Soldiers, Sailors & Airmen Memorial Trust Meeting Minutes – 25 September 2015
    - iii. CCS141 - Confidential Report – List of Accounts Paid Under Delegation September 2015

**PROponent:**

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton

**BACKGROUND:**

Information and items for noting or receiving (i.e. periodic reports, minutes of other meetings) are to be included in an appendix attached to the Council agenda.

Any reports received under this Agenda are considered received only. Any recommendations or proposals contained within the "Reports (including Minutes) to be Received" are not approved or endorsed by Council in any way. Any outcomes or recommendations requiring Council approval must be presented separately to Council as a Report for consideration at an Ordinary Meeting of Council.

**COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:**

Not applicable.

**LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

Not applicable.

**COUNCIL DECISION****MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR HALL****PART A**

**That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.22 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to**

- 1. RECEIVE the following appended reports:**
  - a. Reports – Community Services**
    - i. CS225 – Public Arts Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 3 September 2015**
    - ii. CS226 – HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 7 September 2015**
    - iii. CS227 – Geraldton Regional Art gallery Committee Meeting Minutes – 16 September 2015**
    - iv. CS228 – QEII Seniors & Community Centre Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 16 September 2015**
  - b. Reports – Development & Regulatory Services**
    - i. DRSD103 – Delegated Determinations**

**PART B**

**That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Sections 5.13 and 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 RESOLVES to:**

- 1. RECEIVE the following appended reports:**
  - a. Reports – Corporate and Commercial Services;**
    - i. CCS139 – Audit Committee Meeting Minutes – 6 October 2015**
    - ii. CCS140 – Soldiers, Sailors & Airmen Memorial Trust Meeting Minutes – 25 September 2015**

**iii. CCS141 - Confidential Report – List of Accounts  
Paid Under Delegation September 2015**

**CARRIED 14/0 UNOPPOSED**

*In accordance with Section 9.3 (2) of the City of Greater Geraldton's Meeting Procedures Local Law, February 2012 the motion was passed unopposed.*

*Cr T Thomas and Cr J Critch left Chambers and the meeting at 7.38pm.*

**17 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**18 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**19 URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING**

Nil.

**20 CLOSURE**

There being no further business the Presiding Member closed the Council meeting at 7.39pm.



**APPENDIX 1 – ATTACHMENTS AND REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED**

Attachments and Reports to be Received are available on the City of Greater Geraldton website at: <http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/your-council/meetings>