.

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

MINUTES

24 JULY 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING 2

2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY 2

3 ATTENDANCE 2

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE 3

5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME 6

6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE 14

7 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS 15

8 DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST 15

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING – AS CIRCULATED 15

10 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR 16

11 REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES 18

DCS373 GERALDTON REGIONAL ART GALLERY SCULPTURE 18
DCS374 PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT – URBAN DEVELOPMENT REZONING, SUNSET BEACH 22
DCS375 RFT 25 1718 CLEANING OF PUBLIC ABLUTIONS 30
DCS376 COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CRIME PREVENTION PLAN 33

12 REPORTS OF CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES 37

CCS342 COUNCIL POLICY CP 4.18 LIVE STREAMING OF MEETINGS 37
CCS343 COUNCIL POLICY CP 1.8 COMMUNITY FUNDING PROGRAMS 40
CCS344 STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY TO 30 JUNE 2018 43
CCS345 PROPOSED CHINA DELEGATION SEPTEMBER 2018 46

13 REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES 54

IS175 WHITEHILL ROAD REALIGNMENT SURVEY REPORT 54
IS176 DRUMMOND COVE COASTAL PROTECTION WORKS 62

14 REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO 68

15 REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED 69

JULY - REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED 69

16 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN 71

17 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN 71

18 URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING 71

19 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS 71

20 CLOSURE 71

APPENDIX 1 – ATTACHMENTS AND REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED 72

CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 24 JULY 2018 AT 5.00PM
CHAMBERS, CATHEDRAL AVENUE

M I N U T E S

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 Meeting Procedures Local Laws establish procedures for revocation or recision 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 DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 5pm.

2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

I would like to respectfully acknowledge the Yamatji people who are the Traditional Owners and First People of the land on which we meet/stand. I would like to pay my respects to the Elders past, present and future for they hold the memories, the traditions, the culture and hopes of Yamatji people.

3 ATTENDANCE

Present:
Mayor S Van Styn
Cr G Bylund
Cr D J Caudwell
Cr J Clune
Cr N Colliver
Cr J Critch
Cr S Douglas
Cr S Elphick
Cr R D Hall
Cr S Keemink – *left the meeting at 5.22pm.*
Cr M Reymond
Cr N McIlwaine
Cr T Thomas

Officers:
R McKim, Chief Executive Officer
P Melling, Director of Development & Community Services
B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services
M Dufour, A/Director of Infrastructure Services
S Moulds, PA to the Chief Executive Officer
L Taylor, Administration Officer, Corporate Services

P Radalj, Manager Treasury & Finance, Treasury and Finance
B Robartson, Manager Land and Regulatory Services, Land and Regulatory Services
J Kopplhuber, Communications Officer - Engagement, Economic Development
S Mahoney, Youth Crime Prevention Officer
L Pegler, Executive Support Secretary
E York, Coordinator Gallery and Cultural Development
E Enright, Personal Assistant to Director, Infrastructure Services

Others:
Members of Public: 12
Members of Press: 2

Apologies:
C Lee, Director of Infrastructure Services

Leave of Absence:
Cr L Freer
Cr V Tanti

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Questions taken on notice at the Ordinary Meeting of Council 26 June 2018:

Geoff Barrett, 278 Chapman Road, Beresford 6530

Question
Could you kindly provide the number of vehicles (used privately) supplied to employees at ratepayer expense?

Response
The number of vehicles used privately by City officers is ten (10).

Question
Could you list the makes in 4WD and non 4WD against the classification of the positions in council by the person supplied that position?

Response
Of the ten (10) vehicles used privately, all are 4WD, with the make and classification of position listed below:

Make I model	Directorate	Position
TOYOTA PRADO	Governance	Mayor
TOYOTA PRADO	Governance	CEO
ISUZU MUX WAGON	Development & Community Services	Director Development & Regulatory Services
ISUZU MUX LSY 4X4	Development & Community Services	Manager Libraries & Heritage Services
ISUZU MUX LSU 4X4	Development & Community Services	Manager Land & Regulatory Services
ISUZU MUX - LSU 4X4	Development & Community Services	Manager Urban & Regional Development
ISUZU MUX LSM 4X4	Infrastructure Services	Manager Sport & Leisure
ISUZU MUX LSU 4X4	Infrastructure Services	Manager Maintenance Operations
ISUZU MUX LSU 4X4	Infrastructure Services	Manager Fleet Services
ISUZU MUX LSU 4X4	Infrastructure Services	Manager Project Design & Delivery

Question
What is the number and TOTAL cost (including servicing, fuel and licensing etc) of running the non 4WD vehicles (used privately)?

Response
There are no non-4WD (2wd) vehicles used privately.

Question
What is the number and TOTAL cost (including servicing, fuel, licensing etc) of running the 4WD vehicles (used privately)?

Response
$27,690.16

Question
What is the over-all total cost to ratepayers for council supplied vehicles (used privately).

Response
Overall cost of council supplied vehicles used privately is $27,690.16.

Further to the above, please note that the vehicles with private use are provided to Executives and Managers retained under term contracts. As is the case in the private sector, the City offers a package of benefits to contracted Managers, typically including cash salary, superannuation and private use of a City provided vehicle.

Consistent with better practise in the private sector, the sizing of jobs and the aggregate level of benefits for contracted Manager positions is determined on a role by role basis, using the services of an external specialist private company (Mercer), on the basis of a national employment market database, to ensure that the City is able to attract and retain suitably qualified and experienced management team members. City Executives and Managers have market-based benefit levels, and these are reviewed annually. The market-based approach aims to ensure that the City neither under-pays nor over-pays its management team.

As is also the case in the private sector, inclusion of a vehicle in a package attracts Fringe Benefits Tax payable by the contracted employee. Should a contracted manager elect not to use a City provided vehicle, they are eligible in lieu to receive a vehicle allowance, on which they pay Income Tax. This allowance is excluded from the cash salary level utilised to determine the City's contribution to Superannuation, saving City funds.

As you can see above, not all City Directors and Managers utilise City-provided vehicles, some electing to take the allowance in lieu. Hence the number and type of vehicles will vary over time, and with manager turnover. The type of vehicle, and its equivalent allowance value (used for the purposes of the value to be included within their aggregate benefits package) are determined by reference to a sector-wide standard issued for Local Government in WA by WALGA. In framing the standard, WALGA utilises vehicle data provided by the RAC. The standard *takes* into account the acquisition cost and depreciation expense of a vehicle, its registration and insurance costs, and its operating costs including fuel and tyres. Actual vehicle usage levels are monitored, and the consistent City experience is that vehicles with private use remain well within the parameters used by WALGA in determining the standard.

In summary, the cost to the City is determined by the Value of a private use vehicle under the WALGA vehicle standard. A private use vehicle is available as a benefits package option to contracted managers. Whether or not a contracted manager elects to take a City vehicle, or takes the allowance in lieu, is a matter of personal choice and, as noted, some Directors and Managers elect to take the vehicle allowance, and run their own vehicles for business purposes.

Hence the actual number of private use vehicles makes no difference to the City bottom line and the practice of offering private use vehicles to

contracted managers is long- established in both the private and public sectors. It offers a taxation benefit to the employee, and ultimately saves money for the employer.

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 5.01pm

Karl Proudlove, 226 Place Road, Wonthella, Geraldton 6530
Relates Item to IS175 Whitehill Road Realignment Survey Report

Question
Council are seeking to use funds from the CHRMAP adaptation fund to undertake planning and design of a road that was a preferred outcome of a Survey that issued before the CHRMAP report was submitted. In light of the new findings of this report it is my understanding council are seeking a motion to install GSC groynes on the foreshore as a temporary adaptation measure to mimic, monitor and apply a conclusive solution.

My question to council is,

Why is planning and fund seeking for a temporary/ medium standard road connection design being sort for motion before a permanent negation of erosion is applied or proven when...

- we already have temporary connection at no cost via Hester, Stillwater and or boat Cove or NWCH;
- we are motioning to temporarily monitor GSC groynes to gain a correct, educated and fair outcome; and
- future recreational areas will be affected by this connection after the findings of the GSC groins are made true to give us an indication of where connectivity could be at a premium to all?

Response
Thank you for your question.

The City recognises that this is an important issue for the local community and Council. The City also recognises that local community members have differing views on how the matter should be addressed. Because it is such an important issue, officers have been working through the CHRMAP process and various options as quickly as possible. Usually Councils are criticised for taking too long to act. Hence as soon as the draft CHRMAP report was released, officers felt it was important to also provide options to Council that are in accordance with the document. The two

related Items on this agenda are consistent with the draft CHRMAP report currently out for public comment.

With respect to the Drummond Cove Coastal Management Unit the CHRMAP adaptation pathway for Whitehill Road (Page 11, Table 3.2) recommends a managed retreat that "allows continued use until the asset is no longer safe or structurally sound". The section of Whitehill Road identified in report IS175 is no longer safe or structurally sound and therefore the managed retreat trigger point has been reached.

Accordingly Item IS175 provides a recommendation to proceed with planning and design only for an alternative connection. This is based upon the result of the recent community survey and in line with the managed retreat recommendation.

I am happy to meet with you and discuss this matter in more detail if that is appropriate.

The Mayor allowed Mr Proudlove to ask a supplementary questions as it related to an item listed on the Agenda that was being determined at this meeting.

Supplementary question from Karl Proudlove

Why are we seeking funds for a temporary medium standard road when we already have that connection if we open up Boat Cove, because we are temporarily monitoring some erosion, why not use that road as connection?

Response to supplementary question

It is a complex issue and the reasons are not always straightforward. The City is happy to work through with you the various background. This has been going on for a couple of years to date, and there are various iterations and reason why thing have come up when they have. The road disappeared in 2016. Officers have tried to keep the road closed, but unfortunately it has been unsuccessful. It suggests that locals do want access through there, so we wanted to confirm if access is wanted, and if so, what the options were. What should the park look like; what should the coastal protection look like; and what should the connectivity look like - if there is connectivity at all. They are all intertwined and you have to start somewhere. While the CHRMAP is being progressed, the City has undertaken various coastal protection studies. The City has also been looking at the road options to gauge the community response, via a survey, if they want or don't those options, with the results being presented to Council at this Council meeting. The City has undertaken various studies and looked at road options, and there is a report to Council this evening.

The City has been criticised for being too slow before anything happens. But once the CHRMAP process has concluded a Coastal Policy is developed, with Council deciding on what actions are to be taken on the various sites along the coast. It could be several years before decisions are made. So Council will review the responses at this meeting.

Supplementary question from Karl Proudlove

The survey was put out over a two week period, so it shouldn't take two years to get a result now that people know that the second motion of tonight's proceedings goes through they will know about the sand bag groynes. Would that alter the decision of the road network?

Response to supplementary question
Community sentiment changes over time. The City has undertaken surveys; one in 2014; 2016 with community workshops. Then with the CHRMAP PROCESS we did some more consultation. If Council believe more consultation is required, then that can occur. The City is trying to very hard to gauge the sentiment of the community, and that is why officers are going out on a regular basis seeking feedback.

Question
Through previous email correspondence with the Mayor I am aware of the fact that the upcoming motion to use GSC groins to temporarily negate and monitor erosion to the foreshore in the hope they will mimic permanent rock groins. Permanent or temporary Groynes were not marked in on all connection options of the road connection survey. In light of this fact, Why was the connectivity survey put to the public months before the CHRMAP report was is issued not giving the public all current information about the findings and motions being put forward when the original alignment could most definitely be an option instead of putting plans forward that could possibly ruin homes permanently and have a major affect on how the recreational areas are designed?

Response
Thank you for your question.

The road connectivity survey was undertaken as a priority to address specifically the ongoing requests from the local community to restore connectivity lost in 2016 and ongoing management and expense associated with sand renourishment and management of illegal 4wd access to the foreshore at Whitehill Road. The preferred connectivity option, along with financial considerations and technical requirements will then inform the coastal adaptation options. The community's values with respect to the foreshore were obtained through the recent CHRMAP community survey and workshops and through the 2016 community meeting.

The draft CHRMAP report provides longer term recommended adaptation measures, broken down by Coastal Management Units. The adoption of the CHRMAP report will require Council to develop a Coastal Planning Policy that addresses the issues at Drummond Cove holistically and not just in regards to Whitehill Road.

Question
Through previous email correspondence with the Mayor I am aware that the motion in question is seeking funds to design a road of a 10 year standard road rather than 30 year standard road to keep costs down. In light of this, if council are seeking to have the motion in question to be passed in the intention of keeping the public demands of connectivity, recreational and erosion negation in mind at a low cost, Why is council seeking these funds to design a road that already exists as temporary connectivity when the public answered the survey at the time in only the knowledge of 6 options with no CHRMAP results, not knowing plans for GSC groynes to mimic permanent rock groynes?

Response
The road connectivity survey was undertaken as a priority to address specifically the ongoing requests from the local community to restore connectivity lost in 2016 and ongoing management and expense associated with sand renourishment and management of illegal 4wd access to the foreshore at Whitehill Road. It was also conducted to gauge community sentiment on whether the connectivity should be re-established. 78% of respondents indicated that they are in favour of re-establishing connectivity. Because of this strong indication that the local community would like connectivity returned, officers have placed a report before Council seeking permission to plan and design (not construct) the preferred option. The planning and design of the connectivity will take at least six months to complete at which time Council will have a further opportunity to either proceed or not proceed with the construction of the connectivity.

Should Council endorse the recommendation for the detailed design of option 3, the road will be designed in accordance with the appropriate AusRoads standards.

The options presented in the community survey align with the CHRMAP report currently out for public comment. They are all located behind the 2030 erosion setback line consistent with a managed retreat approach.

Raymon Proudlove, PO Box 2128, Geraldton, WA 6531
Relates to Item IS175 Whitehill Road Realignment Survey Report

Question
The item of the road survey is being debated and decided on tonight before the item of the erosion study. The erosion is the reason we are at this point now with no road access or connectivity. The public have been asked on roads, before knowing what protection measures will be used for the erosion. As the CHRMAP study has now recommended to install 2 geotextile groynes to simulate rock groynes for monitoring purposes over the next 5 – 10 years, would it not be more logical to decide the outcome of erosion control measures before we are to decide on installing new infrastructure that may well be prone to erosion if our erosion measures are of a less than permanent nature?

Response
The two Agenda items refer to two separate issues of equal importance to the community arising from the CHRMAP survey and workshops process. The two issues of equal importance being the road connectivity and the foreshore amenity. Agenda Item IS175 addresses how connectivity can be retained consistent with the draft CHRMAP report currently out for public comment. The adaptation pathway recommended for Whitehill Road (Page 11, Table 3.2) is for a managed retreat. It states “allow continued use until the asset is no longer safe or structurally sound”. The section of Whitehill Road identified in report IS175 is no longer safe or structurally sound and therefore the managed retreat trigger has been met. Agenda item IS176 addresses how beach amenity can be retained. The adaptation pathway for Beaches (Page 11, Table 3.2) is to “build resilience”. The structures are designed to assist in

trapping sand trap to maintain beach amenity only. The draft CHRMAP report provides longer term recommended adaptation measures, broken down by Coastal Management Units. The adoption of the CHRMAP report, will require Council to develop a Coastal Planning Policy that addresses the issues at Drummond Cove holistically and not just in regards to Whitehill Road.

I am happy to meet with you and discuss this matters in more detail if that is appropriate.

Question

With the CHRMAP study recommendation of 2 geotextile groynes being placed down to simulate rock groynes which is a temporary measure, and if successful would be replaced by permanent rock groynes, the public has been asked to provide feedback via the road survey well before this study findings were released. The survey cited on its cover page that reinstalment of Whitehill Road was not an option due to cost and loss of beach amenity. However if the groynes are a success and become a permanent fix to the erosion, then Whitehill road can be reinstated. With the recommendation of a temporary solution for monitoring purposes, why is council being asked to spend vital funds on a permanent road, which can be delivered also in temporary form for connectivity until permanent erosion measures are sorted, when there is no guarantee that new infrastructure won't be under threat in the future?

Response

The GSC groynes presented in Agenda Item IS176 are consistent with the CHRMAP adaptation pathway for Beaches (Page 11, Table 3.2) which is to "build resilience". The structures are designed to assist in trapping sand to maintain foreshore amenity only and are insufficient to provide the required levels of protection for a road asset. To retain Whitehill road on its current alignment would require $2-3M worth of rock revetment type protection which is inconsistent with the CHRMAP report adaptation pathway for managed retreat and retaining foreshore amenity.

The Mayor allowed a supplementary question as the third question provided was similar to Karl Proudlove's third question, which has been answered as per above.

Supplementary question from Raymon Proudlove

With the new infrastructure that is being put forward for a brand new road, there is no guarantee that it won't get washed away as well in the process, as the erosion measures are only temporary or not permanent.

Response to supplementary question

That is correct. It depends on the horizons and timelines you are viewing. On the City's website there are different reports. There is a 2030; 2070 and 2100 timeline.

If predictions come true and the sea level rises, that coastal erosion will continue to move back, so when you say it will be permanent solution or not, it is a difficult question to respond to. The sandbags that we are proposing to

put down there are the same design as the ones at Rundell Park, Kempton Street. They are designed to slow up the erosion, to monitor impacts and see if works. The Studies show that to do a more permanent solution the City will have to find a significant amount of money and source funding options, which to date the City has been unsuccessful in securing. The aim of the bags is to slow erosion down while the City investigates other funding sources; other solutions; or to give Council time to make a decision on how they want to implement the CHRMAP report. The sandbags are only there to slow erosion down.

Cr Keemink left Chambers and the meeting at 5.22pm.

Max Correy, PO Box 202, Geraldton WA6531

Question

Can you please advise of the cost of the Geo-Tech Report done in early 2015 which resulted in the site being rendered too contaminated to proceed with the residential subdivision and with the resultant Council decision to rescind the subdivision plan and in turn develop the area as parkland?

Response

Thank you for your question Mr Correy.

Within the minutes of this meeting I will provide an extract from the Special Elector's meeting which details the Olive Street project expenditures. I would also refer you to the council website which provides all of the previous council reports on the project.

Your question is difficult to answer because the Council decision not to proceed with the residential development was made as a result of various reports, not just one piece of information. Officers have offered to meet with you to discuss this project in detail to ensure we provide you with an appropriate response.

Please refer to Page 56-57 of the Special Meeting of Electors minutes of 11 June 2018.

Website Link: https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/council-meetings/special-meeting-of-electors-monday-11-june-2018-5.30pm-at-the-queens-park-theatre/139

Extract from the Minutes

8.5 Matter Taken on Notice – Olive Street Project

Details of project costs were provided in the initial response at the meeting, as noted in the minute above. A further breakdown of Project costs is as follows:

2011/12 - $24,166

Greg Rowe & Associates (Project planning, scheme amendment and subdivision) - $19,783.

Emerge Associates – (Landscape Masterplan) - $750.

WAPC – (Subdivision application) - $3,633.

2012/13 - $743,277

GHD PL - (Hydrological & engineering services – Stormwater Harvesting Phase) - $167,640.

GHD PL - (Site investigations & project engineering management) - $281,302.

Bactec SE PL – (UXO investigations) - $10,670.

Blacktop Material Engineering PL – (Soil sample analysis) - $2,490.

Prime Property Valuations - $5,500.

WBHO Civil PL – (site investigations) - $32,483.

Fauna for the Future (relocation of fauna) - $5,000.

Arnelle Enterprises PL – (Erection of fencing) - $34,091.

Market Creations – (website development) - $6,370.

Quantum Surveys – (Site survey subdivision & volumetric surveys) - $27,630.

Environmental Resources Management Australia PL – (Environmental auditor) - $15,057.

Geraldton Newspapers/Midwest Times – (Notices & media releases) - $263.

Greg Rowe & Associates (Project planning, scheme amendment and subdivision) - $154,781.

2013/14 - $373,295

GHD PL - (Hydrological & engineering) - $36,057.

GHD PL – (Site investigations & project engineering management) - $234,270.

Greg Rowe & Associates (Project planning, and subdivision) - $42,022.

Environmental Resources Management Australia PL – (Environmental auditor) - $4,874.

Market Creations (website hosting) - $300.

Arnelle Enterprises PL – (fencing repair) - $1,786.

WBHO Civil PL – (site investigations) - $53,986.

2014/15- $138,096

Greg Rowe & Associates – (subdivision amendment modelling, planning) - $22,208.

GHD PL – (revised subdivision review) - $29,286.

Western Power (Networks designs fees) – 2,950.

Environmental Resources Management Australia PL – (Environmental auditor) - 5,172.

Pact Management Services – (site investigations, design & wetlands project) $24,990.

Activewest Real Estate – (agency engagement costs) - $11,300.

GHD PL – (Integrated Project Management Plan, Detailed Site Investigation Report, Remediation Action Plan, Site Management Plan and Residential Lots review) - $42,190.

The Mayor gave notice that he would extend Public Question Time, as per Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011 Section 9.

Vic Sekuloff, 3 Wave Crest Circle, Drummond Cove

Mr Sekuloff was in attendance at the meeting but asked another member of the gallery to read his questions on his behalf, which the Mayor approved.

Question

The City, before & during the 'connectivity' survey, engaged surveyors to survey the drainage system along Whitehill Rd North & later to carry out surveying along Estuary Place. Is this because the City had already made up its mind about the location of the proposed 'new road' and the opening of Estuary Place?

Response

No. The City has not made a decision on whether it will or will not connect the road. This will be determined by Council at this Council meeting [IS175].

Question

Now that the CHRMAP study has been released and the recommendation is to install 2 geo textile groynes then 'what and see what happens'. The cost of the groynes is about $200,000, the cost of the City's preferred 'new road' is about $500,000. Instead of wasting $500,000 on a road that no home owners or property owners along the West side of Wave Crest Circle want place on front of their bedroom window or back yard why isn't this money used to install the groynes and to cover the costs of sand replenishment or rock wall which may still be required?

Response

The City is investigating road connectivity because of local community approaches to the Council regarding the desire to have road connectivity re-established. It is noted that it has a larger impact to the properties directly adjacent the various options, but the reason why we are looking at the road is because the feedback we receive from the community is that they would like connectivity established. The Survey feedback was that 78% said they would like connectivity re-established.

Question

Home owners along the West side of Wave Crest Circle and along Estuary Place have over many years sent a large quantity of photos of the HOONS carrying out illegal activities directly outside our homes in their pursuit to get to the North car park (these activities occur any hour of the day AND NIGHT!!

These photos & messages have been regularly sent to all councillors and & Mayor. The City has all but stopped this activity by the erection of barriers. If the City is to install a 'shortcut' for these HOONS then they are condoning the illegal and dangerous act. Who will accept responsibility if there is an increase injuries or fatalities as a result of the increase in these activities.

Response
Roads are provided by council to be used in a lawful manner. The enforcement of the road rules is a police activity. If members of the community are using the roads illegally the police have the option to change that. The responsibility for any accidents or injuries is a matter for the Courts. But if you are using a road illegally in an unlicensed vehicle, the responsibility would rest highly with the person that undertakes the illegal act.

Public question time concluded at 5.31pm.

6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Existing Approved Leave

Councillor	From	To (inclusive)	Date Approved
Cr L Freer	2 July 2018	5 August 2018	22/5/2018
Cr V Tanti	19 July 2018	10 August 2018	26/6/2018
Cr R Hall	17 August 2018	23 October 2018	24/4/2018
Cr T Thomas	20 August 2018	19 September 2018	26/6/2018
Cr S Douglas	31 August 2018	5 October 2018	19/12/2018
Cr S Elphick	4 September 2018	4 September 2018	22/5/2018
Cr N McIlwaine	16 November 2018	30 November 2018	23/1/2018

**Note: If Elected Members' application for leave of absence is for the meeting that the request is submitted, they will be noted as an apology until Council consider the request. The granting of the leave, or refusal to grant the leave and reasons for that refusal, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting*

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR CAUDWELL, SECONDED CR HALL
Cr R Hall requests leave of absence for the period 26 July 2018 to 3 August 2018.

Cr G Bylund requests leave of absence for the period 17 August 2018 to 26 August 2018.

Cr G Bylund requests leave of absence for the period 1 September 2018 to 9 September 2018.

Cr G Bylund requests leave of absence for the period 4 October 2018 to 15 October 2018.

Cr G Bylund requests leave of absence for the period 2 November 2018 to 12 November 2018.

CARRIED 12/0

In accordance with Section 9.3 (2) of the City of Greater Geraldton's Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011, the motion was passed unopposed.

7 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS

Nil

8 DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services, declared a direct financial interest in Item CCS345 Proposed China Delegation September 2018 as his wife, a City of Greater Geraldton employee, is attending the proposed trip as the delegation coordinator and interpreter.

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING – as circulated

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 26 June 2018, as previously circulated, be adopted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR REYMOND
RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 26 June 2018, as previously circulated, be adopted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

CARRIED 12/0

In accordance with Section 9.3 (2) of the City of Greater Geraldton's Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011, the motion was passed unopposed.

10 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Events attended by the Mayor or his representative

DATE	FUNCTION	REPRESENTATIVE
27 June 2018	Launch of the City of Greater Geraldton Budget for 2018-19	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 June 2018	Spirit Radio Interview – Outcomes of Council Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
28 June 2018	ABC Interview – RUAH Community Services Residential Facility	Mayor Shane Van Styn
28 June 2018	Greater Geraldton Sporting Achievement Grant – Presentation of Awards	Cr Graeme Bylund
28 June 2018	Wards and Representation – Public Meeting in Mullewa	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 June 2018	Brockman Group - Introduction	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 June 2018	Knit Wit Group Open Day	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 June 2018	Mid West Development Commission (MWDC) Board Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 June 2018	Budget Wrap Up & Update – Geraldton Property Team	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 June 2018	Art Exhibition – The Gerald	Mayor Shane Van Styn
30 June 2018	West Australian Football League (WAFL) VIP Luncheon	Mayor Shane Van Styn
30 June 2018	Geraldton Volunteer Marine Rescue 30 Year Anniversary	Mayor Shane Van Styn
1 July 2018	Radio Mama Interview – Local Matters	Mayor Shane Van Styn
1 July 2018	Geraldton Harriers RunFest and Marathon 2018	Mayor Shane Van Styn
2 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
2 July 2018	Seniors Bowls	Mayor Shane Van Styn
2 July 2018	Citizenship Ceremony	Mayor Shane Van Styn
2 July 2018	Regular Meeting with Local Member – Hon. Laurie Graham MLC, Member for the Agricultural Region	Mayor Shane Van Styn
2 July 2018	Master Builders Western Australia – Introduction to New Chief Executive Officer	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Meeting with Shadow Minister for Local Government Tony Krsticevic & Ian Blayney MLA – Matters in Common	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Verification of International Pension Documents – Ferdinand Frank	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Werner Weber – Drummond Cove Building Permits	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Beresford Update	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Activ Geraldton City to Surf 2018 – Media Promotion	Mayor Shane Van Styn
3 July 2018	Concept Forum	Mayor Shane Van Styn
6 July 2018	Geraldton Airport Expansion – Media Call	Mayor Shane Van Styn
7 July 2018	Geraldton Combined Equestrian Club Show Jumping Classic – Presentation of Awards	Mayor Shane Van Styn
9 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn

10 July 2018	North Midlands Project 'The Exchange' & Meeting with Carnamah Chief Executive Officer	Mayor Shane Van Styn
11 July 2018	Bundiyarra NAIDOC Week Celebrations	Cr Natasha Colliver
13 July 2018	Geraldton Building Services & Cabinets – Introduction	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 July 2018	Maitland Park and the Botanical Garden Showcase – Friends of Geraldton Gardens (FROGGS)	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 July 2018	Lot 601 – Update with Stakeholders	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 July 2018	Activ Disability Services & Support – Photography Project	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 July 2018	Geraldton Youth Assistance Proposal	Mayor Shane Van Styn
14 July 2018	ABC Radio Interview	Mayor Shane Van Styn
14 July 2018	Rotary Club of Geraldton Greenough Change Over Evening	Mayor Shane Van Styn
15 July 2018	Radio Mama Interview – Local Matters	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 July 2018	Progress Midwest Monthly Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 July 2018	Geraldton Rugby – Discussion	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 July 2018	Southgates – Future Zoning Discussion	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 July 2018	Regional Capitals Australia – Board Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 July 2018	Regular Meeting with Local Members Hon. Colin de Grussa MLC and Hon. Martin Aldridge MLC – Local & Regional Matters	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 July 2018	Agenda Forum	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 July 2018	Meeting with the Commissioner of Police – Local Issues	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 July 2018	Abrolhos Tourism - Glass Bottom Boat Launch – Media Call	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 July 2018	WA Industry Link Regional Roadshow - Mid West Sundowner with Hon. Allanah MacTiernan	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 July 2018	Junior Rugby Sporting Event & Meeting with Rugby WA Chief Executive Officer	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 July 2018	Community Nursery Plant Sale	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 July 2018	Fire & Rescue Service Captains Dinner	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 July 2018	Regular Catch up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 July 2018	Regular Meeting with Local Member – Hon. Laurie Graham MLC, Member for the Agricultural Region	Mayor Shane Van Styn
24 July 2018	Ordinary Meeting of Council	Mayor Shane Van Styn

11 REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

DCS373 GERALDTON REGIONAL ART GALLERY SCULPTURE	
AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-052103**
AUTHOR:	**S Smith, Manager Community and Cultural Development**
EXECUTIVE:	**P Melling, Director Development and Community Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**15 June 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**RC/3/0006-02 & GO/6/0013**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x4) Confidential** **A. Confidential – Design Concept** **B. Confidential – Design Concept** **C. Confidential – Risk and Mitigation Factors** **D. Confidential – Risk and Mitigation Factors**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to commission an artist, from the two shortlisted artists, as per the attached confidential design submissions, to produce a sculpture that will be located at the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery.

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

1. CONSIDER the two concept designs submitted by the shortlisted artists;
2. ENDORSE *{to be determined by Council}* as the preferred design for the sculpture; and
3. COMMISSION *{to be determined by Council}* as the preferred artist to undertake the fabrication and installation of the sculpture at the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 27 February 2018, Council resolved to support expenditure of up to $80,000 (from existing budget 2017-18) for the proposed Gallery Sculpture. The $80,000 allocated to this project includes a $30,000 art contribution from Megara Pty Ltd from their development on North West Coastal Highway/ Eastward Road, Wonthella.

Following this, the City invited Expressions of Interest (EOI) from artists to create a large sculptural work to be located at the Gallery - on the grassed area on Durlacher Street. It was required that the work be site specific and suitable for general audiences. The selected work should demonstrate artistic excellence and be delivered at a high standard. The work is to reference the

building and its place within the community, its historic and/or contemporary purpose.

The City received 26 EOI's. A selection panel consisting of Mayor Shane Van Styn, Cr Michael Reymond, Professor Ted Snell (UWA) and the Coordinator Gallery and Cultural Development shortlisted two artists to prepare a thorough concept design. The selected artist's names were provided to Councillors.

The artists provided an overview of these concepts at the Concept Forum on the 5 June 2018 and there was an opportunity for Councillors to ask questions. It was agreed a final decision for the preferred design would be made by Council at the July 2018 Ordinary Meeting of Council. The two shortlisted design concepts are attached as Confidential Attachment Nos. DCS373A and DCS373B.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
A prominent sculpture, located outside the Heritage listed Geraldton Regional Art Gallery and former Town Hall, will become a landmark and contribute to the Geraldton community's sense of place. It will enhance the building which is already valued for its cultural and social associations.

Public art of this nature can enhance and complement our environments, bring communities together, offer social and educational opportunities and promote tourism (Iles, B. *CGG Public Art Strategy* 2016 – 2020 p.9).

Environment:
There are no adverse environmental impacts.

Economy:
The installation of a sculpture at the Gallery has the potential to attract increased visitation to the area by local people as well as visitors. This could also create economic opportunities for local businesses.

Governance:
There are no adverse governance impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
A Schematic Masterplan Report for the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery, endorsed by Council in February 2012 stated:

> "The intersection of Durlacher Street and Chapman Road provides a prominent location for a commissioned art piece/sculpture to be installed, reflective of the gallery's collections". (Philip Griffiths Architects, 2011 *Schematic Masterplan Report for the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery,* p.13).

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
The artists presented design submissions to Councillors at the June 2018 Concept Forum. Concept designs have been circulated to the Geraldton Regional Art Management Committee.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
The City's Pubic Arts Strategy has a guiding principle that: "The City and its public art partners will develop high quality public art in key tourism locations" and advocates that there should be public art marker sites such as Durlacher Street and Chapman Road.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
Funds have been allocated for the sculpture from the Capital Expenditure (Public Art) budget.

There are no further foreseeable adverse budget implications. Both concept designs have minimal maintenance requirements and an approximate life span of 20 years.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Community	**1.1 Our Heritage and the Arts**
Strategy 1.1.1	Recording, recognising and preserving our social, environmental and built heritage.
Strategy 1.1.3	Facilitating engagement in the arts in all its forms.
Title: Community	**1.5 Recognise, value and support everyone**
Strategy 1.5.4	Supporting initiatives that enhance education and learning opportunities for all community members.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
As a Regional Gallery, it is important that Geraldton sets a high standard. The sculpture will add to the Gallery's reputation as a leading cultural institution.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
There is a risk that there could be negative community feedback in the choice of the design. To minimise this risk it is advised Council consider the local community when selecting the final design. The artwork should appeal to the general public, demonstrate artistic excellence and be delivered at a high standard and act on an iconic feature to lead the community into the gallery.

Confidential Attachment Nos. DCS373C and DCS373D address the risk concern at an executive level relating to the possibility of people climbing on/ up the sculptures. The artists were asked to comment on this aspect and the feedback received is contained in the attachments. A further requirement specified in the EOI is that the sculpture work/installation needs to be structurally certified.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
An option exists to not accept any design and not proceed with any artistic work at this location. This option is not supported as a vibrant City Centre extends beyond just providing roads and footpaths. Councillors would be aware that a driver for activating spaces is via a public art component. The City's Art Gallery is located on a key intersection, but unfortunately lacks a focussing identity which an iconic public art work would deliver at this location.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR MCILWAINE, SECONDED CR REYMOND
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **CONSIDER the two concept designs submitted by the shortlisted artists;**
2. **ENDORSE Protected Memory as the preferred design for the sculpture; and**
3. **COMMISSION April Pine as the preferred artist to undertake the fabrication and installation of the sculpture at the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery.**

CARRIED 9/3
Time: 5:51 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 3
Yes Votes: 9

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	NO
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	NO
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	NO
Mayor Van Styn	YES

DCS374 PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT – URBAN DEVELOPMENT REZONING, SUNSET BEACH

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-052796**
AUTHOR:	**K Elder, Coordinator Strategic Planning**
EXECUTIVE:	**P Melling, Director Development and Community Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**28 June 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**LP/14/0006**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x1)** **Scheme Amendment Report**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
An application has been received to initiate a Local Planning Scheme Amendment ('amendment') to rezone Lot 2349 North West Coastal Highway (Reserve 27953) from 'Public Open Space' local scheme reserve to the 'Urban Development' zone.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to initiate the amendment and determine that the rezoning is a 'standard' amendment.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

Part A:
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to *Part 5, Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005* RESOLVES to:

1. AMEND Local Planning Scheme No. 1 by rezoning Lot 2349 North West Coastal Highway (Reserve 27953) from 'Public Open Space' local scheme reserve to the 'Urban Development' zone.

Part B:
That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Part 5, Division 1, Regulation 35 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* RESOLVES to:

1. DETERMINE that the rezoning is a 'standard' amendment.
2. MAKES the determination on the following grounds:
   a. The amendment would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not the subject of the amendment,
   b. The amendment is consistent with a local planning strategy for the scheme that has been endorsed by the Commission; and
   c. The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts in the scheme area.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is Town Planning Innovations on behalf of LandCorp, who act on behalf of the State of Western Australia.

BACKGROUND:
The subject land is Lot 2349 North West Coastal Highway, Sunset Beach also identified as Crown Reserve 27953 which is vested with the City for the purposes of 'recreation'. Lot 2349 is 4.58ha in area, and while there are numerous existing shrubs and mature trees on-site the lot is not established as a formal park.

The Lot is bound to the east by North West Coastal Highway, to the west by existing residential development, to the south by the Chapman River Wildlife Corridor and to the north by Public Open Space area being Reserve 31961, which is the area used by the Spalding Horse and Pony Club.

Lot 2349 is reserved 'Public Open Space' under Local Planning Scheme No 1 ('the Scheme') and the amendment proposes to rezone it to the 'Urban Development' zone.

The applicant has provided the following comments with regard to the proposed amendment:

- The land has been identified as surplus to City's and State Government's requirements.
- The highest and best use for the surplus asset was subsequently considered by the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage's (DPLH) land divestment function, in the context of the adjoining land uses and development.
- The potential highest and best use was identified as disposal via the open market for future residential development.
- Accordingly, the existing 'Public Open Space' reservation over the site is no longer suitable.
- The purpose of this amendment is to establish a suitable zoning over the land, to ensure adequate development, subdivision and land use controls are in place prior to the land being offered for sale.
- The site offers unique future development opportunities in the heart of Sunset Beach and a Structure Plan will assist in achieving the revitalisation of this area.

A copy of the scheme amendment report is included as Attachment No. DCS374A.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
There are no adverse community impacts.

Environment:
As part of the amendment process, and prior to public advertising, the Environmental Protection Authority is required to assess the amendment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.

Economy:
The amendment is proposed to facilitate the development of 4.85ha of land for future residential use.

Governance:
There are no adverse governance impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
The author is not aware of any relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
Should Council initiate the amendment it is required to be publicly advertised for a period of not less than 42 days in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

There has been no Councillor consultation however, at the conclusion of public advertising period the matter must be presented back to Council which will include a schedule of submissions received. A resolution must then be passed to either support the amendment (with or without modification) or not support the amendment.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Planning and Development Act 2005:
Part 5, Section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* provides for a local government to amend a local planning scheme.

Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015:
Part 5, Division 1, Regulation 35 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* requires that the local government resolution must specify whether, in the opinion of the local government the amendment is a basic, standard or complex amendment.

In essence a 'basic' amendment is one that corrects an administrative error in the scheme or rectifies a zoning anomaly.

A 'standard' amendment is one that is consistent with a local planning strategy, would have minimal impact on land in the area and does not result in any significant impacts on the land.

A 'complex' amendment is one that is not consistent with a local planning strategy and is of a scale that will have an impact that is significant relative to the development in the locality.

This amendment is considered to be a 'standard' amendment under the above criteria.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Scheme No. 1:
The subject land is currently zoned 'Public Open Space' local scheme reserve under Local Planning Scheme No. 1 and the amendment proposes to rezone the land to 'Urban Development'.

The objectives of the 'Urban Development' zone are to:

(a) identify areas that require comprehensive planning in order to provide for the coordination of subdivision, land use and development.
(b) provide a basis for more detailed structure planning in accordance with the provisions of this Scheme.

If rezoned to 'Urban Development' zone the City will be unable to support the future subdivision or development of the land without a Structure Plan being prepared and endorsed.

The preparation of a structure plan is considered warranted in this area given that there are a number of issues which are required to be addressed. These include, bushfire management, local water management, impacts of noise and vibration from North West Coastal Highway and the design of an appropriate interface between proposed residential area and the Chapman River Wildlife Corridor.

Structure planning will also allow for a flexible approach to be taken to design so that the future subdivision can provide an appropriate interface with existing residential development and provide a variation of densities which supports the location in close proximity to a commercial activity centre.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial or resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	**4.2 Planning and Policy**
Strategy 4.2.2	Responding to community aspirations by providing planning and zoning for future development.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

Geraldton Regional Plan (1999) and the Greater Geraldton Structure Plan Update (2011):
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. The subject land is identified as 'regional park, recreation and conservation'.

In the time since these documents were prepared the City has completed a number of strategies which provide a more up-to-date projection of growth and development within Greater Geraldton.

Local Planning Strategy (2015):
The Strategy represents the land use planning response to the City's strategic community vision based on an aspirational population of 100,000. The Strategy will guide long-term land use planning and provide the rationale for land use and development controls.

The subject lot is identified as 'Urban' on the Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan and is located in close proximity to the Sunset Beach neighbourhood centre. The Strategy includes a number of strategies for residential development including:

- Consolidate housing activity by encouraging development in existing (or identified) residential areas.
- Ensure residential densities support activity centres to optimise use of existing and planned facilities and services and more sustainable transport modes.

The amendment is consistent with the Strategy given that the 'Urban Development' zone will facilitate future residential development but that the requirements for structure planning will ensure that the design and density of development is appropriate for its location close to a neighbourhood centre.

Commercial Activities Centres Strategy (2013):
This Strategy provides a strategic planning framework for managing future growth in commercial activity by providing performance-based criteria for commercial centres. The Strategy informs the City and proponents of the potential scale for future retail and commercial development in existing and planned activity centres.

Lot 2349 is located approximately 250m south of the Sunset Beach neighbourhood centre which is identified in the Strategy as being a Status 1 centre.

Neighbourhood centres have a greater focus on servicing the daily and weekly household shopping needs of residents and providing community facilities and a small range of other convenience services. Their relatively small scale and catchment enables them to have a greater local community focus and provide services, facilities and job opportunities that reflect the particular needs of their catchment.

The amendment is considered consistent with the Strategy as it will facilitate future residential subdivision and development within the catchment of a neighbourhood centre.

Public Open Space Strategy (2015)
The Public Open Space Strategy was adopted by the City in November 2014 and endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission in May 2015. It provides a comprehensive strategic vision and framework to assess community needs and to guide future public open space provision for the next 20 years and beyond.

An objective of the Strategy was to provide recommendations on opportunities regarding consolidation of public open space through land acquisition, land disposal and/or land exchanges.

In preparing the Strategy an audit was undertaken in order to provide a snapshot of the current provision of public open space in each locality to identify; over or under supply of spaces, their distribution, role and servicing. In doing so, Lot 2349 and Reserve 31961 (Spalding Horse and Pony Club) were identified as 'residual'.

With the deduction of these areas the Sunset Beach locality still maintains a public open space requirement of 9.82% or 11.8ha. This calculation does not include foreshore reserves in the locality.

Furthermore, as part of the redevelopment of Lot 2349 a 10% public open space contribution will be required. The appropriate location for this open space will be determined as part of future structure planning.

Precinct Plan - Sunset Beach Local Planning Policy

The 'Precinct Plan – Sunset Beach' Local Planning Policy was adopted by Council 28 October 2014 as a response to the outcomes of the '2029 and Beyond: Designing our City' project. The area was identified for precinct planning in order to identify and guide improvements required for it to attract renewal investment and secure its future.

The Precinct area is based on a 400 metre walkable catchment around the Sunset Beach neighbourhood centre and includes Lot 2349. Three scenarios were examined and the policy identifies Scenario 3 as the preferred precinct plan, with some additions.

Lot 2349 is shown in the preferred scenario as having potential for new residential lots and quality open space. The plan also identifies a north south road and pedestrian links through the reserve with quality tree lined streetscapes which improved pedestrian access to both the river and the coast.

The proposed amendment is consistent with the preferred plan for the Sunset Beach precinct.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

There are no inherent risks to the City in initiating the amendment.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

It is considered that the amendment is consistent with the overall strategic planning framework outlined by the Local Planning Strategy, Commercial Activity Centres Strategy and the Public Open Space Strategy.

The land has been identified as surplus to the Government's requirements and disposal via the open market for future residential development is considered the highest and best use of the site.

The 'Urban Development' zone will require structure planning to be undertaken which will ensure development is appropriately designed for the location and be guided by the Precinct Plan for Sunset Beach. The option to refuse is therefore not supported.

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

An option exists for Council to not initiate the amendment on the basis that the City sees value in retaining the land as open space. This is on the basis that since the Public Open Space Strategy was adopted, the Spalding Park area has been further developed and options for further facilities into the future will potentially need additional land to be available. This option is not supported as the request to initiate the amendment is consistent with Council's existing policy provisions.

B Davis left Chambers at 5.51pm.

B Davis returned to Chambers at 5.53pm.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR REYMOND, SECONDED CR DOUGLAS
Part A:
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to *Part 5, Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005* RESOLVES to:

1. **AMEND Local Planning Scheme No. 1 by rezoning Lot 2349 North West Coastal Highway (Reserve 27953) from 'Public Open Space' local scheme reserve to the 'Urban Development' zone.**

Part B:
That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Part 5, Division 1, Regulation 35 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* RESOLVES to:

1. **DETERMINE that the rezoning is a 'standard' amendment.**
2. **MAKES the determination on the following grounds:**
   a. **The amendment would have minimal impact on land in the scheme area that is not the subject of the amendment,**
   b. **The amendment is consistent with a local planning strategy for the scheme that has been endorsed by the Commission; and**
   c. **The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts in the scheme area.**

CARRIED 11/1
Time: 5:56 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 1
Yes Votes: 11

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	NO
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	YES
Mayor Van Styn	YES

DCS375 RFT 25 1718 CLEANING OF PUBLIC ABLUTIONS

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-053247**
AUTHOR:	**J Featherby, Property and Maintenance Officer**
EXECUTIVE:	**P Melling, Director Development and Community Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**4 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**GO/6/0013**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x2) Confidential** **A. Confidential Evaluation Report** **B. Confidential Evaluation Spreadsheet**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to award RFT 25 1718 Cleaning of Public Ablutions to the preferred tenderer.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. AWARD the contract RFT 25 1718, Cleaning of Public Ablutions to the preferred tenderer; and
2. RECORD the estimated contract value in the minutes.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
This tender is for the cleaning of public ablution blocks throughout the City (with the exception of Mullewa). The Principal is seeking a contractor to provide cleaning services on a daily basis according to the intervals provided in the tender document.

The general objectives of this contract are that the Contractor:

a. Provides a professional and experienced cleaning service to the satisfaction of the Principal;
b. Provides a cost effective cleaning service in a safe and environmentally responsible manner;
c. Assists the Principal to maintain its assets in a functional, safe and aesthetically acceptable manner to the satisfaction of the community in general; and
d. Cleans all assets in a manner to enhance and maximise the life of these assets.

The whole of this service must be executed to the satisfaction of the Principal in strict accordance with this specification, the General Conditions of Contract and any other documents forming part of the contract.

The Contractor must provide a level of service that ensures the requirements of the specification will be met at all times to ensure that each of the nominated sites is provided with the level of service specified.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
The Community expects the City to provide clean and sanitary public facilities in the CBD, parks and other areas where public ablutions are provided.

Environment:
There are no adverse environmental impacts.

Economy:
The successful tenderer employs local people and use local suppliers which has a positive impact on the community. Establishing a contract with set rates also provides the City with best value for money.

Governance:
There are no adverse governance impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
The City periodically calls for tenders from suitably qualified contractors for provision of goods and services.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
No community or Councillor consultation has occurred.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
The RFT was conducted in compliance with Council's Procurement of Goods and Services policy (CP010).

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
The tendered amounts are within the City's building operations budget.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	**4.4 Financial Sustainability and Performance**
Strategy 4.4.1	Preparing and implementing short to long term financial plans.
Strategy 4.4.3	Delivering and ensuring business systems and services support cost effective Council operations and service delivery.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
Lack of formal service contract may place the City in breach for non-compliance regarding procurement requirements to a value exceeding $150,000 (ex GST).

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
There were no alternative options considered by City Officers. Requesting services on an ad hoc basis does not provide, represent or deliver best value to the City.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR REYMOND, SECONDED CR HALL
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **AWARD the contract RFT 25 1718, Cleaning of Public Ablutions to the preferred tenderer being Hot Cleaning; and**
2. **RECORD the estimated contract value in the minutes being $221,634.96 per annum excluding GST.**

CARRIED 12/0
Time: 5:58 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 0
Yes Votes: 12

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	YES
Mayor Van Styn	YES

DCS376 COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CRIME PREVENTION PLAN

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-053152**
AUTHOR:	**S Smith, Manager Community and Cultural Development**
EXECUTIVE:	**P Melling, Director Development and Community Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**5 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**CS/6/0008-02**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x1)** **Draft Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of the draft Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan.

This updated document complements the strategies outlined in the Community Strategic Plan 2017-2027. It ensures that the relevant activities beneficial to increasing community safety are available and accessible. It will guide the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Committee in their decision making process regarding the implementation or recommendation towards community safety initiatives and the expansion or discontinuation of current initiatives.

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

1. ENDORSE The Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan; and
2. REQUEST that the plan is updated biennially.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
The City has long recognised that crime and the perception of crime has a negative effect on the community, and that local Government authorities have a role to encourage collaboration to investigate the nature of crime and how best to provide localised solutions.

Addressing the issue of crime is the responsibility of each and every community member. To this end, the City is in the position to be involved at grass roots level in raising awareness about crime prevention.

A Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan for the former City of Geraldton, former Shire of Greenough and Shire of Chapman Valley was adopted by all Councils in 2004. This was updated to Greater Geraldton Plan in 2007, and revised again in 2012. The Plan stipulates that the City will host

the Greater Geraldton Crime Prevention Committee, which is the overarching Committee for Crime Prevention in the City.
One of the actions of the U-Turn Crime Prevention Project is to update the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan (2012).

The revised plan will assist the Committee in maintaining a collective focus that makes the best use of resources and networks to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
Strong engagement with all stakeholders in the development of strategies to prevent crime and reduce the incidents of crime is vital in providing a safe environment for the community.

Environment:
Crime Prevention through Environmental Design and Management (CPTEDM) is a multi-disciplinary approach to reducing and deterring criminal behaviour through the design and management of environments. It involves applying a range of designing principles to a site to minimise the potential for that site to facilitate and support criminal behaviour.

Economy:
Crime, vandalism and anti-social behaviour create a negative economic impact given the funds required to replace and repair damaged property, to restore order and improve safety.

Governance:
There are no adverse governance impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
There have been several iterations of Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plans over past years, with a Committee consisting of representatives from various agencies and community organisations meeting to address issues highlighted in the plans.

In a bid to update the 2012 plan, crime prevention forums were facilitated by the City, with the support of the Office of Crime Prevention, in 2015. The forums identified priority strategies. However, due to restructures in the City and changing roles, the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan was not progressed. One of the actions of the U-Turn Crime Prevention Project (2016) was to update the 2012 Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
The Youth Crime Prevention Officer has consulted with representatives of the Community Safety Crime Prevention Committee, Coordinator Youth Development, WA Police OIC Geraldton, Coordinator Ranger Services and other human services agencies to develop this plan. The draft plan has been

presented to the Executive Management Team and to the July Council Concept Forum.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
There are no legislative or policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
Two resourcing levels have been identified in the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan.

1. Initiatives which can be undertaken within staff resources and existing budget lines; and
2. For initiatives which will require additional external funding, grants and other agencies assistance will be sought.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Community	**1.3 Community Health and Safety**
Strategy 1.3.4	Encouraging initiatives to improve community safety.
Title: Community	**1.5 Recognise, value and support everyone**
Strategy 1.5.1	Supporting and strengthening community groups, organisations and volunteer services.
Strategy 1.5.2	Supporting young people to develop the skills to make valuable contributions to their communities.
Strategy 1.5.3	Providing community services and programs that support people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds.
Strategy 1.5.4	Supporting initiatives that enhance education and learning opportunities for all community members.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
The adoption of the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan will set an example for other towns in the Mid West Region.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
This plan will act as a guide to the future development and adoption of crime prevention and community safety initiatives. It will ensure that activities and services are researched, planned and implemented in a timely, more cost effective manner. If the plan is not adopted, there is a risk that initiatives will lack planning, with the result that this ad hoc approach would fail to have an impact on crime and community safety.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
No alternative options were considered by City Officers.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR CRITCH
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **ENDORSE The Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan; and**
2. **REQUEST that the plan is updated biennially.**

CARRIED 12/0
Time: 6:02 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 0
Yes Votes: 12

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	YES
Mayor Van Styn	YES

12 REPORTS OF CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES

CCS342 COUNCIL POLICY CP 4.18 LIVE STREAMING OF MEETINGS

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-046482**
AUTHOR:	**D Duff, Manager ICT Services**
EXECUTIVE:	**B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**8 June 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**GO/19/0008**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x2)** **A. Draft Council Policy 4.18 - Live Streaming of Meetings** **B. Comparison Table – Council Policy 4.18**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of Council Policy 4.18 Live Streaming of Meetings version 2, as amended.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. APPROVE Council Policy 4.18 Live Streaming of Meetings version 2.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
Council Policy 4.18 Live Streaming of Meetings was last reviewed by Council on 24 January 2017. Within the biennial review process for the Council Policy Manual the policy is due for review prior to July 2018.

There is one minor revision to Council Policy CP 4.18 Live Streaming of Meetings, being a spelling change to Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011 under Workplace Information. In addition, the review date has been updated.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
This policy reflects the City's commitment of engaging with the community to ensure that it becomes more informed on the City's activities.

Environment:
There are no adverse environmental impacts.

Economy:
There are no adverse economic impacts.

Governance:
The Local Government Act requires that Councils establish good governance principles through the introduction of policies and guidelines.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
Council first approved the Live Streaming of Meetings policy (then CP053) in September 2012.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
Council were consulted via briefing note on 6 March 2018 and at the Concept Forum on 3 July 2018. The Executive Management Team reviewed the draft policy on 20 June 2018.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
Pursuant to section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 the role of Council includes determination of Council Policies:

2.7. Role of council

(1) The council —

(a) governs the local government's affairs; and

(b) is responsible for the performance of the local government's functions.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the council is to —

(a) oversee the allocation of the local government's finances and resources; and

(b) determine the local government's policies.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial or resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	**4.1 Community Engagement**
Strategy 4.1.1	Continuing to engage broadly and proactively with the community.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
Ensuring that the Council Policy Register is current and comprehensive supports the role of Council in the good government of the Local Government of the City of Greater Geraldton.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
No alternative options were considered by City Officers.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR MCILWAINE, SECONDED MAYOR
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **APPROVE Council Policy 4.18 Live Streaming of Meetings version**

CARRIED 11/1
Time: 6:07 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 1
Yes Votes: 11

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	NO
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	YES
Mayor Van Styn	YES

CCS343 COUNCIL POLICY CP 1.8 COMMUNITY FUNDING PROGRAMS

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-053403**
AUTHOR:	**P Radalj, Manager Treasury and Finance**
EXECUTIVE:	**B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**2 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**GO/14/0002**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x1)** **Draft Council Policy CP 1.8 – Community Funding Programs**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of a new Council Policy – CP 1.8 Community Funding Programs.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. RETIRE existing Council Policy CP 1.8 Minor Sporting Facilities and Self-Supporting Loans; and
2. APPROVE and REPLACE with new Council Policy CP1.8 Community Funding Programs.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
The new draft Council Policy being presented for consideration and review, consolidates an existing Council Policy (CP1.8 – Minor Sporting Facilities and Self Supporting Loans) and a former Council Policy (CP033 – Community Funding).

The new Policy proposes a reconfiguration to the City of Greater Geraldton existing funding programs to provide more effective and targeted (including service based) funding to the community.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
Improved delivery and fluency of funding to community groups.

Environment:
There are no adverse environmental impacts.

Economy:
There are no adverse economic impacts.

Governance:
The Local Government Act requires that Councils establish good governance principles through the introduction of policies and guidelines.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
Council review or amend Council Policies as and when required.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
Councillors were initially consulted via a discussion paper circulated in May 2018. At the Concept Forum held on 3rd of July 2018, Councillors were provided with a final draft of the new proposed policy.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
Pursuant to section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 the role of Council includes determination of Council Policies:

2.7. Role of council

(1) The council —

(a) governs the local government's affairs; and

(b) is responsible for the performance of the local government's functions.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the council is to —

(a) oversee the allocation of the local government's finances and resources; and

(b) determine the local government's policies.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
The following table outlines existing and proposed distribution of funds per program:

Account Name	Existing Allocation	Proposed Allocation
Community Support Fund	$175,000	$200,000
Community Project Support Fund	$15,000	$15,000
Service Agreements	$60,000	$145,435
Cricket Wicket Maintenance	$45,000	$0
Tennis Court Maintenance	$21,435	$0
Mayoral Donations	$25,000	$50,000
Sponsorship – Office of the CEO	$32,000	$0
Signature Events	$30,000	$70,000
Community Event Sponsorship	$65,000	$0
Major Event Attraction	$30,000	$0
CSRFF – Small Grants	$100,000	$100, 000
Total	**$498,435**	**$480,435**

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	**4.5 Good Governance & Leadership**
Strategy: 4.5.2	Ensuring finance and governance policies, procedures and activities align with legislative requirements and best practice.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
Ensuring that the Council Policy Register is current and comprehensive. Provide clarity on the distribution of funding by the City of Greater Geraldton to the community.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
No alternative options were considered by City Officers.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR CRITCH, SECONDED CR HALL
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **RETIRE existing Council Policy CP 1.8 Minor Sporting Facilities and Self-Supporting Loans; and**
2. **APPROVE and REPLACE with new Council Policy CP1.8 Community Funding Programs.**

CARRIED 12/0
Time: 6:10 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 0
Yes Votes: 12

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES
Cr. Freer	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Elphick	YES
Cr. Hall	YES
Cr. Keemink	NOT PRESENT
Cr. McIlwaine	YES
Cr. Reymond	YES
Cr. Tanti	NOT PRESENT
Cr. Thomas	YES
Mayor Van Styn	YES

CCS344 STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY TO 30 JUNE 2018

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-054071**
AUTHOR:	**T Machukera, Senior Treasury Officer**
EXECUTIVE:	**B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**9 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**GO/6/0012-05**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x1)** **Monthly Management Report for period ended 30 June 2018**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The attached financial reports provide a comprehensive report on the City's finances to 30 June 2018.

It needs to be noted that the financial report for June does not represent the City's final financial position for the financial year ending 30 June 2018 as current figures will be subject to material changes until end-of-year processes are completed. The City's final position will not be determined until the audited financial statements for 2017-18 are completed.

The statements in this report 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 monthly financial statements of activity dated 30 June 2018, as attached.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

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

Operating Income	$ 2,204,305	2.9% over YTD Budget
Operating Expenditure	$ 3,366,539	4.2% under YTD Budget
Net Operating	$ 5,570,844	121.9% Positive variance
Capital Expenditure	$ 3,366,461	6.6% under YTD Budget
Capital Revenue	$ 7,024,194	48.7% under YTD Budget
Cash at Bank – Municipal	$10,549,952	
Cash at Bank – Reserve	$18,343,928	
Total Funds Invested	$28,293,182	

Net Rates Collected	98.15%
Net Rates Collected in June 2017	98.84%

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 revised budget.

The financial position represented in the June financials shows a variance of $5,570,844 in the net operating result (this takes into account commitments).

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
There are no community impacts.

Environment:
There are no environment impacts.

Economy:
There are no economic impacts.

Governance:
There are no governance impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
Council is provided with financial reports each month.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
There has been no community or 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	**4.4 Financial Sustainability and Performance**
Strategy 4.4.1	Preparing and implementing short to long term financial plans.
Strategy 4.4.3	Delivering and ensuring business systems and services support cost effective Council operations and service delivery.
	4.5 Good Governance and Leadership
Strategy 4.5.2	Ensuring finance and governance policies, procedures and activities align with legislative requirements and best practice.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
There are no risks to be considered.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
There are no alternative options to consider.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR THOMAS, SECONDED CR BYLUND
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 RESOLVES to:

1. **RECEIVE the monthly financial statements of activity dated 30 June 2018, as attached.**

CARRIED 12/0
In accordance with Section 9.3 (2) of the City of Greater Geraldton's Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011, the motion was passed unopposed.

CCS345 PROPOSED CHINA DELEGATION SEPTEMBER 2018

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-054352**
AUTHOR:	**H J Davis, Officer Economic Development**
EXECUTIVE:	**B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**11 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**ED/2/0009**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x3)** **A. Collaboration Proposal** **B. Proposed Itinerary** **C. Invitation by Mayor of Linfen City**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to undertake a City delegation to the People's Republic of China, to visit Zhanjiang, Zhoushan and Linfen cities for eleven (11) days during September 2018.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. APPROVE the proposed delegation to China in September 2018;
2. ENDORSE the itinerary including Zhanjiang, Linfen and Zhoushan, as proposed in Attachment No. CCS345B;
3. APPROVE City representation by:
   a. Mayor Shane Van Styn;
   b. a Councillor, to be appointed per item 4 below;
   c. the City's Manager of Economic Development Ms Trish Palmonari;
   d. the City's Economic Development Officer Han Jie Davis to act as delegation coordinator and interpreter;
4. APPOINT Councillor _____ as a Council representative for the delegation; and
5. INVITE representatives of Government agencies, and the Private Sector, to participate in the delegation to China at their own expense.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
The City has been officially invited by the Mayor of Linfen City (the City's Strategic Partner in Shanxi Province of China), to attend the Tourism Development Conference of Shanxi Province (Attachment No CCS345C), which is scheduled for 19-21 September 2018.

The Conference is an annual event sponsored by the Shanxi Provincial Government. Linfen City won the bid to be the host city on the basis of significant financial investment. Linfen City Government invited Geraldton to attend this Conference as their Strategic Partner City.

The Mayor of Zhanjiang (the City's Sister City in Guangdong Province of China) also invited our Mayor to visit Zhanjiang, as he is newly elected as the Mayor.

As a result of the City's delegation to China in 2017, the City is working together with Linfen (the City's Strategic Partner City in Shanxi Province) on the 'China Connect' project. A collaboration proposal is currently under consideration by Linfen City Government (Attachment No. CCS345A). It is proposed that a Memorandum of Understanding will be executed between the City Governments during the Tourism Development Conference of Shanxi Province scheduled for September 2018.

In addition to the 'China Connect' project, the City has the following ongoing projects:

1. Trade: Zhanjiang (the City's Sister City in Guangdong Province) Airport will be completed in 2020 as an International Airport. Along with Linfen's new airport, the capacity upgrade of Geraldton Airport (with the City's successful application for Commonwealth BBRF funding of $10M now notified) creates new opportunities for direct freight trade and tourism.

2. Education: Following the successful student exchange program between Geraldton Grammar and Zhoushan Putuo No2 School, we are currently pursuing opportunities for Chinese teachers to teach Mandarin in Geraldton. Chinese investors have acquired land and are actively investigating development of a residential school in Geraldton.

3. Mining: A Linfen based investor is actively investigating development of an iron ore pelleting plant in Geraldton, with recent visits inspecting land sites suitable for such industrial development in Narngulu.

4. Tourism: City staff remain busy, working with both wholesale and retail Travel Agents based in Hong Kong and mainland China, and Chinese travel agents based in Perth, facilitating and guiding familiarisation tours. Visitation by Chinese tourists continues to grow, as evidenced by the numbers being accommodated by Geraldton Air Charter. A recent initiative involves development of China-based and Geraldton-based photography competitions for an exchange Photography Exhibition between partner cities.

The City has been approached by a number of business people expressing interest in forming a public/private sector delegation to visit China, especially to the City's partner cities. Should Council approve the delegation, an EOI process will be undertaken, as in past years, through the Mid West Chamber of Commerce & Industry (MWCCI) and the Geraldton Visitor Centre.

Letters will be sent to relevant State Government agencies, inviting their participation. Participation in the mission over a period of 11 days will be at an approximate cost of $5000 per delegate (departing from Perth), with

Government and private delegates participating at their own expense, at no cost to the City.

The following delegates are proposed to represent the City of Greater Geraldton:

1. Shane Van Styn – Mayor.
2. A Councillor – it would be advantageous to also have the Council represented by a Councillor.
3. Trish Palmonari – Manager, Economic Development.
4. Han Jie Davis – Economic Development Officer, as delegation coordinator and interpreter.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
Long term relationships with Cities in China will be the bridge between communities and cultures, and will support opportunities for tourism and trade, growing employment in the City.

Continuing development of relationships between the City of Greater Geraldton and cities in China presents opportunities for cultural exchange. Discussions will include development of further arrangements for educational exchange.

Environment:
There are no adverse environmental impacts.

Economy:
Last financial year, over 16 million tonnes of freight shipped from Port of Geraldton, over 12 million tonnes of which shipped to China. They are the major trading partner of the Mid West. Maintaining and building our Partner City relationships

China Connect Project

- Enabling a permanent, cross language platform promoting our local products, services and business opportunities, in China, at minimum cost.
- Establishing a cross border presence for our local businesses in China, bridging demand and supply, opportunity and investment in tourism, trade, agriculture, education and mining etc.

Tourism Development Conference - Shanxi Province

- A marketing opportunity to showcase our tourism product to the International tourism industry and Chinese market, through the display of video material and the distribution of brochures and promotional products at the conference.
- The opportunity to directly communicate with key tourism industry players, such as airlines and tourism agencies, to explore tourism opportunities with China and promote our regional tourism product and potential;

Building upon our strategic relationship with Zhanjiang, Zhoushan and Linfen, we can directly pursue markets for education, tourism and trade.

Governance:
Development and nurturing City-to-City relationships that offer the prospects of growth in tourism and trade, demonstrates proactive leadership by the Council.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
Council has previously supported delegations to China in 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016 and 2017.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:
There has been no community or Councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
Council Policy 2.2 *Establishing International Relations*.

The proposed delegation to China continues to pursue the objectives of the Growing Greater Geraldton Plan.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
Linfen City has offered free accommodation, meals and road transportation during 19–21 September 2018.

Zhoushan and Zhanjiang City Government have offered to cover the cost of meals and road transportation during the proposed visit for all delegates from Geraldton.

As a result of this generosity, the total approximate cost for each participant in this delegation would be $5000, including visa application fees, return airfares between China and Australia, attending the Tourism Development Conference of Shanxi Province in Linfen, and the visits to Zhanjiang and Zhoushan. Costs to the City for the proposed itinerary:

Mayor	$ 5,000
Trish Palmonari	$ 5,000
Han Jie Davis	$ 5,000
Councillor	$ 5,000
Total	$20,000

$25,500 has been allocated in the 2018-19 budget for foreign city relationships. There are sufficient funds to cover the costs for the Mayor, a Councillor, and the two Officers (one as delegation coordinator and interpreter), on the proposed delegation.

In particular, the Director of Corporate and Commercial Services advocates inclusion of the City's recently appointed Manager of Economic Development in the delegation.

Local business stakeholders and representatives of Government agencies joining the delegation would be required to fund all of their own expenses.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Economy	**3.1 Growth**
Strategy 3.1.1	Promoting Greater Geraldton and its potential business opportunities to facilitate targeted economic development
Strategy 3.1.4	Supporting and facilitating implementation of the *Growing Greater Geraldton Plan*
Title : Governance	**4.3 Advocacy and Partnerships**
Strategy 4.3.2	Partnering with key international communities through strategic alliances

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
International relationships with Cities in China target regional economic growth and investment opportunities and partnerships in the Mid West Region. Positive results are already emerging in the areas of tourism and education. Capacity building in the City region (e.g. the Geraldton Airport upgrade) is opening new opportunities for trade, in the context of Australia's Free Trade Agreement with China. The FTA sets timeframes for reduction of barriers to Australian exports of varying kinds.

Beyond the agreement between the nations at Federal Government level, Federal and State agencies continue to work with Provincial Governments in China, to put in place protocols and processes for the operational aspects of actually enabling the trade to develop. During this transition period towards 'free trade' the persistent maintenance of relationships with Provincial and City governments in China is important, if the City region is to remain well positioned to benefit from the FTA.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
The City has formally executed a Sister City Agreement with Zhanjiang City, and Strategic Partnership Agreements with Zhoushan and Linfen Cities.

Under these Agreements, the partner cities undertake to cooperate in fields of trade, tourism, logistics, education and so on； Leaders and staff in the cities undertake to maintain contact with each other to discuss and consult on matters relating to friendly exchanges, cooperation and common interests. Failing to do so would directly impact target outcomes of cooperation projects, damaging the relationships that established after years of joint effort and commitment.

World trade is experiencing uncertainty and instability as a result of new USA policies with respect to trading relationships with China and other nations, including Australia, with Australia potentially likely to suffer collateral damage as a consequence of USA/China trade disputes. China has formally complained to the WTO on the tariffs action recently introduced by the USA. China is already the major trading partner for the Mid West region of WA, the

primary destination for a significant majority of exports from the Port of Geraldton.

To mitigate the risks of collateral damage to trade at our regional level, and to open new opportunities for trade and tourism, it is important to reaffirm and strengthen our City-to-City relationships in China, demonstrating that our City remains committed to two-way engagement to produce mutual benefits. The proposed delegation to China in September 2018 aims to reaffirm and strengthen the relationships we have carefully built since 2010-11.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
The option of not conducting a delegation to China in 2018 was considered but was discounted as being inconsistent with Council's adopted *Growing Greater Geraldton Plan*, ignoring the clear local economic benefits already generated via rapidly growing Chinese tourist visits to Geraldton, and growing Chinese investment in the City region, resulting from past delegations to China, and from the consequent private delegation visits from China.

The following mission options were considered by City Officers:

- Only attending the Tourism Development Conference of Shanxi Province in Linfen, costing about $2000 per delegate for 5 days; or
- Only visiting two cities, Zhanjiang and Linfen, with the cost at about $3800 per delegate for 8 days; or
- Visiting our Sister City and our two Strategic Partner Cities, with the cost per delegate for 11 days at about $5000.

Leveraging the generosity offered by the City's Partner Cities and maximising the utility of scarce City funds – seeking more benefits from every dollar - the option of visiting all three of our partner cities, Zhanjiang, Linfen and Zhoushan offers opportunities to pursue significantly wider benefits from further education, tourism and trade promotion and development projects.

Importantly, the City must be seen by the City Governments of our partner cities as remaining committed to nurturing and growing the relationship with all of our Partner Cities. The City has invested years of effort to gain and build these important relationships in China, the most important destination (by orders of magnitude – 12+ million tonnes exported to China out of the 16+ million tonnes of shipping through Port of Geraldton) for exports from the Mid West Region. There has now been a full election cycle for officials in the Peoples Republic of China, with a number of new Mayors and senior City officials now appointed. Hence the proposed delegation to China in 2018 has additional importance, to develop new relationships between Mayors and City Officers.

Significantly, financial assistance from both Commonwealth and State Governments will enable the Geraldton Airport Upgrade project to proceed during 2018, opening a new direct tourism and trade gateway. It will take time to develop the trade, but this project is a potential game-changer for direct export trade to China (and other countries in South East and East Asia, and potentially the Middle East). With other States and regions eager to get into

the China market ahead of our region, for similar products and services, the City should continue its pro-active strategy of building direct relationships in China. Our delegation visits are key to that.

Accordingly, the extended itinerary delegation trade and tourism mission (for 11 days, to all three Partner Cities, costing about $5000 per delegate) is recommended.

B Davis, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services, declared a direct financial interest in Item CCS345 Proposed China Delegation September 2018 as his wife, a City of Greater Geraldton employee, is attending the proposed trip as the delegation coordinator and interpreter. He was not required to leave Chambers.

Cr Hall nominated Cr Keemink to attend the delegation to China.

Mayor called for further nominations.

Cr Reymond nominated himself.

There being more nominations than candidates a ballot was conducted.

Each candidate was invited to give a short presentation prior to voting.
Cr Hall spoke on behalf of Cr Keemink.

R McKim, Chief Executive Officer and L Taylor, Administration Officer, Corporate Services, were the Returning Officers.

The preferred nomination was Cr S Keemink.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR HALL, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **APPROVE the proposed delegation to China in September 2018;**
2. **ENDORSE the itinerary including Zhanjiang, Linfen and Zhoushan, as proposed in Attachment No. CCS345B;**
3. **APPROVE City representation by:**
   a. **Mayor Shane Van Styn;**
   b. **a Councillor, to be appointed per item 4 below;**
   c. **the City's Manager of Economic Development Ms Trish Palmonari;**
   d. **the City's Economic Development Officer Han Jie Davis to act as delegation coordinator and interpreter;**
4. **APPOINT Councillor Simon Keemink as a Council representative for the delegation; and**
5. **INVITE representatives of Government agencies, and the Private Sector, to participate in the delegation to China at their own expense.**

CARRIED 9/3
Time: 6:23 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 3
Yes Votes: 9

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	**YES**
Cr. Bylund	**NO**
Cr. Caudwell	**YES**
Cr. Colliver	**YES**
Cr. Clune	**NO**
Cr. Critch	**YES**
Cr. Freer	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Elphick	**YES**
Cr. Hall	**YES**
Cr. Keemink	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. McIlwaine	**YES**
Cr. Reymond	**YES**
Cr. Tanti	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Thomas	**NO**
Mayor Van Styn	**YES**

13 REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

IS175 WHITEHILL ROAD REALIGNMENT SURVEY REPORT	
AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-054000**
AUTHOR:	**M Dufour, Acting Manager Engineering Services**
EXECUTIVE:	**C Lee, Director Infrastructure Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**4 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**EM/10/0006**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x1)** **Whitehill Road Realignment Survey Report – May 2018**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The City has recently completed a further significant community engagement project with respect to Whitehill Road connectivity. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a copy of the resulting community engagement report and seek a Council resolution on the preferred option to enable planning and design works to proceed.

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

1. RECEIVE the Whitehill Road Realignment Survey Report;
2. ENDORSE Option three (3) as a coastal adaptation measure for the Whitehill Road foreshore (Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and extend across the back of the foreshore reserve); and
3. AUTHORISE the CEO to undertake the planning, survey, detailed design and estimation works associated with the preferred connectivity option utilising the CHRMAP Adaptation Measures fund endorsed by Council as part of 2018-19 budget.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
In early 2016, high tides and strong swells eroded Whitehill Road forcing its closure between the John Batten Community Hall and Drummond Cove Road. In response, a number of community engagement activities have been undertaken with details provided to Councillors.

The *Whitehill Road Realignment Survey* (refer to Attachment No. IS175) was undertaken in May 2018. The survey was distributed to all households and landowners located on the west side of Chapman Road within the locality of Drummond Cove and Glenfield Beach Estate. It provided the community with five (5) connectivity options. The survey was undertaken to determine whether or not the local community wanted to re-establish a road connection between John Batten Community Hall and Drummond Cove Road, and if so,

on what alignment. The five options presented to the community along with high-level cost estimates are shown below:

Connectivity options presented to the community

With reference to the attached survey report, connectivity is desired by 78% of the survey respondents with option three (3) being the preferred alignment.

Connectivity options report results

Option 1	Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and a road through lots #240 and #246	2%
Option 2	Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and Boat Cove	22%
Option 3	Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and extend across the back of the foreshore reserve	40%
Option 4	Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and Whitehill Road	18%
Option 5	Connect to Drummond Cove Road via Estuary Way and provide no connection to Whitehill Road	10%
Other	I want the road reconnected, but I don't like any of these options	8%

Option 3

Connect to Estuary Way and extend across the coastal reserve
Estimated cost: $420,000

Survey preferred connectivity option

Agreement in principal has been reached with the owners of Lot 9010 (Estuary Way) regarding the establishment of a road reserve and construction thereto to facilitate the joining of the two sections of Estuary Way (southern

end). This would be required as part of any development of the lot. A road reserve would also need to be created at the rear of the City's foreshore reserve (Reserve R44791) at the northern end.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:

The survey suggests that there will be a positive community impact through the restoration of connectivity at Drummond Cove. Some residences will be impacted by the community's preferred realignment option due to their proximity.

Environment:

The preferred connectivity option realigns the road behind the 2030 erosion setback line. It addresses the erosion impact to the road asset at Whitehill Road in line with the Draft Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines developed by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage.

Economy:

Finalising the issues along the Drummond Cove Foreshore are expected to have a positive impact on the local economy.

Governance:

The preferred connectivity is consistent with:

- State Planning Policy 2.6 (State Coastal Planning Policy);
- Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Draft *Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines*; and
- City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council of 26 September 2017, Item DCS343, Council determined to invite Point Moore lessees to surrender their current leases and enter into new 21 years leases. In line with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Draft *Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines*, the new lease included trigger points to manage the retreat from coastal hazards. When one or more trigger points with respect to sea level rise, erosion, public health, power supply, wastewater and water supply are realised the leases will be mandatorily terminated.

In July 2017, in line with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Draft *Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines* the City removed a toilet block from Triton Place as the coastal erosion hazard had encroached within a few metres of the building.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Since May 2016, the City has been conducting ongoing community engagement with the Drummond Cove community regarding erosion along the Whitehill Road foreshore.

Engagement timeline:

May 2016: Whitehill Road Community Workshop - which 73 people attended. The workshop gave participants the opportunity to be involved in two objectives:

Objective 1: To gain a better understanding the importance of Whitehill Road (since it had already been partially closed due to coastal erosion) and in particular the connection it provided between John Batten Community Hall and Drummond Cove Road. More than 85% of participants stated the road either meant: something, a lot, or the world to them.

Objective 2: To determine the community's preferred temporary coastal adaptation measure for the area to be implemented by the City whilst waiting for the results of the coastal adaptation project. More than 60% of participants stated sand nourishment was their preferred temporary solution.

Media Releases

- July 2016: Media Release - Emergency sand nourishment to slow Drummond Cove coastal erosion;
- April 2017: Media Release - Sand nourishment works on Whitehill Road;
- June 2017: Community Service Announcement - Whitehill Road fencing upgrade;
- October 2017: Media Release - Drummond Cove fence vandals urged to stop antisocial behaviour;
- 9 May 2018: Media Release - Whitehill Road survey underway; and
- 22 May 2018: Media Release - Sand nourishment critical to reducing erosion.

Survey

May 2018: Whitehill Road Realignment Community Survey (refer to Attachment No. IS175). A total of 372 responses were received.

Objective 1: To determine whether or not the local community wanted to re-establish a road connection between John Batten Community Hall and Drummond Cove Road. 78% were in favour of re-establishing road access. This outcome is consistent with the results from the Whitehill Road Community Workshop where 85% stated the Whitehill Road either meant something, a lot, or the world to them

Objective 2: Should connectivity be desired, what the community's preferred option would be. 40% chose Option 3 as their preferred option.

In addition to the five (5) options provided in the survey, respondents provided eight (8) alternate connectivity options:

- One (1) suggestion is a variation of the *Do Nothing* approach considered by City Officers. It is not recommended for the same reason identified in the *Do Nothing* approach.

- Three (3) suggestions are variations of the *Construction of coastal protection* option considered by City Officers. These are not recommended for the same reason(s) as identified in the *Construction of coastal protection* approach;
- Three (3) suggestions provide partial connectivity. These are not recommended as they do not address community's desire for connectivity between John Batten Hall and Drummond Cove Road.
- One (1) suggestion proposed connectivity between Bayside Boulevard and Drummond Cove Road on Council owned/vested land. This is not recommended as it does not address community's desire for connectivity between John Batten Hall and Drummond Cove Road.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
The proposal is consistent with the State Planning Policy 2.6 (State Coastal Planning Policy). The proposal is consistent with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) Draft Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines. The proposal is consistent with the City of Greater Geraldton's Local Planning Strategy.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
The Council has provided $600,000 for adaptation measures as part of the 2018-19 capital renewal budget. The recommended planning and design works for this project are expected to be between $50,000 and $70,000.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	**2.2 Sustainability**
Strategy 2.2.3	Promoting and planning innovative design that enables low impact living and sustainable urban development.
Title: Environment	**2.3 Built Environment**
Strategy 2.3.1	Promoting a built environment that is well planned and meets the current and future needs of the community.
Strategy 2.3.3	Providing a fit for purpose, safe and efficient infrastructure network.
Title: Environment	**2.4 Asset Management**
Strategy 2.4.1	Applying financial sustainability principles to ensure a coordinated and integrated approach to infrastructure planning, implementation, maintenance and renewal.
Title: Governance	**4.1 Community Engagement**
Strategy 4.1.1	Continuing to engage broadly and proactively with the community.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
The executive recommendation addresses the identified risk of Whitehill Road being inside the storm-bite trigger point line, thus requiring a managed retreat adaptation measure. The recommended measures are based on the best

available science and information regarding coastal processes and the need for adequate coastal setbacks. This is in line with the City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy.

In addition, the recommended measures are in line with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Draft *Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines.*

There will also be some residual reputation risk, due to varying respondent survey connectivity preference. However, the recommendation aligns with the 78% of respondents that want to re-establish connectivity.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
The following options were considered by City Officers:

Decommission or leave the Whitehill road closed:
This is not recommended since it does not address community's desire for connectivity between John Batten Hall and Drummond Cove Road.

Reconstruct Whitehill Road on former alignment:
Coastal protection works would cost between $2M to $3M, in addition to the costs to reconstruct the road. This option is not recommended as it is financially costly compared to the preferred connectivity option. The ongoing maintenance and repair costs would also be higher than the community's preferred connectivity option.

Cr Douglas moved an alternative motion to defer determination of connectivity option until the CHRMAP process is complete.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR DOUGLAS, SECONDED CR MCILWAINE
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **RECEIVE the Whitehill Road Realignment Survey Report; and**
2. **DEFER determination of a connectivity option until the CHRMAP process is complete and the outcomes of coastal protection works (including the proposed geo—textile groynes) are clear.**

CARRIED 11/1
Time: 6:51 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 1
Yes Votes: 11

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	YES
Cr. Bylund	YES
Cr. Caudwell	YES
Cr. Colliver	YES
Cr. Clune	YES
Cr. Critch	YES

Cr. Freer	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Elphick	**YES**
Cr. Hall	**YES**
Cr. Keemink	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. McIlwaine	**YES**
Cr. Reymond	**YES**
Cr. Tanti	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Thomas	**YES**
Mayor Van Styn	**NO**

REASON FOR VARIATION TO THE EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION – Cr Douglas' stated he thinks the original motion was too risky from an environmental; social and financial point of view.

IS176 DRUMMOND COVE COASTAL PROTECTION WORKS

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-055519**
AUTHOR:	**M Dufour, A/Manager Engineering Services**
EXECUTIVE:	**D Emery, A/Director Infrastructure Services**
DATE OF REPORT:	**11 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**EM/10/0006**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x2)** **A. Low Crest Groyne Layout Plans** **B. Low Crest Groyne Construction Estimate**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to implement medium term coastal protections works on the Drummond Cove Foreshore. This report should be considered along with report IS175 also on this agenda.

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

1. APPROVE the construction of two (2) low-crest Geotextile Sand Container (GSC) groynes on the Drummond Cove Foreshore;
2. FUND the works from the CHRMAP Adaptation Measures endorsed by Council as part of 2018-19 budget; and
3. NOTE that the public open space at Whitehill Road is included in the City's Parks Master planning project currently underway.

PROPONENT:
The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:
On-going coastal erosion at Drummond Cove resulted in the closure of Whitehill Road on 25 April 2016. Subsequently at its Ordinary meeting held in June 2016, Council resolved the following:

That Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 6.8 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. *ENDORSE the attached report resulting from the Whitehill Road Community Workshop held on Wednesday 18 May 2016;*
2. *APPROVE the expenditure of $50,000 in emergency funds to facilitate immediate sand nourishment works in the vicinity of Whitehill Road; and*
3. *ENDORSE further investigation into options to protect the area in the medium term, as a matter of priority with a subsequent report to be presented to Council.*

With respect to item two (2) of the 2016 resolution, the City has conducted four sand nourishment activities at the Whitehill Road foreshore since May 2016 at total cost of $235,000. The City has applied for a Coastal

Adaptation and Protection (CAP) grant from the Department of Transport for the 2018-19 financial year. If successful, the City would receive up to $75,000 towards sand nourishment at Whitehill Road.

With respect to item three (3) of the 2016 resolution, Officers have investigated a number of options to protect the area in the medium term with a number of presentations and reports being provided to Councillors. During this time, Officers have also sought funding assistance for the required works from State Agencies. To date, these endeavours have been unsuccessful meaning that any coastal works will need to be funded by the City. A summary of the coastal works investigated is presented below:

1. Medium Term Revetment Protection (Rocks)

M P Rogers investigated temporary (20-25 years) protection options involve the construction of a fully engineered rock protection system along the alignment of the original Whitehill Road. The cost of these works is estimated at between $2 million and $3 million. Given that this option would need to be funded by the City, and that the beach amenity would be severely impacted, this option was not progressed further.

2. Medium Term Rock/Sandbag/Concrete block Revetment Protection

GHD investigated the construction of cheaper temporary (5-10 years) revetment options. The resulting advice is that a sandbag or concrete block revetment structure could be constructed for approximately $800,000 on the current Whitehill Road alignment. This option was then superseded with the community-led initiative to construct a boat ramp at this location with associated rock protection works.

3. Boat Ramp Protection

Preliminary options for the construction of a boat ramp and associated infrastructure were prepared by M P Rogers. A preliminary estimate of costs for this preferred option was $4.3 million. This estimate was used to apply for a Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme (RBFS) grant; however the grant application was unsuccessful.

4. Groyne Protection Options

Because of the community's desire to retain the beach amenity at Drummond Cove, the associated costs of revetment works and the failure to attract grant funding for the boat ramp, Officers then investigated rock and sandbag groyne options. For a temporary medium-term solution (25-30 years), one 120m long groyne would be required, or two groynes of 85m and 70m respectively would need to be constructed. Again, the cost of these solutions is prohibitive and so medium term options were considered.

With reference to Attachment No. IS176A, M P Rogers have designed two short length, low crest groynes (~30-40m) similar to the structure successfully installed at Rundle Park, Bluff Point. This option will slow coastal erosion at this location, but not permanently solve the problem. Sand replenishment may still be required, especially after large weather

events. However, this option is more affordable and adaptable should funding in the future become available for the boat ramp project or longer term coastal protection measures.

With reference to Attachment No. IS176B, the cost estimate for this option is approximately $200,000. This option is in keeping with the coastal adaptation recommendations for the Drummond Cove area.

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES:

Community:
The proposed Geotextile Sand Container (GSC) groynes will assist in retaining sand at the Whitehill Road foreshore and reduce the reliance on temporary sand nourishment operations. Access to the beach and the amenity it offers will be maintained. This approach is in keeping with the community values identified through the various Drummond Cove community engagement exercises.

Given the loss of foreshore due to coastal erosion, City Officers are recommending that improvements occur to the balance of the public open space. A park masterplan for the Whitehill Road Public Open Space is being developed as part of the City's Parks Master Planning Project. Council's determination on Item IS175 will influence the master plan for this space. Once the master plan has been completed, City Officers will report to Councillors on progressing the master plan for the Whitehill Road Public Open Space (POS).

Environment:
The proposed low-crest GSC groynes will trap sand on their southern side assisting in sand retention at the Whitehill Road foreshore. If in the future, this option is superseded, or is found to have a detrimental impact on the local environment, the bags can be easily removed with minimal environmental impact.

Economy:
There is no adverse economic impact through the implementation of the coastal works.

Governance:
This proposal is in keeping with the:

- State Planning Policy 2.6 (State Coastal Planning Policy).
- Department of Planning Lands and Heritage Draft *Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines*
- City of Greater Geraldton Draft Coastal Hazard Adaptation Report

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:
The proposed coastal works are consistent to the low-crest GSC groyne constructed at Rundle Park, Bluff Point. The groyne has assisted in retaining sand and stabilising the beach.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Engagement timeline:

May 2016: Whitehill Road Community Workshop which 73 people attended. The workshop gave participants the opportunity to be involved in two objectives:

Objective 1: To gain a better understanding of the importance of Whitehill Road (since it had already been partially closed due to coastal erosion) and in particular the connection it provided between John Batten Community Hall and Drummond Cove Road. More than 85% of participants stated the road either meant: something, a lot, or the world to them.

Objective 2: To determine the community's preferred temporary coastal adaptation measure for the area to be implemented by the City whilst waiting for the results of the coastal adaptation project. More than 60% of participants stated sand nourishment was their preferred temporary solution.

Media Releases

- July 2016: Media Release - Emergency sand nourishment to slow Drummond Cove coastal erosion;
- April 2017: Media Release - Sand nourishment works on Whitehill Road;
- June 2017: Community Service Announcement - Whitehill Road fencing upgrade;
- October 2017: Media Release - Drummond Cove fence vandals urged to stop antisocial behaviour;
- 9 May 2018: Media Release - Whitehill Road survey underway;
- 22 May 2018: Media Release - Sand nourishment critical to reducing erosion; and
- May 2018: Whitehill Road Realignment Community Survey.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The project is consistent with the State Planning Policy 2.6 (State Coastal Planning Project). Section 5.5 advocates protection where there is a defined need to preserve values such as the foreshore reserve and public access.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The Council has allocated $600,000 for adaptation measures as part of the 2018-19 capital renewal budget. The recommended low-crest groynes are estimated to cost $200,000 (refer Attachment No. IS176B).

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	**2.3 Built Environment**
Strategy 2.3.3	Providing a fit for purpose, safe and efficient infrastructure network.
Title: Environment	**2.4 Asset Management**
Strategy 2.4.1	Applying financial sustainability principles to ensure a coordinated and integrated approach to infrastructure planning, implementation, maintenance and renewal.

Title: Governance	4.1 Community Engagement
Strategy 4.1.1	Continuing to engage broadly and proactively with the community.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:
There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:
With all coastal works, there is a risk that the works do not achieve the desired outcomes or have adverse unexpected impacts. This risk is mitigated with the use of GSCs that can be easily removed. The detailed design of the low-crest groynes has been undertaken by experienced coastal engineering consultants.

There is a risk that the project costs are greater than expected. This risk has been mitigated through obtaining a detailed estimate of the works. Knowledge has been gained through the construction of the Rundle Park GSC low-crest groyne.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:
Alternative options are detailed in the body of the report.

Do not undertake coastal works. The coastline at this location will continue to be impacted by coastal processes. Regular sand nourishment will need to be undertaken to maintain the current beach alignment. This option is not recommended since it does not address the community value placed on the beach.

COUNCIL DECISION
MOVED CR CAUDWELL, SECONDED CR HALL
That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. **APPROVE the construction of two (2) low-crest Geotextile Sand Container (GSC) groynes on the Drummond Cove Foreshore;**
2. **FUND the works from the CHRMAP Adaptation Measures endorsed by Council as part of 2018-19 budget; and**
3. **NOTE that the public open space at Whitehill Road is included in the City's Parks Master planning project currently underway.**

CARRIED 11/1
Time: 7:02 PM
Not Voted: 3
No Votes: 1
Yes Votes: 11

Name	Vote
Cr. Douglas	**YES**
Cr. Bylund	**YES**
Cr. Caudwell	**YES**
Cr. Colliver	**YES**

Cr. Clune	**YES**
Cr. Critch	**YES**
Cr. Freer	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Elphick	**YES**
Cr. Hall	**YES**
Cr. Keemink	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. McIlwaine	**YES**
Cr. Reymond	**NO**
Cr. Tanti	**NOT PRESENT**
Cr. Thomas	**YES**
Mayor Van Styn	**YES**

14 REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO

Nil

15 REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

JULY - REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

AGENDA REFERENCE:	**D-18-054396**
AUTHOR:	**R McKim, Chief Executive Officer**
EXECUTIVE:	**R McKim, Chief Executive Officer**
DATE OF REPORT:	**9 July 2018**
FILE REFERENCE:	**GO/6/0012-05**
ATTACHMENTS:	**Yes (x2) x1 Confidential** **A. Delegated Determinations and Subdivision Applications** **B. Confidential Report – List of Accounts Paid Under Delegation June 2018**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of 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 – Development & Community Services:
      i. DCSDD136 - Report - Delegated Determinations and Subdivision Applications.

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. CCS346 - Confidential Report – List of Accounts Paid Under Delegation June 2018.

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 CLUNE
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 – Development & Community Services:**
      i. **DCSDD136 - Report - Delegated Determinations and Subdivision Applications.**

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. **CCS346 - Confidential Report – List of Accounts Paid Under Delegation June 2018.**

CARRIED 12/0

In accordance with Section 9.3 (2) of the City of Greater Geraldton's Meeting Procedures Local Law 2011, the motion was passed unopposed.

16 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

17 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

18 URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING

Nil

19 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

Pursuant to Section 5.2 (i) of the Meeting Procedures Local Law February 2011, please note this part of the meeting will be closed to the public, if applicable, where confidential discussion is required.

Livestreaming will be turned off.
Nil.

20 CLOSURE

There being no further business the Presiding Member closed the Council meeting at 6.56pm.

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