



ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

AGENDA

24 MAY 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	DECLARATION OF OPENING.....	3
2	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY	3
3	ATTENDANCE.....	3
4	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	4
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	4
6	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	4
7	PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS.....	4
8	DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	4
9	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING – AS CIRCULATED.....	5
10	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	6
11	REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY SERVICES.....	9
	<i>DCS268 BATAVIA COAST MARINA DESIGN GUIDELINES</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>DCS269 ADOPTION OF DRAFT (REVISED) CITY CENTRE LOCAL PLANNING POLICY.....</i>	<i>14</i>
	<i>DCS270 PROPOSED ALFRESCO DINING – GERALDTON FORESHORE.....</i>	<i>18</i>
	<i>DCS271 PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT – RURAL REZONING, RUDDS GULLY</i>	<i>22</i>
	<i>DCS272 MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE 'MORESBY HEIGHTS' STRUCTURE PLAN.....</i>	<i>26</i>
	<i>DCS273 PROPOSED ROAD DEDICATION – GERALDTON MT. MAGNET ROAD</i>	<i>29</i>
	<i>DCS275 MODIFICATIONS TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS WITHIN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT.....</i>	<i>31</i>
	<i>DCS276 AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION FOR CLEANING OF CITY PUBLIC ABLUTION BLOCKS.....</i>	<i>34</i>
	<i>DCS279 MICHELANGELO REPLICA EXHIBITION TO GERALDTON.....</i>	<i>37</i>
12	REPORTS OF CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES	41
	<i>CCS177 ELECTED MEMBERS FEES AND ALLOWANCES.....</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>CCS178 COUNCIL POLICY CP032 ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF COMMITTEES.....</i>	<i>46</i>
	<i>CCS179 CP010 PROCUREMENT OF GOODS & SERVICES AMENDMENT</i>	<i>49</i>
	<i>CCS180 POSSESSION OF LAND FOR UNPAID RATES & CHARGES IN EXCESS OF 3 YEARS</i>	<i>52</i>
	<i>CCS181 RATES EXEMPTION – PARKERVILLE CHILDREN AND YOUTH CARE INCORPORATED</i>	<i>56</i>
	<i>CCS182 MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT TO 30 APRIL 2016</i>	<i>58</i>
	<i>CCS183 RATES 2016-17 NOTICE OF INTENTION.....</i>	<i>60</i>
	<i>CCS186 CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES</i>	<i>66</i>
14	REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES	67
	<i>IS120 BATAVIA PARK DEVELOPMENT PLAN</i>	<i>67</i>
	<i>IS121 PARK HIERARCHY AND LEVELS OF SERVICE.....</i>	<i>72</i>
	<i>IS122 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS</i>	<i>75</i>
	<i>IS123 RFT 18 1516 – ABRAHAM STREET ROUNDABOUT</i>	<i>79</i>
	<i>IS124 RFT 16 1516 MULLEWA TRANSFER STATION CONSTRUCTION.....</i>	<i>83</i>
15	REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO.....	88
	<i>CEO042 VOTING DELEGATES FOR THE 2016 WA LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (WALGA) ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING</i>	<i>88</i>
16	REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED.....	91

17	ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	93
	<i>ROAD SAFETY RISKS - MULLEWA – WUBIN ROAD.....</i>	<i>93</i>
18	QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	95
19	URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING	95
20	DEFERRED MATTERS	95
	<i>CCS186 CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES</i>	<i>95</i>
21	CLOSURE	96
	APPENDIX 1 – ATTACHMENTS AND REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED	97

CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON
ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL
TO BE HELD ON MONDAY, 24 MAY 2016 AT 5.00PM
CHAMBERS, CATHEDRAL AVENUE

A G E N D A

DISCLAIMER:

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

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING

2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

I would like to respectfully acknowledge the Yamaji 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 the Yamaji people.

3 ATTENDANCE

Present:

Officers:

Others:

Members of Public:

Members of Press:

Apologies:

Cr R Ellis

Leave of Absence:

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

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

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

6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**Existing Approved Leave**

Councillor	From	To (inclusive)
Mayor Shane Van Styn	23 August 2016	23 August 2016
Cr G Bylund	2 July 2016	17 July 2016
Cr G Bylund	18 August 2016	29 August 2016
Cr G Bylund	3 September 2016	10 September 2016
Cr G Bylund	2 October 2016	9 October 2016
Cr J Critch	15 September 2016	10 October 2016
Cr M Reymond	1 September 2016	26 September 2016

Cr R Ellis requests leave of absence for the period 25 May 2016 to 20 June 2016 be approved.

Cr S Douglas requests leave of absence for the period 21 June 2016 to 26 June 2016 be approved.

Cr J Critch requests leave of absence for the period 21 June 2016 to 21 June 2016 be approved.

Cr L Graham requests leave of absence for the period 7 June 2016 to 8 June 2016 be approved.

7 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

8 DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Cr L Graham declared a financial indirect interest in item DRS276 Amendment to Resolution for Cleaning of City Public Ablution Blocks as he is associated with the owner of Delron Cleaning.

Cr S Douglas – declared a proximity/ impartiality interest in item DRS268 – Batavia Coast Marina Design Guidelines as he is a salaried employee of the Mid West Development Commission and owns a lot in Forrest Street.

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

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 26 April 2016, as previously circulated, be adopted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

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

DATE	FUNCTION	REPRESENTATIVE
21 April 2016	Harrison – WA Citizenship Awards Nominations	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 April 2016	Green Army Graduation	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 April 2016	Regional Centres Development Plan - Cluster Workshop	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 April 2016	Cashless Debit Card Local Reference Group Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
21 April 2016	Geraldton Universities Centre – Graduation Ceremony	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	Meeting with Department of Health - Aged Care Services - Mullewa	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	Morning Tea – Mark McGowen	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	Official Opening of the Geraldton Career Fire Station	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	ANZAC Day Briefing	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	US Consul General staff - Pollinators	Mayor Shane Van Styn
22 April 2016	Art Gallery Exhibition – Derek Kreckler Accident & Process, Future Generations: Exploring Self	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 April 2016	Mullewa Bowls Club – 22 nd Annual Midwest Golden Bowls	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 April 2016	Frack Free Midwest & Gascoyne Alliance – Community Presentation with John Fenton	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 April 2016	Anzac Day Dawn Service	Mayor Shane Van Styn
25 April 2016	Anzac Day Main Service	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Regular Catch up with Media & Marketing	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Regular Catch up with CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Meeting with Cr Critch & Cr Thomas – Mullewa Discussions	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Citizenship Ceremony – April 2016	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Pat Hodge – Foodbank	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Jeanette Mitchell – Andrew Forrest Consultant	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Meeting with Ross Ayling – Midwest Caravan Club	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Meeting with Phil Frazee – Consulting Arborist	Mayor Shane Van Styn
26 April 2016	Ordinary Meeting of Council – April 2016	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 April 2016	Phone Interview – Radio Mama – Current Council Issues	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 April 2016	ABC Radio Interview – Outcomes from Council Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 April 2016	Geraldton Guardian Interview – Cashless Welfare Card	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 April 2016	Meeting with Playground Reference Group	Mayor Shane Van Styn
27 April 2016	Official Opening of Sun City Christian Centre by Minster Redman	Mayor Shane Van Styn
28 April 2016	Chair Meeting with Regional Capitals Alliance Secretariats	Mayor Shane Van Styn
29 April 2016	National Cities Summit	Mayor Shane Van Styn

3 May 2016	Regional Australia Institute – Stakeholder Lock In	Mayor Shane Van Styn
5 May 2016	Individual Citizenship Ceremony	Mayor Shane Van Styn
5 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
5 May 2016	Meeting with Ross Davies – Anzac Day	Mayor Shane Van Styn
5 May 2016	Todd West – Discuss Progress Midwest	Mayor Shane Van Styn
9 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
9 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
9 May 2016	Lunch with Ric Charlesworth Function	Mayor Shane Van Styn
9 May 2016	Local Government Boundary Change Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
10 May 2016	Meeting – Shredding & Compaction Trials at Meru Landfill	Mayor Shane Van Styn
11 May 2016	ABC Radio Interview – Beresford Foreshore	Mayor Shane Van Styn
11 May 2016	Meeting with Jill Ahearn – Meedac	Mayor Shane Van Styn
11 May 2016	Mid West Development Commission – New Board Meeting Members Induction	Mayor Shane Van Styn
12 May 2016	National Volunteer Week 2016 – Acknowledgement of Foodbank Volunteers	Mayor Shane Van Styn
12 May 2016	International Nurses Week Morning Tea – Opal Aged Care	Mayor Shane Van Styn
12 May 2016	Regional Centres Development Plan Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
12 May 2016	Cashless Debit Card – Geraldton Local Reference group Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
12 May 2016	Meet with Town Towers Developers	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 May 2016	MWCCI 2016-17 WA State Government Budget Breakfast	Mayor Shane Van Styn
13 May 2016	Greenough Museum Visit	Mayor Shane Van Styn
14 May 2016	Beresford Foreshore Protection & Enhancement Community Engagement Project – Amenities	Mayor Shane Van Styn
14 May 2016	Radio Mama GNFL Broadcast– Rovers Football Club	Mayor Shane Van Styn
15 May 2016	Radio Interview with Radio Mama	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	Regular Meeting with Local Members	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	Meeting with Consul General of Vietnam- Mr Phung The Long	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	RUKPA – Annual General Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
16 May 2016	Citizenship Ceremony	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 May 2016	Morning Tea with Volunteers of the Community Nursery & Tour	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 May 2016	Telstra NBN Role Out Media Event	Mayor Shane Van Styn
17 May 2016	Agenda Forum – May 2016	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 May 2016	Local Emergency Management Committee Meeting	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 May 2016	Official Launch of Headspace in Geraldton	Mayor Shane Van Styn
19 May 2016	Official Opening of the Disability Access Ramp – Town Beach	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 May 2016	Small Business Development Corporation – Breakfast	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 May 2016	Special Board Meeting – RGS & CCF Midwest Development Commission	Mayor Shane Van Styn

20 May 2016	Photo Opportunity – Yamatji Arts Community Grant Acceptance	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 May 2016	Big Sky Readers & Writers Festival Opening	Mayor Shane Van Styn
20 May 2016	Big Sky Dinner	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 May 2016	Parliament & Parliamentary Process Seminar	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Marketing & Media	Mayor Shane Van Styn
23 May 2016	Regular Catch Up – Mayor & CEO	Mayor Shane Van Styn
24 May 2016	Ordinary Meeting of Council – May 2016	Mayor Shane Van Styn

11 REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY SERVICES

DCS268 BATAVIA COAST MARINA DESIGN GUIDELINES

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28689
AUTHOR:	M Connell, Manager Urban & Regional Development
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	03 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	LP/8/0001
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	LandCorp
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

LandCorp, in conjunction with the City and the Mid West Development Commission have been progressing the development of the next stages of the Batavia Coast Marina (BCM) project. A set of design guidelines have been prepared which are proposed to be adopted as an addendum to the City Centre local planning policy.

This report recommends adoption of the draft design guidelines for the purpose of public advertising.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. ADOPT the 'Batavia Coast Marina Design Guidelines' local planning policy as a draft for the purpose of public advertising;
2. ADOPT the local planning policy for final approval should no objections be received during the advertising period; and
3. REQUIRE a further report to Council should there be any objections received during the advertising period.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is LandCorp.

BACKGROUND:

BCM Stage 1 was developed approximately 10 years ago and in 2012 LandCorp, the Mid West Development Commission and the City entered into a Memorandum of Agreement for the development of the remaining land.

The vision for the Batavia Coast Marina is:

The Batavia Coast Marina will become a renowned waterfront revitalisation development, providing a vibrant mixed use precinct defined by an eclectic mix of residential, retail, entertainment and commercial land uses.

Batavia Coast Marina development will integrate the urban core of Geraldton, providing a cohesive city centre link. Defined by a built form comprised by both heritage preservation and contemporary landmark developments, Batavia Coast Marina will establish itself as the pre-eminent tourism 'hot-spot' of Geraldton and the Midwest Region.

The following objectives further reflect the intent of the design guidelines:

- Integrate the Batavia Coast Marina with the city centre and surrounding developments.
- Create 'destinations' which promote activity and vibrancy in the Batavia Coast Marina.
- Provide high quality mixed use residential development within the Batavia Coast Marina that offer housing choice and diversity.
- Facilitate investment and the establishment of commercial/business activity in the Batavia Coast Marina.
- Minimise the impact of vehicular traffic and car parking in Batavia Coast Marina.
- Provide attractive and pedestrian-oriented streets and public spaces.
- Reflect Geraldton's unique culture and heritage throughout the built form and character of Batavia Coast Marina.
- Promote the Batavia Coast Marina as a tourist destination.
- Be a water sensitive City exemplar.

The design guidelines are included as Attachment No. DCS268.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

It is envisaged that the BCM will integrate with the urban core of Geraldton, providing cohesive city centre linkages through to the marina. A range of dwelling types, as well as opportunities for commercial and retail are proposed in order to compliment and invigorate the area.

Social:

BCM will provide a diversity of lot types in order to facilitate higher density living options. Townhouses and apartments will accommodate a gap in the market, providing affordable living options in an active and vibrant precinct.

Environmental:

Historically, the area within BCM was used as part of the WA government railway marshalling yard. Extensive site investigations and remediation works have been undertaken.

Cultural:

The design guidelines promote Geraldton's unique culture by the integration of art into public spaces which will assist in fostering a unique sense of character

and identity for the BCM precinct. A Public Art Strategy and Public Realm Master Plan form part of the design guidelines.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council has previously adopted four addendums to the City Centre local planning policy.

The author is not aware of any other relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Local planning policies are required to be publically advertised for a period of not less than 21 days in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 2, clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

There has been no Councillor consultation.

Community Consultation to date:

There has been extensive stakeholder and community consultation in preparation of the design guidelines to date. This has involved (inter alia):

- Targeted stakeholder engagement on January 2011, January 2013 and February 2013.
- Visioning workshop on 15 April 2013.
- Community Information session on 3 June 2013.
- Research synthesis workshop held by the CRC for Water Sensitive Cities on 9-10 December 2014.

Given this prior consultation, the 21-day advertising period would be utilised.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015:

The *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* provides for local planning policies as follows:

3. *Local planning policies*

- (1) *The local government may prepare a local planning policy in respect of any matter related to the planning and development of the Scheme area.*
- (2) *A local planning policy:*
 - (a) *may apply generally or in respect of a particular class or classes of matters specified in the policy; and*
 - (b) *may apply to the whole of the Scheme area or to part or parts of the Scheme area specified in the policy.*

- (3) *A local planning policy must be based on sound town planning principles and may address either strategic or operational considerations in relation to the matters to which the policy applies.*
- (4) *The local government may amend or repeal a local planning policy.*
- (5) *In making a determination under this Scheme the local government must have regard to each relevant local planning policy to the extent that the policy is consistent with this Scheme.*

City Centre local planning policy:

This policy seeks to facilitate the development of a unique city centre possessing a high level of amenity and activity. The policy allows for the adoption of addendums as follows:

2.5.5 Addendums

It is likely (given the diversity of the city centre) that specific sites will require more detailed design indicators and parameters to provide further guidance. In these instances, site specific design guidelines (which may vary the requirements of this Policy) will be attached to this Policy.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial and resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	Sustainability
Strategy 2.3.3	Promoting and planning innovative design for a sustainable lifestyle that enables low impact living and sustainable urban development
Title: Economy	Lifestyle and Vibrancy
Strategy 4.1.3	Revitalising the CBD through economic, social and cultural vibrancy
Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.7	Ensuring efficient and effective delivery of service

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

Local Planning Strategy:

This Strategy represents the land use planning response to the City's strategic community vision. It guides long-term land use planning and provides the rationale for land use and development controls.

The BCM is part of the city centre and the Strategy has the following relevant strategies and actions for the city centre:

Strategies:

- *Ensure the City Centre remains the principal activity centre within the district, providing the most intensive concentration of development in the region with the greatest range of high order*

services and jobs and the largest commercial component of any activity centre.

- *Ensure that the City Centre is multifunctional, provides a high level of amenity and is the focal point for all modes of transport.*

Actions:

- *Ensure local planning policies and design guidelines support the role of the City Centre and encourage quality design, vibrancy and high amenity.*
- *Introduce a range of height limits, with emphasis of greater height within the City Centre core.*

It is considered that the design guidelines will greatly assist in achieving the above strategies and actions.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

By not adopting the policy there is a risk that the City will not have a sufficient planning framework to guide decision making in the BCM.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

It is considered essential, that in the interest of providing a sound planning framework from which the local government can be guided in its discretion and decision making process, that new policies be prepared and existing policies be revised.

The City has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement for the development of the remaining BCM land and a set of contemporary design guidelines is required in order to guide development that will ultimately fulfil the desired vision for the site. 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.

DCS269 ADOPTION OF DRAFT (REVISED) CITY CENTRE LOCAL PLANNING POLICY
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28705
AUTHOR:	M Connell, Manager Urban & Regional Development
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	03 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	LP/8/0001
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

With the gazettal of the new Local Planning Scheme No. 1, staff have reviewed and updated the City Centre local planning policy (the policy).

This report recommends adoption of the draft (revised) policy for the purpose of public advertising.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. ADOPT the 'City Centre' local planning policy (version 8) as a draft for the purpose of public advertising;
2. ADOPT the local planning policy for final approval should no objections be received during the advertising period; and
3. REQUIRE a further report to Council should there be any objections received during the advertising period.

PROponent:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

With the recent gazettal of the City's new Local Planning Scheme No. 1 and the planning framework established by the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, there is a need to review and revise the policy.

The revised policy has been reformatted in accordance with the new local planning policy template and a number of photos and graphics have been deleted to 'simplify' the document. The main changes are summarised as follows:

- Including all land zoned 'Regional Centre' in the policy (inclusive of the Batavia Coast Marina).

The current policy does not cover the entire CBD area.

- Updating the 'Planning Context' section of the document to reflect recently adopted strategies.

The revised policy now refers to the Local Planning Strategy, Geraldton City Centre Vibrancy Strategy, Residential Development Strategy, Commercial Activity Centres Strategy and the Integrated Transport Strategy.

- Updating the cash-in-lieu figure for car parking and including new cash-in-lieu figures for motorcycle / scooter and bicycle parking.

Previously the cash-in-lieu figure was based on 4 different precincts in the CBD and the figure ranged from \$13,150 to \$39,250 per bay. The revised policy now has one single cash-in-lieu rate that the developer can use or alternatively seek their own valuation.

The current City Centre Planning Policy can be viewed on the City's website via the link:

http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Document-Centre/Planning/New_LPPs/City_Centre_Planning_Policy.pdf

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

The city centre is the largest multi-functional centre of activity, providing the most intensely concentrated development in the region. It has the greatest range of high order services and jobs and the largest commercial component of any activity centre. The centre services the City and the Midwest region.

The city centre is the focus for intense development within the Geraldton Urban Area and is the focus for public transport and the road network. It also showcases heritage and culture through buildings and cultural elements, providing a focus for visitors to the City and the region. As the population increases, the commercial composition of the city centre will change to strengthen its role as the regional focus for tourism, cultural and entertainment activities. The City Centre will also accommodate an increasing number of residents in higher density housing forms.

The complexity of these issues gives rise to the need for more detailed supplementary urban design policy.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council has reviewed the policy at meetings held on 24 March 2009, 15 April 2009, 23 March 2010, 22 March 2011, 24 April 2012, 26 June 2012 and 15 September 2012.

The author is not aware of any other relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Local planning policies are required to be publically advertised for a period of not less than 21 days in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 2, clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

There has been no Councillor consultation on these specific amendments however previously there has been briefings, workshops and as part of the policy development and amendment.

The development of the City Centre Planning Policy was undertaken via community workshops, community advertising and a review including further community consultation. The current changes proposed bring the policy up to date with the other work undertaken such as Batavia Coast Marina Stage 2.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* provides for local planning policies as follows:

3. Local planning policies

- (1) *The local government may prepare a local planning policy in respect of any matter related to the planning and development of the Scheme area.*
- (2) *A local planning policy:*
 - (a) *may apply generally or in respect of a particular class or classes of matters specified in the policy; and*
 - (b) *may apply to the whole of the Scheme area or to part or parts of the Scheme area specified in the policy.*
- (3) *A local planning policy must be based on sound town planning principles and may address either strategic or operational considerations in relation to the matters to which the policy applies.*
- (4) *The local government may amend or repeal a local planning policy.*
- (5) *In making a determination under this Scheme the local government must have regard to each relevant local planning policy to the extent that the policy is consistent with this Scheme.*

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial and resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	Sustainability
Strategy 2.3.3	Promoting and planning innovative design for a sustainable lifestyle that enables low impact living and

	sustainable urban development
Title: Economy	Lifestyle and Vibrancy
Strategy 4.1.3	Revitalising the CBD through economic, social and cultural vibrancy
Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.7	Ensuring efficient and effective delivery of service

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

Local Planning Strategy:

This Strategy represents the land use planning response to the City's strategic community vision. It guides long-term land use planning and provides the rationale for land use and development controls.

The Strategy has the following relevant strategies and actions for the city centre:

Strategies:

- *Ensure the City Centre remains the principal activity centre within the district, providing the most intensive concentration of development in the region with the greatest range of high order services and jobs and the largest commercial component of any activity centre.*
- *Ensure that the City Centre is multifunctional, provides a high level of amenity and is the focal point for all modes of transport.*

Actions:

- *Ensure local planning policies and design guidelines support the role of the City Centre and encourage quality design, vibrancy and high amenity.*
- *Introduce a range of height limits, with emphasis of greater height within the City Centre core.*

It is considered that the policy will greatly assist in achieving the above strategies and actions.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

By not adopting the policy there is a risk that the City will not have a sufficient planning framework to guide decision making in the city centre.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

It is considered essential, that in the interest of providing a sound planning framework from which the local government can be guided in its discretion and decision making process, that new policies be prepared and existing policies be revised. 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.

DCS270 PROPOSED ALFRESCO DINING – GERALDTON FORESHORE

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28734
AUTHOR:	M Connell, Manager Urban & Regional Development
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	6 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	TP14/304 & A8055
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Anti Slip WA Pty Ltd
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

An amended application has been received to relocate 10 alfresco dining tables (each with 4 chairs) associated with the 'Two Foreshore' café located on the Geraldton foreshore.

This report recommends conditional approval of the application.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 9, clause 68 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, RESOLVES to:

1. GRANT development approval for alfresco dining on portion of Lot 506 (Reserve 50100) Foreshore Drive Geraldton;
2. MAKES the determination subject to the following conditions:
 - a. this approval entirely replaces the previous development approval issued on 25 August 2014;
 - b. development shall be in accordance with the attached approved plan(s) dated 24 May 2016 and subject to any modifications required as a consequence of any condition(s) of this approval. The endorsed plans shall not be modified or altered without the prior written approval of the local government;
 - c. all furniture is required to be removed from the area at the close of business each day;
 - d. all furniture located as part of the alfresco dining area is required to be readily removable. No permanent features are permitted;
 - e. the alfresco dining area is required to be cleaned daily and all rubbish removed;
 - f. all furniture for dining must not obstruct pedestrian movement with a minimum clear footpath width of 1.5 metres being maintained at all times;
 - g. no alteration to existing paved or landscaped areas shall be made without the prior written approval of the local government;
 - h. the City being indemnified in relation to any actions regarding accessibility to/ from the alfresco area;

- i. this development approval shall remain valid while the lease of the adjoining premises remains current and valid, and on expiration or earlier termination of the lease, this development approval shall cease to be valid;
- j. the approved alfresco dining area (other than the approved furniture) is not for the exclusive use of the patrons; and
- k. the alfresco dining area is to be maintained to the approval of the local government at all times (inclusive of existing landscaped areas).

PROPONENT:

The proponent is Colin Dymond on behalf of Anti Slip Pty Ltd.

BACKGROUND:

The application for alfresco dining was originally approved (under delegation) on 25 August 2014, which allowed for 20 tables with 4 chairs per table. The current approved site plan is included in Attachment No. DCS270A.

The applicant is now proposing to relocate 10 tables (each with 4 chairs) onto the adjoining grassed area to take advantage of the shady trees. It must be noted that there is no increase in total numbers of chairs and tables that has been approved.

The proponent has advised that at present patrons move the furniture onto the grassed area themselves to sit under the shade of the existing trees and the application has been made in response to customer requests.

A copy of the amended site plan and alfresco dining furniture is included in Attachment No. DCS270B.

One aspect that has been raised as a concern from a patron was the lack universal access to the subject area. There is no specific requirement for universal access into this area as the operator provides alternate seating in close proximity to the application area.

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

There are no economic issues.

Social:

The approved application has already enhanced the public's visit to the foreshore and the relocation of the furniture is in direct response to customer requests.

Environmental:

There are no environmental issues.

Cultural:

There are no cultural issues.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council at its meeting held on 27 May 2014 approved the lease for the 'Two Foreshore' café on the foreshore.

Council at its meeting held on 26 April granted development approval for alfresco dining associated with the 'Jaffle Shack' café located on the Geraldton foreshore.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The Geraldton Foreshore (Reserve 50100) is vested with the City for the purpose of 'Foreshore Reserve'. The City has power to lease the Reserve.

Local Planning Scheme No. 1:

The land is a 'Local Scheme Reserve' for the purpose of 'Foreshore' under the Scheme. The objective of the 'Foreshore' reserve is:

To set aside land for foreshore reserves and provide for conservation and/or public access with a range of active and passive recreational uses.

Foreshore Use and Development policy:

The aim of this policy is to provide for an effective framework for the management of proposals for commercial businesses, infrastructure development, recreational and other usages on the foreshore.

The policy advocates the activation of the foreshore recognising that while public open space is a high priority and should not be compromised, people want amenities and activities that enhance their experience of the foreshore.

It also promotes opportunities for activities that respect the essence of the place and enables providers to offer services and facilities to the public to enhance their visit to the foreshore.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial and resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Economy	Lifestyle and vibrancy
Strategy 4.1.3	Revitalising the CBD through economic, social and cultural vibrancy.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

By not approving the application the proponent may seek a review of the decision from the State Administrative Tribunal.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

It is considered that the proposal will further enhance the vibrancy and attraction of the foreshore area without compromising its recreational amenity for the general public. The application is in direct response to customer requests to take advantage of the shade offered by the existing trees, and therefore the option to refuse is not supported.

The option to defer is not supported as there is considered sufficient information for Council to determine the matter. In any event a deferral may trigger a review right under Part 14, Division 2 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 which states that the local government is to be taken to have refused an application if it has not given its decision within a period of 60 days after receipt of the application.

DCS271 PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT –
RURAL REZONING, RUDDS GULLY

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28712
AUTHOR:	C Krummenacher, Planning Officer
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	4 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	LP/14/0001
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Western Power
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

An application has been received to initiate a Local Planning Scheme Amendment ('amendment') to remove the 'Public Purpose' reservation from Lot 51 Rudds Gully Road, Rudds Gully and rezone it to 'Rural'.

This report recommends that Council 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 51 Rudds Gully Road, Rudds Gully to the 'Rural' 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; and
2. MAKES the determination on the following grounds:
 - a. The amendment is consistent with the City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy; and
 - b. The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on the land.

PROponent:

The proponent is the Electricity Networks Corporation (trading as Western Power).

BACKGROUND:

The subject land is located approximately 10.5km south-east of the Geraldton city centre in Rudds Gully and has an area of 1.99ha. Scott Road and Rudds Gully Road border the lot on the western and south-eastern boundaries.

The subject land is generally flat, predominantly cleared of vegetation and does not contain any buildings. It is currently used for rural uses (cropping) in conjunction with the rural land abutting to the north. An electricity distribution line runs along the Scott Road boundary.

Western Power has identified the subject land as surplus to its requirements as it is not required for electrical network purposes in the foreseeable future. It is proposed to be sold and hence the need to change the zoning from its current 'Public Purpose' reservation.

The amendment document is included as Attachment No. DCS271.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

There are no economic issues.

Social:

There are no social issues.

Environmental:

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.

Cultural:

There are no cultural issues.

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.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Local Planning Scheme No. 1:

The subject land is currently a local reserve for 'Public Purposes'. The reserve objective is:

"To provide for a range of essential physical and community infrastructure and services."

The subject land is not required for electrical network purposes in the foreseeable future and hence the 'Public Purpose' reservation no longer reflects

the intended use of the subject land. Rezoning the subject land to 'Rural' is most appropriate given the land to the north of Rudds Gully Road alignment that surrounds the subject land is also zoned 'Rural'.

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.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial and resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

Geraldton Region Plan:

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 'future urban' on the structure plan.

Local Planning Strategy:

This Strategy represents the land use planning response to the City's strategic community vision. It guides long-term land use planning and provides the rationale for land use and development controls.

The subject land has been identified in the Strategy within 'Development Investigation Area 7 (Rudds Gully)'. The Strategy considers the ultimate land uses may include service commercial, light industry and urban, subject to future rezoning and/or structure planning.

More extensive planning is required to ascertain the ultimate land use for the subject land. This will need to be done in context with the wider area covered by the Development Investigation Area when demand warrants, which is not anticipated in the short-to-medium term.

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. The subject land is not required for electrical network purposes in the foreseeable future and hence the 'Public Purpose' reservation no longer reflects the intended use of the subject land.

Rezoning the subject land to 'Rural' is most appropriate given the land to the north of Rudds Gully Road alignment that surrounds the subject site is also zoned 'Rural' and therefore the option to refuse is not supported.

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

DCS272 MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE 'MORESBY HEIGHTS' STRUCTURE PLAN
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28710
AUTHOR:	C Krummenacher, Planning Officer
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	04 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	LP/9/0045
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	CLE Plan
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The City has received a request for a minor amendment to the 'Moresby Heights' structure plan to incorporate a Rural Residential 'homestead' lot that will contain the existing dwelling on Lot 80 Hackett Road, Waggrakine.

This report recommends that the amendment to the structure plan be approved by the WA Planning Commission.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 4, clause 29 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 RESOLVES to:

1. REQUEST that the WA Planning Commission to amend the 'Moresby Heights' structure plan, as per the attachment (Attachment No. DCS272) to include a 'homestead' lot.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is CLE Plan.

BACKGROUND:

In February 2015 the WA Planning Commission endorsed the 'Moresby Heights' structure plan over Lots 80 & 81 Hackett Road and Lot 55 Cooper Street, Waggrakine. The structure plan provides the planning framework for the development of around 400ha of land as a new residential neighbourhood including public open space, a primary school, tourism node, neighbourhood centre, district recreation and regional open space protecting the Moresby Range.

Lot 80 contains a farm house which has been the long-time residence of the existing landowner of Lots 80 and 81. The farm house and associated outbuildings are located in the south-eastern portion of the structure plan area. The existing landowners wish to retain the farmhouse and its immediate surrounds (approximately 5.6ha) to enable their continued residence on the site.

The eastern portion of the endorsed structure plan area (79ha) was identified for 'Regional' public open space consistent with the Moresby Range

Management Strategy 2009 to introduce protection to the Range face in recognition of its visual significance to the area. Whilst the vast majority (73.4ha) of the proposed 'Regional' public open space area is still proposed to be retained, this amendment has been prepared to recognise and retain the ongoing use of the existing farm house. This will provide for its retention as a Rural Residential 'homestead' lot to enable its continued occupation and use by the current landowners.

This amendment does not introduce any development or visual intrusion within the 'Regional' open space beyond that which already exists. As such, the amendment is considered minor in nature.

The proposed (amended) structure plan is included as Attachment No. DCS272.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

All economic, social, environmental and cultural issues were dealt with in the original approval of the structure plan.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council at its meeting held on 24 June 2014 Council adopted the structure plan which was subsequently endorsed by the WA Planning Commission on 25 February 2015.

The author is not aware of any other relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Schedule 2, Part 4, clause 29(3) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 states that the local government may decide not to advertise an amendment to a structure plan if, in the opinion of the local government and the Commission, the amendment is of a minor nature.

It is considered that the modification is minor in nature and therefore no community consultation is proposed.

There has been no Councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

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

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial and resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no regional outcomes as a result of this minor amendment to the structure plan.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

There are no inherent risks to the City in supporting this minor amendment to the structure plan.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

The existing landowners wish to retain the farmhouse and its immediate surrounds to enable their continued residence on the site. The vast majority of the proposed 'Regional' public open space area is still proposed to be retained. This amendment does not introduce any development or visual intrusion within the 'Regional' open space beyond that which already exists. Therefore, the option to refuse is not supported.

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

DCS273 PROPOSED ROAD DEDICATION – GERALDTON MT. MAGNET ROAD

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28997
AUTHOR:	A Eastough, Acquisitions and Disposals Officer
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development & Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	05 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	RO/5/0003
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Department of Lands
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A request has been received from the Department of Lands (DOL) to formalise the road dedication for that portion of the Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road that was formerly known as the ‘Southern Transport Corridor’ (STC).

This report recommends that Council agree to the dedication of the land as road.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority, pursuant to Section 56 of the Land Administration Act 1997, RESOLVES to:

1. DEDICATE the following land as road:
 - a. Lots 12647, 12655, 12653, 12654, 12646, 12652, 12651, 12645, 12650, 12644, 12649, 12642 and 12648 on DP 27385;
 - b. Lot 12635 on DP 26965;
 - c. Lots 12640, 12641, 12639, 12638, 12637 and 3193 on DP 26966;
 - d. Lots 3194 and 3206 on DP 26967;
 - e. Lot 3195 on DP 26968;
 - f. Lot 12601 on DP 27001; and
 - g. Lot 501 on DP 63108.

PROponent:

The proponent is the Department of Lands.

BACKGROUND:

DOL has received advice from Main Roads WA (MRWA) that action to proceed with the road dedication of the STC awaits a resolution from the City. No formal requests for such a resolution have been received by the City prior.

Formal survey of the land required for the STC occurred a number of years ago but has never been acted upon by MRWA.

A copy of the overall locality plan indicating the land is included as Attachment No. DCS273. A copy of the survey Deposited Plans is available to Council upon request.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council has previously resolved to formally dedicate roads on numerous occasions.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community or Councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Section 56 of the Land Administration Act 1997 provides for the dedication of land for road purposes.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**Local Planning Strategy:**

This Strategy represents the land use planning response to the City's strategic community vision. It guides long-term land use planning and provides the rationale for land use and development controls.

The STC is shown as 'Infrastructure Corridor'.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

There are no inherent risks.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS:

The tenure of the STC is technically Unallocated Crown Land and the formal dedication to 'road' status is simply an administrative requirement, therefore the option to refuse is not supported.

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

DCS275 MODIFICATIONS TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS WITHIN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29214
AUTHOR:	N Beer, Coordinator Ranger Services
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development and Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	05 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	TT/1/0002
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x3)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's endorsement of the proposed parking restriction implementation in various central locations to accommodate infrastructure development, small business expansion and parking improvements within the community.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. IMPLEMENT two (2) hour time restriction parking at the following locations:
 - a. Marine Terrace, East side, between Lester Avenue and Francis Street;
 - b. Museum Place;
 - c. Maitland Street West side between Durlacher Street and rear lane access way to Queens Park Theatre; and
 - d. Foreshore Drive between Bayley Street and Forrest Street.

PROponent:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

As the City of Greater Geraldton continues to improve and expand local business through social and economic vibrancy the necessity for Council to provide fair and accessible parking options for the community also continues.

Business owners operating along Marine Terrace have requested parking restrictions adjacent to their properties, refer Attachment No. DCS275A, to provide customer parking. At present without the restrictions, vehicles are utilising the bays for all day parking therefore impeding customer turnover.

Business owners within the Marina precinct have raised concerns regarding unrestricted parking bays, refer Attachment No. DCS275B. The Batavia Coast Marina Stage 2 once completed, will impact parking availability within this area if the parking bays remain unrestricted.

Restricted parking is required along Maitland Street, refer Attachment No. DCS275C, to provide additional parking bays for vehicles during morning and

afternoon school pupil transfers. At present without restrictions, the bays are being utilised all day by employees from surrounding businesses.

To improve on street parking and regulation thereof the implementation of two (2) hour time restriction parking at the following locations is recommended:

- a. Marine Terrace, East side between Lester Avenue and Francis Street;
- b. Museum Place;
- c. Maitland Street West side between Durlacher Street and rear lane access way to Queens Park Theatre; and
- d. Foreshore Drive between Bayley Street and Forrest Street.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The provisions of appropriate parking restriction will add stimulus to the City's economy.

Social:

The provision of appropriate parking restrictions enables fair vehicle access to areas within the City of Greater Geraldton.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

The City of Greater Geraldton Council under powers conferred by the Local Government Act 1995 resolved to make the Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2012 on 26 June 2012. The Local Law was printed in the Government Gazette on 4 September 2012.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Should Council agree to endorse the parking restrictions contained in this report, local public advertising advising of the new parking restrictions will be conducted prior to implementation. This will include a door knock of adjacent premises to discuss the intended changes (noting that a number of requests were submitted from adjoining premises) for these changes.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Section 3.18 of the Local Government Act 1995 - Performing Executive Functions whereby a local government is to satisfy itself that the services and facilities that it provides are managed efficiently and effectively.

The City of Greater Geraldton Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2012; Section 1.8 Powers of the Local Government.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	Planning and Policy
Strategy 5.2.5	Supporting the creation of a 20 minute city where community infrastructure is accessible by car, bike or foot.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The proposed item will assist in alleviating parking congestion in the Central Business District.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no identified specific risks regarding this proposal. The proposal reduces the City's exposure to risk by ensuring the City's statutory obligations are met.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The alternative option considered is to not implement the two-hour time restriction. This option was discounted as it is not consistent with the Parking Management Plan adopted by Council nor provides fair and accessible parking to the community. Consideration was also given to:

- Extending the 2-hour limit into Bayly Street in the Marina, however there has not been any issues raised to date on this area.
- Extending the 2-hour parking limit further along Maitland Street (adjacent to Queens Park Theatre). The area is used by Queens Park Theatre attendees (especially on day long events), City staff permit parking. The implementation of the recommended amendments will be monitored to determine if further restrictions need to be put in place.

DCS276 AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION FOR CLEANING OF CITY PUBLIC ABLUTION BLOCKS
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28671
AUTHOR:	L MacLeod, Coordinator Land & Property Services
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Community & Development Services
DATE OF REPORT:	2 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	PM/8/0005
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1 Confidential)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

An error was contained in the Council minutes for item DCS266 and the confidential attachment, which recorded the tendered rates to be noted in the Minutes to be *inclusive* of GST. The purpose of this report is to rescind the previous minutes, resubmit the item to Council and to resolve the tendered rates for all of submissions for RFT 17 1516 are *exclusive* of GST and award the tender accordingly.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**PART A**

Council by 1/3rd Majority pursuant to Section 5.25(1)(e) RESOLVES to CONSIDER to RESCIND the Council Decision made at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 26 April 2016:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) RESOLVES to:

- 1. AWARD RFT 17 1516 Cleaning of City Public Ablution Blocks to the preferred tenderer Hot Cleaning Services; and*
- 2. RECORD the tendered rates in the minutes being \$287,541 (inc GST) per annum and the contract term is for two years.*

PART B

Council by Absolute Majority pursuant to Section 5.25(1)(e) RESOLVES to RESCIND the Council Decision made at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 26 April 2016:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) RESOLVES to:

- 1. AWARD RFT 17 1516 Cleaning of City Public Ablution Blocks to the preferred tenderer Hot Cleaning Services; and*
- 2. RECORD the tendered rates in the minutes being \$287,541 (inc GST) per annum and the contract term is for two years.*

PART C

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) RESOLVES to:

1. AWARD RFT 17 1516 Cleaning of City Public Ablution Blocks to the preferred tenderer Hot Cleaning Services; and
2. RECORD the tendered rates in the minutes being \$287,541 (exc. GST) per annum and the contract term is for two years.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

The City called for tenders for the cleaning of the City's public ablution blocks and in the preparation of Item DCS266 and associated confidential attachment, reference was made that the recorded tendered rates were to be noted to be *inclusive* of GST. In fact, the tender amount listed in all tenders contained in the attachment were in fact *exclusive* of GST. Council accepted the Executive recommendation and awarded the tender as \$287,541 including GST.

The purpose of this report is seeking Council consideration to rescind the previous minutes, then consider the resubmission of the item and to accept the tendered rates for all of submissions for RFT 17 1516 as *exclusive* of GST.

As the error transcribed was the same for all submitted tenders the actual preferred tender remains the same. Amended confidential Attachment No. DCS276 refers.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

A confidential briefing note regarding this matter was presented to Council at the Concept Forum on 2 May 2016.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no legislative or policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or resource implications as the budget amount stated in the Evaluation Report are excluding GST.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no specific risks identified.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

There are no alternative options to be considered by City officers.

DCS279 MICHELANGELO REPLICA EXHIBITION TO GERALDTON

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29899
AUTHOR:	P Banks, Manager Community and Cultural Development
EXECUTIVE:	P Melling, Director Development and Community Services
DATE OF REPORT:	9 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	RC/3/0006
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Geraldton Regional Art Gallery
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this item is to seek Council's position with regard to committing City funds to bring the Michelangelo Replica Exhibition to Geraldton, noting that some of the costs may be recouped through the ticket sales.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. DECLINE to financially support the bringing of the Michelangelo Replica Exhibition to Geraldton proposed to be held from the 30 September to the 25 November 2017. The Geraldton Regional Art Gallery is encouraged to seek alternate funding for the Michelangelo Replica Exhibition and the City would have no objection to the staging of the exhibition; and
2. ADVISE The Geraldton Regional Art Gallery Committee that the City has no objection to the staging of the Michelangelo Replica Exhibition provided that alternate funding can be obtained.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery.

BACKGROUND:

The former Manager of Communications, Events and Engagement was approached by the WA Museum in Geraldton to determine the City's interest for taking on the Michelangelo Exhibition in September to November 2017. The Museum may be unable to hold the exhibition as they hope they will be undergoing extensions/ refurbishment at the time (subject to funding). The exhibition was alternatively proposed to be held at the Geraldton Regional Gallery, albeit at the City of Greater Geraldton's expense.

The Manager of Community and Cultural Development took this proposal to the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery Committee. The Committee supported the proposal and requested that the proposal be put to Council.

The key aspects to note are as follows:

- The full exhibition requires a space of 500 square metres. The Geraldton Regional Art Gallery only has space for 295 square metres. Therefore, the gallery could only accept a portion of the exhibition pieces.
- The City will be responsible for payment of the exhibition fee, marketing costs and any insurance of the works. The estimated cost is approximately \$90,000.
- Any revenue taken by the gallery for this event will be acquitted to the City, along with visitor figures and comments during the exhibition and photos from the exhibition. The gallery will forgo any profit of this exhibition as long as no extra cost is incurred by the gallery. Ticket sales will therefore offset the total cost. It is difficult to estimate how much money would be generated in ticket sales but worth noting that the WA Museum Geraldton did not break even on the Da Vinci- Exhibition although they came close. 11, 591 ticket sales would have equated to a break even figure for the museum and 10,376 tickets were sold. However, it is also noteworthy that the Da Vinci Exhibition was open from 5 July – 9 November; a significantly longer exhibition period than the Michelangelo would be available for.
- The gallery is able to provide staff to assist the curator and the installation would be in agreement with the touring installation team and Gallery staff only.
- There are a number of areas that the City would need to support either by direct funding or in kind support including: ticketing and advertising for the exhibition. This includes posters and media releases. The Art Gallery WA logo must be included on all advertising and marketing. The City would also need to cover costs of hosting an opening night at the gallery. In addition, the City will be responsible for the storage of any crates during the exhibition as the gallery have limited room, for storage. Storage would also include transportation of the crates (which need to be kept at a constant cool temp).

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

There is a potential economic loss to the City of Greater Geraldton if ticket sales do not break even. This is a likely outcome given that ticket sales did not break even at the Da Vinci Exhibition at the WA Museum.

The exhibition may create some economic stimulus for hospitality businesses who may benefit from additional visitors to Geraldton who travel to see the exhibition.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

The exhibition will contribute to the cultural vibrancy of the City of Greater Geraldton, including making the City a destination to visit for towns in the region.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

The City of Greater Geraldton's former Manager of Communications, Events and Engagement consulted with the WA Museum and the Catholic Church to determine suitability of their venues for the exhibition. Upon determining that these venues would not be suitable, the Manager approached the Manager of Community and Cultural Development and the Acting Director of the Geraldton Regional Art Gallery to determine the art gallery's suitability for holding the exhibition. The Manager of Community and Cultural Development has further consulted with the WA Museum in Geraldton to determine the financial viability of their Da Vinci exhibition.

The Geraldton Regional Art Gallery Committee. The Committee resolved to support the request and recommended it be considered by Council.

The City's Executive Management Team has also been consulted and do not support the request.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no legislative or policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The estimated total cost for the exhibition, inclusive of the exhibition fees, marketing costs and the insurance for the works is approximately \$90,000. A budget figure of \$85,000 noting that an additional \$5,000 is considered in the resource implications as the staffing costs and ticketing costs are not currently known. These can be better determined once Councillors appetites for the exhibition is known.

Some of these costs would be recouped through the ticket sales.

There has been no previous budget consideration for allocation of these funds for this project.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Culture	The Arts
Strategy 1.1.3.1.	Fostering and facilitating art in all its forms

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The exhibition would provide a cultural opportunity to community members outside of the City of Greater Geraldton, such as residents from neighbouring shires, and would emphasise the City of Greater Geraldton as a hub of artistic vibrancy.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The key risk in approving this exhibition is that the costs of delivering the exhibition will not be recouped in ticket sales. An additional risk is that the City now has reduced human resources, including a reduced marketing team and a reduced team in Community Development, to coordinate this significant exhibition coming to Geraldton.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The following option was considered by City Officers:

The Geraldton Regional Art Gallery Committee requested this item be presented to Council for consideration. The alternate option is to endorse and accept the Michelangelo Exhibition at a cost to the City of Greater Geraldton noting that only part of the exhibition could be accommodated at the gallery.

Splitting the display is a further option however this will require additional resources to staff the exhibition and will require identifying a suitable venue for the duration of the exhibition along with any costs for venue hire.

These options are not recommended as the funding has been unbudgeted and there is no guarantee of full cost recovery at a time when the City has been cutting programs and staff to achieve more positive financial outcomes.

12 REPORTS OF CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES

CCS177 ELECTED MEMBERS FEES AND ALLOWANCES

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-25728
AUTHOR:	M Adam, Coordinator Governance
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate & Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	26 April 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/7/0003
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to enable Council to review elected members' fees and allowances with reference to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal ('the Tribunal') determination 2016 which comes into operation on 1 July 2016. The 2016 determination recommends a 1.5% general adjustment to the band ranges.

This report recommends payment of annual attendance fees and annual mayoral and deputy mayoral allowances at the midpoint of the rates recommended by the Tribunal, within the band range. However, any adjustments to elected member fees and allowances are a matter to be determined by Council.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. APPROVE the Mayor's annual local government allowance of \$70,567 in accordance with section 5.98 (5) of the Act;
2. APPROVE the Mayor's annual attendance fees of \$32,408 in accordance with section 5.99 of the Act;
3. APPROVE the Deputy Mayor's annual local government allowance of \$17,641 in accordance with section 5.98A (1) of the Act;
4. APPROVE the annual attendance fees of \$25,090 for every other elected member (excluding the Mayor) in accordance with section 5.99 of the Act;
5. APPROVE an ICT allowance of \$3,500 per year per elected member in accordance with section 5.99A of the Act;
6. APPROVE the reimbursement of expenses incurred by a council member in accordance with section 5.98(2)(b) and (3) of the Act and regulation 32 of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*;
7. APPROVE the reimbursement of child care costs of \$25 per hour or the actual cost incurred by an elected member when attending a meeting referred to in regulation 31(1)(b) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*;

8. APPROVE the reimbursement of travel costs incurred by a council member in accordance with regulation 31(1)(b) of *the Local Government (Administration) Regulation 1996*;
9. APPROVE the adjustment of 1.5% to the band ranges as determined by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, to take effect from 1 July 2016; and
10. AMEND the Budget for the 2016-17 financial year to accommodate the increased expenditures for elected members' allowances and fees as per items 1 through 4 above.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton

BACKGROUND:

Section 7B (2) of the *Salaries and Allowances Act 1975* (the 'SA Act') requires the Tribunal, at intervals of not more than 12 months, to inquire into and determine -

- a) *the amount of fees, or the minimum and maximum amounts of fees, to be paid under the Local Government Act 1995 to elected council members for attendance at meetings; and*
- b) *the amount of expenses, or the minimum and maximum amounts of expenses, to be reimbursed under the Local Government Act 1995 to elected council members; and*
- c) *the amount of allowances, or the minimum and maximum amounts of allowances, to be paid under the Local Government Act 1995 to elected council members*

In discharging its statutory requirement with respect to the remuneration of local government elected members, the Tribunal:

- advertised for public submissions;
- invited local governments and regional local governments to raise any issues relevant to the determination of fees, expenses and allowances for elected council members;
- met with representatives from 22 local governments in regional areas of WA;
- surveyed local governments and regional local governments as to the fees paid to elected council members;
- considered relevant labour market and economic data; and
- sought advice from the Statutory Adviser, Ms Jennifer Mathews, Director General, Department of Local Government and Communities (DLGC).

Survey results received showed that all Local Governments provide fees within the bands determined by the tribunal.

In making their determination the Tribunal noted the State Governments mid-year review and the quarterly financial results report which outlined the challenging economic and fiscal outlook of the state in general. They also considered the State Governments decision to limit pay rises to 1.5% per annum for public sector employees and noted that although the policy does not apply to local governments the decision illustrates the community expectations for wages growth of government officers whose salaries or fees are derived from taxes or rates.

The Tribunal consequently made the 2016 determination of a general adjustment of 1.5 percent to the band ranges.

Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Determination 2016

Annual attendance fees – 2016

The annual attendance fees set by the Tribunal are as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Mayor	\$24,360	\$47,046
Councillor	\$24,360	\$31,364

Annual allowances – Mayor and Deputy Mayor - 2016

The annual allowances set by the Tribunal are as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Mayor	\$50,750	\$88,864
Deputy Mayor	\$12,687	\$22,216

Salaries and Allowances Determination 2015

Annual attendance fees – 2015

The annual attendance fees set by the Tribunal are as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Mayor	\$24,000	\$46,350
Councillor	\$24,000	\$30,900

Annual allowances – Mayor and Deputy Mayor – 2015

Annual allowances set by the Tribunal are as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Mayor	\$50,000	\$87,550
Deputy Mayor	\$12,500	\$21,887

Fees and Allowances Elected Members- 2015-2016

	Meeting Attendance Fees	Allowance	IT & Telephone Allowance
Mayor	\$31,930	\$69,525	\$3,500
Deputy Mayor	\$24,720	\$17,381	\$3,500
Councillor	\$24,720	n/a	\$3,500

Proposed Fees and Allowances Elected Members- 2016-2017

	Meeting Attendance Fees	Allowance	IT & Telephone Allowance
Mayor	\$32,408	\$70,567	\$3,500
Deputy Mayor	\$25,090	\$17,641	\$3,500
Councillor	\$25,090	n/a	\$3,500

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council at its meeting of 26 August 2014 adopted the councillors' fees and allowances as recommended by the Tribunal in the 2014 determination.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Elected members' fees, expenses and allowances are governed by section 5.98, 5.98A, 5.99 and 5.99A of the *Local Government Act 1995* and regulations 30, 31, and 32 of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Should council adopt the percentage increase of 1.5% recommended by the Tribunal, applied to the existing level of Councillor fees, then the increase to the budget will be \$6970.00

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risk issues for the City.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The alternatives that could be considered by Council include:

- No change from the fees as formally adopted as part of the 2015-16 budget (i.e. fixed at 2014 - 2015 levels).
- A percentage change to existing fee levels lower than the 1.5% recommended by the Tribunal.
- A percentage change to existing fee levels higher than the 1.5% recommended by the Tribunal.
- A change from Minimum fee levels for Councillors, to a higher proportion of the range, up the Maximum as determined by the Tribunal.

Whether or not elected members' fees should remain at current positioning within the ranges recommended by the Tribunal, and whether or not fees should be increased by up to the inflation adjustment of 1.5% recommended by the Tribunal is a matter for Council.

The Tribunal has indicated that any increase *higher* than the recommended 1.5% inflationary adjustment would require justification by a Council.

CCS178 COUNCIL POLICY CP032 ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF COMMITTEES.
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-27004
AUTHOR:	M Adam, Governance Coordinator
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	2 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/7/0003
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's adoption of CP032 Establishment and Operation of Committees Policy which has undergone review.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 52 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ENDORSE Council Policy CP032 Establishment and Operation of Committees Policy.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

This policy was last endorsed by the Council of the City of Greater Geraldton 25 September 2012 and has now been reviewed and minor amendments made to align with the process and structure changes in the organisation.

In summary these changes include.

Section 2.2

Reference to sunset clause removed. The dissolution of a Committee will be referred to Council.

Section 6.2

Wording relating to the advertising of Committee meetings amended for consistency with section 5.23 of the *Local Government Act 1995* and regulation 12 of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*:

Local Government Act 1995***5.23. Meetings generally open to public***

- (1) *Subject to subsection (2), the following are to be open to members of the public —*
 - (a) *all council meetings; and*

- (b) *all meetings of any committee to which a local government power or duty has been delegated.*

Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996

12. Meetings, public notice of (Act s. 5.25(1)(g))

- (1) *At least once each year a local government is to give local public notice of the dates on which and the time and place at which —*
- (a) *the ordinary council meetings; and*
 - (b) *the committee meetings **that are required under the Act** to be open to members of the public or that are proposed to be open to members of the public, are to be held in the next 12 months.*
- (2) *A local government is to give local public notice of any change to the date, time or place of a meeting referred to in subregulation (1).*

Section 8.4

Wording amended to reflect the distribution of Committee Minutes via digital distribution.

Reference to publication of minutes on City website removed, in accordance with *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*:

13. Unconfirmed minutes, public inspection of (Act s. 5.25(1)(i))

*A local government is to ensure that unconfirmed minutes of each council and committee meeting are **available for inspection** by members of the public —*

- (a) *in the case of a council meeting, within 10 business days after the meeting; and*
- (b) *in the case of a committee meeting, within 5 business days after the meeting.*

14. Notice papers, agenda etc., public inspection of (Act s. 5.25(1)(j))

- (1) *A local government is to ensure that notice papers and agenda relating to any council or committee meeting and reports and other documents which —*

- (a) *are to be tabled at the meeting; or*
- (b) *have been produced by the local government or a committee for presentation at the meeting,*

*and which have been made available to members of the council or committee for the meeting are available for **inspection by members of the public** from the time the notice papers, agenda or documents were made available to the members of the council or committee.*

- (2) *Nothing in subregulation (1) entitles members of the public to inspect the information referred to in that subregulation if, in the CEO's opinion, the meeting or that part of the meeting to which the information refers is likely to be closed to members of the public under section 5.23(2).*

The Workplace Information/ References have also been updated.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no legislative or policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Implementation of this Policy will ensure the City's ongoing compliance with legislative requirements.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

No alternative options were considered by City Officers.

CCS179 CP010 PROCUREMENT OF GOODS & SERVICES AMENDMENT

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28940
AUTHOR:	B Pearce, Coordinator Procurement & Risk
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate & Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	24 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/6/0012-04
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's endorsement of a minor amendment to CP010 Procurement of Goods & Services policy.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. ENDORSE the amendment to Council Policy CP010 Procurement of Goods & Services

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

Following the endorsement of CP010 Procurement of Goods & Services (Policy) at the March 2016 council meeting, it has become apparent that City Departments would not be able to work within the strict requirements for seeking quotations as required by the amended Policy.

Following an internal review and a further round of consultation with affected Departments, it was found that to ensure the ongoing operational effectiveness of Departments an additional procurement threshold should be considered.

This new procurement threshold would allow purchases up to \$1,000 to be made without the need for written quotes, and be allowable as direct purchases from suitable suppliers. This new threshold is designed for items that are of low risk and value.

An example of why this new threshold is needed is when an Operational Department undertaking daily services functions needs to buy a nonstandard part valued at \$50.00 from a local Supplier, the need to get a written quote is not practical and would cost the City and Supplier more in administration than the item is worth.

This is why it is now recommended that the City amend the Policy as per the following example:

Purchase Value Threshold	Purchasing Requirement
<i>Up to \$1,000</i>	<i>“No quotations required, direct purchase guided by best value for money principle ”</i>
<i>\$1,000 to \$5,000</i>	<i>Unchanged</i>
<i>Over \$5,000 and up to \$50,000</i>	<i>Unchanged</i>
<i>Over \$50,000 and up to \$150,000</i>	<i>Unchanged</i>
<i>Over \$150,000</i>	<i>Unchanged</i>

The City considered if the “no quotations required” procurement range should be higher than \$1,000; however, following consultation and review of transactions historically in this range it was not considered necessary.

All procurement activities exceeding \$1,000 in value are to be conducted in accordance with the Policy’s current requirements.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The proposed amendment will enable the City to more easily utilise local businesses who provide value for money. There will be an appreciable reduction in the administration costs of low value procurement.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council has previously endorsed the revision of this Policy to ensure its ongoing effectiveness and compliance in items *CCS022 Amendment to CP010 Procurement of Goods and Services – 17 December 2013* and *CCS164 Council Policy CP010 Procurement of Goods and Services – 22 March 2016*.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The Local Government Act 1995 section 3.57 and the Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996 section 11, outline the requirements that local government must comply with when undertaking procurement activities. This policy has been drafted to ensuring ongoing compliance with these requirements.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or resource implications.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

This amendment will require the City implement further controls to monitor this range of purchases to ensure that Officers don't inadvertently, through frequency of transactions, breach the tender requirements as per the Local Government Functions (and General) Regulations 1996.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The following options were considered by City Officers:

Option 1 - Leave the Policy unamended; and

Option 2 - Amend the Policy to allow direct purchasing of low value low risk items.

Option 2 was considered the most suitable moving forward as it allows City Officers to purchase low value items without the need for formal quotes.

CCS180 POSSESSION OF LAND FOR UNPAID RATES & CHARGES IN EXCESS OF 3 YEARS.
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28522
AUTHOR:	S Russell, Senior Rates Coordinator
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate & Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	4 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	RV/4/0002-02
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report seeks Council approval to take possession of Lot 30 and Lot 31 Sharpe Street, Pindar both being vacant land within the Pindar Town-site. Both properties have in excess of three (3) years rates and charges outstanding. The recommendation is for the re-vestment of this land to the Crown.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 6.64 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. APPROVE the taking of possession of Lot 30 and Lot 31 Sharpe Street, Pindar for unpaid rates and charges in excess of three (3) years, pursuant to section 6.64 of the Local Government Act 1995.
2. APPROVE the taking of possession of the land without the initiation of a process for recovery for money due on the land, as there is reasonable belief that the cost of proceedings under section 6.56 of the Local Government Act 1995 will equal or exceed the value of the land under section 6.68(2).
3. APPROVE to write-off rates and charges (including penalty interest) for Lot 30 and 31 Sharpe Street, Pindar under section 6.12 (1) (C) of the Local Government Act 1995.
4. MAKE APPLICATION to the Minister, upon taking possession of the land, to have the land re-vested in the crown, pursuant to section 6.74 of the Local Government Act 1995.

PROponent:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

Correspondence was received dated 22 July 2013, from the executor of the will for the estate of the late owner of these properties stating that the family do not wish to keep these blocks. These properties have no value and are a financial burden to the family who have no wish to continue to pay the rates and charges.

Due to the remoteness of the Pindar Townsite which is located 30 Km east of Mullewa there is no appeal to prospective buyers to purchase a 1,012 square metre block with no services.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council Item CCS098 February 2015 resolved to make application to Minister to have six properties based in Pindar and Mullewa re-vested to the Crown. This application was subsequently successful.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

s6.64 of the Local Government Act 1995 states:

- (1) If any rates or service charges which are due to a local government in respect of any rateable land have been unpaid for at least 3 years the local government may, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of this Subdivision take possession of the land and hold the land as against a person having an estate or interest in the land and —
 - (a) from time to time lease the land; or
 - (b) sell the land; or
 - (c) cause the land to be transferred to the Crown; or
 - (d) cause the land to be transferred to itself.
- (2) On taking possession of any land under this section, the local government is to give to the owner of the land such notification as is prescribed and then to affix on a conspicuous part of the land a notice, in the form or substantially in the form prescribed.

S6.68 of the Local Government Act 1995 states:

- (2) A local government is not required to attempt under section 6.56 to recover money due to it before exercising the power of sale where the local government —
 - (a) has a reasonable belief that the cost of the proceedings under that section will equal or exceed the value of the land; or
 - (b) having made reasonable efforts to locate the owner of the property is unable to do so.

s6.74 of the Local Government Act 1995 states:

- (1) If land is —
 - (a) rateable land; and
 - (b) vacant land; and
 - (c) land in respect of which any rates or service charges have been unpaid for a period of at least 3 years,

the local government in whose district the land is situated may apply in the form and manner prescribed to the Minister to have the land revested in the Crown in right of the State.
- (2) The Minister is to consider the application and the circumstances surrounding the application and may grant or refuse the application.
- (3) If the application is granted the Minister is to execute a transfer or conveyance of the land to the Crown and is to deliver the transfer or conveyance to the Registrar of Titles or the Registrar of Deeds and Transfers, as the case requires, for registration.
- (4) Upon the delivery of the transfer or conveyance Schedule 6.3 clause 8 has effect in relation to the exercise of the power referred to in subsection (1).

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The outstanding rates and charges totalling \$4,885.82 plus unapplied penalty interest would be written off. Both properties have an annual charge of the current minimum rate of \$600.00 which totals \$1,200.00 for the 2015/2016 financial year.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The Minister may refuse the Cities application to have these vacant land parcels revested in the Crown. If the application is refused the City would then need to transfer the land to itself and to attempt to sell the land parcels by way of a public auction.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The following options were considered by City Officers:

Alternative Option 1. Upon taking possession of the land sell the land, pursuant to section 6.64(1)(c) of the Local Government Act 1995.

This option was not recommended due to the cost involved in going to Auction and that it had recently been attempted by the Bailiff in the Mullewa Townsite with no success.

Alternative Option 2. Upon taking possession of the land cause the land to be transferred to itself, pursuant to section 6.64(1)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995.

This option was not recommended due to the cost to maintain vacant land taking into account the current economic climate and the surplus amount of freehold vacant land owned by the City at Mullewa.

CCS181 RATES EXEMPTION – PARKERVILLE CHILDREN AND YOUTH CARE INCORPORATED

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-28932
AUTHOR:	S Russell, Rates Coordinator
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	5 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	RV/4/0003
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Parkerville Children & Youth Care Inc.
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Parkerville Children and Youth Care Incorporated made a written request to Council on 15 March 2016 for their property at 21 Awanui Street, Wandina to be deemed as 'non-rateable' land by reason of section 6.26(2)(g) of the *Local Government Act 1995* ("LGA") (being land used exclusively for charitable purposes) and therefore exempt from paying rates.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;

That Council by Simple Majority under Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995:

1. APPROVE a rates exemption for Parkerville Children and Youth Care Incorporated on the property situated at 21 Awanui Street, Wandina on the basis that the property is being used exclusively for a charitable purpose; and
2. EXEMPTION to be effective from 17 March 2016 being the date of ownership.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is Parkerville Children and Youth Care Incorporated.

BACKGROUND:

Parkerville Children and Youth Care Incorporate is a non-Government, not for profit organisation operating under the auspices of the Anglican Church which has been providing care and protection to children and youth in need since 1903.

The home will be used to offer a safe and nurturing environment for children who have been abused or neglected and cannot live with their family. It will be staffed by a full time live in specialist carer to deliver a supportive family like environment to heal the traumatic impact of abuse.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

This Council and its predecessor Councils have previously approved rate exemptions for properties utilised exclusively for charitable purposes, consistent with section 6.26 of the Local Government Act.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Section 6.26 of the Local Government Act provides broad definitions for rateable and non-rateable land. Section 6.26(2)(g) states that land is not rateable if it is “used exclusively for charitable purposes”.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The annual value of the exemption based on the 2015/2016 rates billing is estimated to be \$2,212.88.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Council by not approving the application for rate exemption may be required to defend its decision if the matter were to be appealed by the applicant to the State Administrative Tribunal and that legal costs may be incurred as a result.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Council may decline the application for rate exemption on the basis that it considers Parkerville Children and Youth Care Incorporated is not providing a charitable purpose to the community or that such charitable use relating to the property is not considered an exclusive use.

CCS182 MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT TO 30 APRIL 2016

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29944
AUTHOR:	M Jones, Financial Business Planner
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	9 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	FM/17/0001
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The attached financial reports provide a comprehensive report on the City's finances to 30 April 2016. The statements include no matters of variance considered to be of concern.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;

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

1. RECEIVE the April 2016 monthly financial activity statements as attached.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

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

Operating Income	\$459,072	0.7%	Positive Variance
Operating Expenditure	\$33,436	-0.1%	Negative Variance
Net Operating	\$425,636		
Capital Expenditure	\$192,669	-0.5%	Negative Variance
Capital Revenue	\$22,762	-0.2%	Negative Variance
Cash at Bank – Municipal	\$5,727,470		
Cash at Bank – Reserve	\$16,937,001		
Total Funds Invested	\$17,025,142		
Net Rates Collected	97.36%		

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 April financials shows a positive variance of \$425,636 in the net operating result.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Council is provided with financial reports each month.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no community/councillor consultation.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

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

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

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

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risks to be considered.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

There are no alternative options to consider.

CCS183 RATES 2016-17 NOTICE OF INTENTION

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29233
AUTHOR:	P Radalj, Manager Finance & Treasury
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	3 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/6/0012-04
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report seeks Council approval to give public notice of its intention to impose proposed differential rates and minimum payments for the 2016-17 financial year, to form part of the adopted budget.

This public notice is mandatory under Section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995, before imposing any differential general rates or a minimum payment via the annual Budget.

Such notice must be published within a period of 2 months preceding the commencement of the new financial year, inviting public submissions on the proposed rates or minimum payments.

An elector or ratepayer has 21 days from date of public notice to make submissions in respect of the proposed rates and minimum payments and any related matters. Council is required to consider any submissions received before imposing the proposed rate or minimum payment with or without modification.

The proposed rates-in-the-dollar and minimum payments are based on proposed savings of \$3.23m (via an organisational restructure plus changes to the City range and level of services) in 2016-17 and a Long Term Financial Plan rates revenue increase of 2.9% plus growth for year 1.

Council may resolve to impose rates or minimum payments different from those published in the local public notices, and if it does so, is obliged to publish the reasons for doing so, as part of its formally adopted budget.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;

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

1. ENDORSE the proposed differential rates and minimum payments for the 2016-17 financial year as detailed in table 2 of this report, for the purposes of giving local public notice of intention to impose differential general rates and minimum payments for the 2016-17 financial year, and inviting submissions from electors and ratepayers on the proposed rates and minimum payments and any related matters, as required under section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

The following tables detail the current 2015-16 and the proposed 2016-17 differential rates-in-the-dollar and minimum payments:

Table 1: Current Differential General Rates & Minimum Payments (2015-16)

Differential Rate Types	Rate-in-the-dollar (Cents)	Minimum Payments \$
CGG Residential	11.3506	\$1,010
Non-residential GRV	10.7071	\$1,010
UV Geraldton Rural Mining & Farming General	0.7032	\$1,010
UV Mullewa Rural Mining & Agriculture	0.7573	\$860
GRV Ex-Mullewa Shire District	11.3804	\$600

Table 2: Proposed Differential General Rates & Minimum Payments (2016-17)

Differential Rate Types	Rate-in-the-dollar (Cents)	Minimum Payments \$
CGG Residential (Includes GRV Residential Ex-Mullewa Shire District)	11.4991	\$1,010
CGG Non-Residential (Includes GRV Non-Residential Ex-Mullewa Shire District)	10.9956	\$1,010
CGG UV (ex-Geraldton Rural Mining & Farming General and ex Mullewa Rural Mining & Agriculture)	0.7236	\$1,010

Long Term Financial Plan:

The City of Greater Geraldton Long Term Financial Plan is a high level informing strategy that outlines the City's approach to delivering infrastructure and services to the community in a financially and affordable manner. It also demonstrates the City's commitment to managing its operations in a way that avoids unsustainable rate increases for ratepayers.

In response to concerns raised by the Community, the Mayor, and Councillors, a long term financial planning scenario has been developed that will see future rate increases reduced by 1% in year one and by 0.4% in years two to ten – as compared to the currently adopted Long Term Financial Plan.

Annual aggregate rate collection increase of 2.9% (plus growth) in Year 1. In Year 2 to 10 the increase per annum would be 3.5% (plus growth). The City's

current LTFP (2015-25) was based on an increase of 3.9% per annum (plus growth).

- Growth in annual rate base will continue per annum to be at least 1% or estimated in accordance with current growth.
- Increases in revenue from rates, fees and charges should be smoothed to avoid revenue raising shocks to the community.
- Continual positive movements and achievements of all financial and sustainability ratio benchmarks within the life of the new LTFP.
- The plan delivers a net operating surplus from ordinary activities within ten years.
- Savings of \$3.23m are to be built into the Long Term Financial Plan for 2016-17.

Rates Modelling (2016-17):

The proposed rates model is based on the following:

- Alignment of differential ratings categories per Governor's Orders gazetted for the amalgamation following the merger of the Shire of Mullewa and the City of Geraldton-Greenough. This alignment is to be finalised as at 1st July 2016. Rating categories will be reduced from five to three. The new proposed categories are:
 - CGG Residential;
 - CGG Non Residential;
 - CGG UV;
- Key principle (endorsed by Council March 2016) of the Long Term Financial Plan of a 2.9% (plus growth) increase in aggregate rate revenue 2016-17. Current rates modelling based on the proposed RID's and minimum generates overall revenue of \$42,558,155 which represents an increase of 4.27% in relation to the rates levied in 2015-16.
- Concessions applied to Residential Properties as applied in 2015-16 but reduced from two thirds to one third in 2016-17.

CGG Residential:

This rating category 2016-17 aligns and amalgamates the 2015-16 rating categories CGG Residential & GRV Ex-Mullewa District Residential GRV's. The RID (Rate in the Dollar) increase from 2015-16 calculates to be 1.3%. This is mainly due to a reduction in the concessions provided in 2016-17 plus in 2015-16 the aggregate growth in this rating category GRV value currently sits at 1.76%. It is proposed to freeze again the minimum value for this rating category at \$1010 which due to the alignment of Mullewa GRV's will see this minimum increase from \$600 to \$1010.

CGG Non-Residential:

This rating category 2016-17 aligns and amalgamates the 2015-16 rating categories Non Residential GRV & GRV Ex-Mullewa District Non Residential GRV's. The RID (Rate in the Dollar) increase from 2015-16 calculates to be 2.7% and takes into account a 1.19% growth increase in GRV value in this financial year. Those Ex-Mullewa District properties on minimums will increase

from \$600 to \$1010 with RID properties paying less due to the RID dropping from 11.3804 in 2015-16 to the proposed 2016-17 RID of 10.9956 due to alignment.

CGG UV:

This rating category 2016-17 continues and finalises the alignment of the 2015-16 rating categories UV Geraldton & UV Mullewa. The RID (Rate in the Dollar) increase from 2015-16 re UV Geraldton is proposed to be capped at 2.9% (aligning with LTFP key principle) which results in UV Mullewa RID being reduced by 4.5% to achieve alignment. The growth in overall UV values in this financial year currently sits at 1.1% but this will be offset by the new UV valuations from the Valuer-General which has resulted in a reduction in overall UV values of 0.5% based on the current overall UV rateable values.

Ex UV Mullewa properties that are currently on minimums will see a proposed increase from \$860 to \$1,010 in 2016-17 to align with UV Geraldton.

Note that the proposed rating adjustment represents the initial intent by Council and can be changed during the budget process.

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

There are no adverse economic impacts from this proposal. Councils raise revenue from rates to deliver, maintain and renew as necessary, key economic and social infrastructure and services required to enable the local economy.

Social:

There are no negative social impacts with this proposal. Separately, the City has in place a range of concessions and provisions to assist pensioners and persons experiencing financial hardship. Revenue from rates supports provision of social infrastructure required by the broader community.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Each year, as noted under Legislative Implications below, Councils are required to give local public notice of intent to impose differential general rates and minimum payments. This is an annual statutory obligation.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

City of Greater Geraldton Councillors have been actively engaged through a series of Workshops and Concept Forums which have been conducted through January to May of 2016. Particular workshops addressed Non-Mandatory Services, Organisational Restructure, Capital Works Planning, Long Term

Financial Plan, Level and Range of Services, Fees & Charges and Rates Modelling.

The process under section 6.36 of the Act provides opportunity for the community to consider and make submissions to Council regarding proposed differential general rates and minimum payments.

In addition to the mandatory statement of objects and reasons for proposed differential rates and minimum payments, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document will be published providing explanations of associated issues, in non-technical language. Councillors were invited to nominate particular issues to be covered in the FAQ document.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Statutory requirements for differential general rates and minimum payments are broadly set out in sections 6.31 through 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995. As well, particular matters associated with those provisions of the Act are prescribed in the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations.

Section 6.36 of the Local Government Act requires all Councils before imposing any differential general rates or minimum payments to give local public notice of intention to do so, and inviting submissions from electors and ratepayers.

Such notice may be published within a period of 2 months preceding the commencement of the new financial year (that is during May or June), and must provide at least 21 days for submissions.

The Act requires Councils to consider any submission received, before imposing differential general rates and minimum payments, and Councils may adopt the rates and minimum payments as published in local public notices, or may modify and adopt differential rates or minimum payments different from those published – in which event the Council must include the reasons for doing so, as part of its formal annual budget, when adopted.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The current estimate for 2016-17 based on LTFP key principle of 2.9% plus growth (Year 1) in aggregate rates revenue would levy around \$42.56m from differential general rates and minimum payments per the model presented in this report.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

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

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

There are no impacts to regional outcomes.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Associated risk would be a failure to comply with section 6.36 of the Local Government Act in relation to the requirements to give notice on the Council's intention to impose differential general rates and minimum payments for the forthcoming financial year. This report mitigates that risk.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The proposed model of differential general rates and minimum payments gives consideration to both delivering infrastructure and services to the community in a financially sustainable and affordable manner and at the same time reducing future rate increases by 1% in year one and by 0.5% in years two to ten – as compared to the currently adopted Long Term Financial Plan.

Alternative options and/or rate models may be developed and reviewed as part of Council's final budget deliberation process.

CCS186 CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES
--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-32225
AUTHOR:	A van der Weij, Financial Accountant
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	19 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	FM/12/0002
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1 Confidential)

Confidential item, details of which have been circulated separately.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council by Simple Majority RESOLVES to:

1. DEFER this item until the end of the meeting.

14 REPORTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES**IS120 BATAVIA PARK DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29765
AUTHOR:	A Boska, Senior Strategic Infrastructure Officer
EXECUTIVE:	R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services
DATE OF REPORT:	28 April 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	LP/3/0002
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Batavia Coast Maritime Heritage Association
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Batavia Coast Maritime Heritage Association (BCMHA) has proposed the installation of twelve (12) interpretative elements at Batavia Park to complement the existing Wiebbe Hayes statue. This will provide a collective and sequenced narrative of the Batavia Coast's maritime history and heritage along the Batavia Coast.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of the Batavia Park Development Plan presented to the City by the BCMHA.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.2 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. PROVIDE in principal support of the 2015 Batavia Coast Marine Heritage Association Batavia Park Development Plan subject to:
 - a. BCMHA obtaining specific approval prior to installing future elements to ensure they are structurally sound, safe and suitable for positioning in a public space;
 - b. That the proposed elements do not interfere with pedestrian movements across and through the space or the interface with Lot 601;
 - c. All capital funds for the project are supplied by BCMHA; and
 - d. That once installed, the elements become the property of the City along with the responsibility of funding maintenance.

PROponent:

The proponent is Batavia Coast Maritime Heritage Association (BCMHA).

BACKGROUND:

Batavia Park is approximately 1,614m² in size, and is located adjacent to Champion Bay. It is bounded by Marine Terrace, Durlacher Street and Foreshore Drive. The land is a reserve managed by the City of Greater Geraldton. Batavia Park also shares a boundary with Lot 601 which is owned by Landcorp and is planned to accommodate a multi-level mixed use

development. The park was developed in 2009 as part of the PTA land subdivision process, with dedication of the park in 2013 as 'Batavia Park' initiated and facilitated by BCMHA.

There is growing national interest in the story of the Batavia. This represents an opportunity to attract visitors to the region if suitable facilities were provided for them. In keeping with this vision, the Batavia Coast Maritime Heritage Association (BCMHA) has lodged a Development Plan for Batavia Park.

Infrastructure Services officers met with representatives of BCMHA and discussed the project. The group are seeking permission from the Council to develop the Park in accordance with the information supplied. The construction of the park itself has actually been completed. The first two elements have also been installed (The statue of Wiebbe Hayes and the Mariner's Astrolabe). BCMHA are now seeking a decision from Council to continue to add additional elements as detailed in their submission. This endorsement from Council will enable BCMHA to apply for the required grant funding to continue the project. BCMHA are seeking this Council decision in May so that the decision can be announced as part of their 387th anniversary commemorations which will begin on Wednesday 1 June 2016. (4 June 2016 marks the 387th anniversary of the wrecking of the *BATAVIA* on Morning Reef of the Abrolhos Islands in 1629).

BCMHA have confirmed that they are not seeking capital support for the project from the City. They are planning to complete the project over many years as grant funding allows. They are requesting that the City maintain the park and its elements once installed. BCMHA have not developed the ideas for the proposed elements further than that which has been provided to Councillors.

The Development Plan was submitted to Council in December 2015 for consideration. The plan proposes the following twelve (12) interpretative elements to achieve the development vision for Batavia Park and provide a collective and sequenced narrative of the Batavia Coast's maritime history and heritage:

1. A Perspective of Time – Pavement Timeline
2. A Perspective of Space – the Discoverers' Globe
3. A Perspective of Navigation – the Mariner's Astrolabe
4. A Perspective of Houtman – Houtman Tribute
5. Overview of the Batavia Story – Batavia Woodcuts Scroll
6. Batavia Coast Shipwrecks – Shipwrecks Scroll
7. A Memorial to Those Who Innocently Lost Their Lives in the Wreck of the Batavia
8. Wiebbe Hayes Statue + Soldiers Fort
9. Scaled-down Batavia Shipwreck Footprint
10. Marquee Space
11. Batavia Park Dedication Plaque
12. Entry Statements/Signage

Further detail surrounding the elements and their layout can be found within the BCMHA Development Plan and Brochure. The BCMHA Development Plan and elements proposed for Batavia Park have been developed to accord with the City's principles and guidelines for the design of public open spaces.

If approved, the development of the Park will proceed in line with the development plan under direction of the BCMHA and in collaboration with the City. BCMHA will have responsibility for coordinating the development of plans, acquisition of funding and oversight of construction and installation.

BCMHA propose to progressively develop Batavia Park with full development envisioned to be completed by the early 2020. Element development timeframes and sequence have been planned by BCMHA to align with relevant and connecting historic maritime anniversaries. The development program for all elements is currently only indicative, and is available within the attachments.

After discussions with BCMHA representatives, it is proposed that once installed, the elements will become the property of the City. The City will then be responsible for their maintenance and up keep with technical assistance available from BCMHA.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The City has the opportunity to capture the growing national interest in the story of the Batavia by providing a location that attract visitors to Geraldton.

Social:

BCMHA's anticipate that the interpretive structures will help cultivate a 'sense of place' for the local community, and that they will engage visitors in our maritime stories and history and become a 'must see' part of Geraldton as a tourist destination".

This proposal provides an opportunity for the community (individuals and groups) to participate in the development of the park.

The development of Batavia Park also contributes towards the further activating the Geraldton Foreshore Precinct.

Environmental:

There are no known environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

The proposal is a unique opportunity to enhance the cultural and heritage experiences of the community and tourists in Geraldton.

Some of BCMHA's objectives for Batavia Park which have a positive cultural and heritage impact are as follows:

- To assist in developing and sustaining Geraldton's identity on the Batavia Coast with its maritime history and place in Australia's European history.
- To provide a focal point and place for commemorating historical events associated with the Batavia Coast's maritime history.
- To provide an outdoor venue for the collection and display of maritime heritage interpretive objects and structures.
- To link and compliment the WA Museum Geraldton displays and maritime heritage sites elsewhere along the Batavia Coast.
- To stimulate enquiry and research into the maritime history of the Batavia Coast.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no known relevant precedents.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

BCMHA presented to the Council in November/December 2015 Concept Forum and provided a copy of the Batavia Park Development Plan for Council review and consideration.

BCMHA have undertaken some informal community consultation with feedback indicating that there is support from the community for the development being proposed. An appropriate strategy surrounding community engagement will be worked through as each development stage is progressed.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no legislative or policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

BCMHA have advised that the intention is to progressively develop Batavia Park in stages, with BCMHA being responsible for acquisition of project funding, which is understood to be sourced from grants and community support. A schedule of costs was not included within the Development plan.

BCMHA will design and construct all structures with the view to minimising future care and maintenance.

The City will be responsible for the ongoing management of the park elements from an operation, maintenance and renewal perspective. Further discussions and negotiations will be held with BCMHA on each development element to better understand and advise Council regarding the budgetary impact, if any, on the City both in the short and long term.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Culture	Our Heritage
Strategy 1.1.1	Recognising and protecting our history and restoring heritage sites and buildings.
Title: Social	Recreation and Sport
Strategy 3.1.2	Encouraging informal recreation through well planned and developed public open spaces, cycle/walk paths and green streetscapes.
Title: Economy	Lifestyle and Vibrancy
Strategy 4.1.3	Revitalising the CBD through economic, social and cultural vibrancy
Strategy 4.1.5	Developing and promoting Greater Geraldton as a preferred cultural, environmental and agri/aquaculture tourism destination

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The development of Batavia Park would be a welcome and positive tourist attraction to Geraldton and be in important place for the presentation and interpretation of maritime history of the mid-western coast of Australia.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Preliminary investigations have been undertaken by the City into the proposed development of Lot 601 and its impact on Batavia Park. As the development of Lot 601 is yet to be progressed, the impact cannot be foreseen at this time.

Specific approval for each element in the development plan will ensure that the maintenance impacts to the City and the impacts on the use of the park as a passive recreational public open space are well known.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

Alternatives include the City not supporting the Batavia Park Development Plan or supporting an amended plan. Not supporting the Development Plan would be inconsistent with the dedication of the park as Batavia Park. An amended plan may not align with the anniversary milestones identified in the Development Plan.

Some concern was raised regarding the number of elements to be located in the small park. To address this issue, an option was raised to locates some of the proposed elements at alternative locations along the esplanade foreshore area with a map providing details of their locations.

IS121	PARK HIERARCHY AND LEVELS OF SERVICE
-------	--------------------------------------

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29771
AUTHOR:	A Boska, Senior Strategic Infrastructure Officer
EXECUTIVE:	R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services
DATE OF REPORT:	2 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	PR/4/0005
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement for the proposed park hierarchy and associated levels of service. The hierarchy and levels and service have been developed in accordance with the Western Australian Planning Commission's 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' publication and the City's Public Open Space Strategy.

Endorsement of the strategy will enable officers to undertake appropriate renewal programs and develop a sustainable ten-year capital works program for park infrastructure. It will also enable officers to respond strategically to requests for new park infrastructure.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.2 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ENDORSE the Park Hierarchy and associated Levels of Service as Council's Policy; and
2. DIRECT the CEO to review the Park Hierarchy and associated levels of service in two years' time and prepare a further report to Council.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

The City of Greater Geraldton (City) has a substantial amount of 'Open Space'. This open space contributes significantly to the liveability of Geraldton through the provision of parks, sportsgrounds, natural areas, community spaces, undeveloped open space, and drainage reserves. This report only deals with the open spaces that have been classified as 'Parks'.

The development of the proposed park hierarchy and associated levels of service is in keeping with the Western Australian Planning Commission's 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' publication and the City's Public Open Space Strategy. The theory involves maximising access to appropriate levels of park infrastructure to the whole community.

The hierarchy proposes four park classifications (Local, Neighbourhood, District, Premier). As the names suggest, 'Local Parks' are small parks located close to residential populations, 'Neighbourhood Parks' service the recreational needs of the adjacent neighbourhood and 'District Parks' have more infrastructure, are a bit further away and meet the needs of the broader area. 'Premier Parks' (such as the Foreshore Development) provide a high level of facilities to the entire City and region.

The aim of the park hierarchy is to ensure the equitable distribution of park assets across the region that the City can sustainably afford to provide. This is achieved by:

- Assigning a park hierarchy classification and associated asset provision standards to the different parks
- Inform decision making surrounding future new capital and asset renewal programs
- Provide clear direction regarding the provision of playgrounds and toilet blocks at different parks
- Allow for the rationalisation and consolidation of playgrounds where appropriate.

A separate report will be provided to Councillors detailing which parks have been assigned which classification.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The provision of appropriate park infrastructure aids the economic success of Geraldton by providing a liveable City that attracts families to reside in the region.

Social:

The supply of high quality park infrastructure that is readily accessible to the entire community is essential in the development of a 'Liveable City' that provides the assets required for social and recreational activities.

Environmental:

The proposed park hierarchy is for the management of park spaces. The City also provides other types of open space such as foreshore areas and natural bush areas. The decisions are in keeping with the City's environmental goals.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no known cultural & heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Other Australian Cities have developed similar park hierarchies to ensure the equitable and sustainable provision of park infrastructure.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

This proposal builds upon the consultation undertaken as part of the development of the City's Public Open Space Strategy.

The proposed park hierarchy has been workshopped with Councillors earlier in the year and also presented to Councillors at the March 2016 Concept Forum. Consultation has occurred with the community through the recent playground project and the establishment of the Community Playground Reference group. It was agreed at the workshops that additional specific communication will occur when specific items of park infrastructure are being installed or removed from Parks.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The development of the proposed park hierarchy and associated levels of service is in keeping with the Western Australian Planning Commission's 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' publication and the City's Public Open Space Strategy.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The proposed Park Hierarchy and Levels of Service will provide the framework which will enable officers to establish a ten-year plan for park infrastructure. These decisions will have an economic impact on the City's annual operational and capital budgets.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Social	Recreation and Sport
Strategy 3.1.2	Encouraging informal recreation through well planned and developed public open spaces, cycling/walk paths and green streetscapes.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The provision of high quality Premier Parks will attract people from the region to Geraldton.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The proposed hierarchy is aimed at reducing the level of risk associated with the provision of park infrastructure by approaching it in a very strategic manner. Over time, the hierarchy will improve the equitable distribution of park infrastructure across the City and at a level the City can sustainably afford.

Further specific risks will be detailed in the park classification report to Council.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

Councillors can decide to not accept the proposed park hierarchy or to endorse an amended park hierarchy.

IS122 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29780
AUTHOR:	A Boska, Senior Strategic Infrastructure Officer
EXECUTIVE:	R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services
DATE OF REPORT:	2 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	PR/4/0005
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement for the proposed application of the Park Hierarchy Report to the City's park network. This endorsement will establish the level of park infrastructure to be provided at the various parks across the City.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.2 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ENDORSE the proposed application of the park hierarchy as shown under attachment A as Council's Policy;
2. DIRECT the CEO to proceed to develop a ten-year capital works program for park infrastructure based on the classifications; and
3. DIRECT the CEO to review the park classifications in two years and prepare a further report to Council.

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

In 2015 an accident on a City playground triggered an external audit of the City's equipment which resulted in twenty-two sets of playground equipment being removed. To enable this equipment to be replaced strategically and in an economically sustainable fashion, officers have been working with Councillors to develop a level of service for the City's park infrastructure. The subsequent replacement of six district level playgrounds of high quality in accordance with the proposed hierarchy has been very well received by the community.

The park hierarchy report proposes four park classifications (Local, Neighbourhood, District, Premier). As the names suggest, 'Local Parks' are small parks located close to residential populations, 'Neighbourhood Parks' service the recreational needs of the adjacent neighbourhood and 'District Parks' have more infrastructure, are a bit further away and meet the needs of the broader area. 'Premier Parks' (such as the Foreshore Development) provide a high level of facilities to the entire City and region.

Following development of the park hierarchy report, officers have worked with Councillors and reviewed individual parks and assigned a park hierarchy classification. These decisions were based on the hierarchy criteria such as:

- Park locality, size, purpose and popularity;
- Park radial distances in line with the POS Strategy, being Local Park (400m), Neighbourhood Park (800m) and District Park (2km);
- Existing infrastructure in the park;
- Existing community uses in the park.

Each park is included in the attached park schedule and park mapping documents. The park mapping spatially identifies the distribution of different park classifications, and identifies those park classifications proposed to have playgrounds as a service provision (Neighbourhood, District and Premier parks).

The park mapping exercise revealed that there are areas which have an oversupply and others an undersupply of playgrounds. The implementation of this park hierarchy will see a more equitable distribution of playground equipment. The parks classification and service provision will allow the City to have fewer (but larger) playgrounds which are more cost effective to maintain and maximise the community return in comparison with scattered smaller playgrounds that are expensive to maintain and are less desirable for the community to use. There will be a gradual reduction in the number of park playgrounds from forty-two (42) (currently) to twenty-eight (28) over the next 8-10 years.

The application of the park hierarchy is occurring retrospectively and as such, a 'perfect' outcome cannot be achieved. However, the proposed classifications will see a far more equitable distribution of park infrastructure than currently exists.

The proposed hierarchy and its application is a 'living' decision. Amendments can be made by Council over time.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The provision of appropriate park infrastructure assists to ensure the economic success of Geraldton by providing a liveable City that attracts people to the region.

Social:

The supply of high quality park infrastructure that is readily accessible to the entire community is essential in the development of a 'Liveable City' that provides the assets required for social and recreational activities.

Environmental:

The proposed park hierarchy is for the management of park spaces. The City also provides other types of open space such as foreshore areas and natural bush areas. The decisions are in keeping with the City's environmental goals.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no known cultural & heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Other Cities and Shires have developed similar Park Hierarchies to ensure the equitable and sustainable provision of park infrastructure.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

This proposal builds upon the consultation undertaken as part of the development of the City's Public Open Space Strategy.

The proposed Park Hierarchy has been workshopped with Councillors earlier in the year and also presented to Councillors at the March 2016 Concept Forum. Consultation has occurred with the community through the recent playground project and the establishment of the Community Playground reference group. It was agreed at the workshops that additional specific communication will occur when specific items of park infrastructure are being installed or removed from Parks.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The development of the proposed Park hierarchy and associated levels of service is in keeping with the Western Australian Planning Commission's 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' publication and the City's Public Open Space Strategy.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The proposed park hierarchy and levels of service will provide the framework to enable officers to establish a ten-year plan for park infrastructure. These decisions will have an economic impact on the City's annual operational and capital budgets.

The removal of playground equipment approximately eighteen (18) months ago is an example of the provision of financially unsustainable assets. The reduction of playground locations from the original forty-nine (49) to twenty-eight (28) will save the City approximately \$500,000 per annum in depreciation, maintenance and renewal costs. (The cost to install the six new district level playgrounds was over \$400,000).

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Social	Recreation and Sport
Strategy 3.1.2	Encouraging informal recreation through well planned and developed public open spaces, cycling/walk paths and green streetscapes.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The provision of high quality Premier Parks will attract people from the region to Geraldton.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The proposed Hierarchy is aimed at reducing the level of risk associated with the provision of Park Infrastructure by approaching it in a very strategic manner. Over time, the hierarchy will improve the equitable distribution of park infrastructure across the City and at a level the City can sustainably afford.

There is a risk that some communities are not satisfied with the outcomes of the review. This is because a reasonable number of local parks currently have playgrounds. When these playgrounds reach the end of their useful lives, these playgrounds will be removed and not replaced. This is unfortunate but is required if the City is to become financially sustainable and be able to monitor and maintain safe playgrounds.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

Councillors can decide to not accept the proposed application of the park hierarchy or to endorse an amended application of the park hierarchy.

IS123	RFT 18 1516 – ABRAHAM STREET ROUNDABOUT
-------	---

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29831
AUTHOR:	M Fates, Project Manager
EXECUTIVE:	R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services
DATE OF REPORT:	3 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	RO/4/0028
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2 Confidential)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Abraham Street and Eastward Road, Utaarra is the last major element in the implementation of the Karloo-Wandina Road link. The roundabout will ensure improved road safety to the users on Abraham Street who need to enter Eastward Road.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to award Request for Tender (RFT) 18 1516 Construction of Abraham Street Roundabout to the preferred tenderer.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. AWARD the contract for RFT 18 1516 - The Construction of Abraham Street Roundabout to the preferred tenderer; and
2. RECORD the tender amount for RFT 18 1516 - The Construction of Abraham Street Roundabout in the meeting minutes

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

The proposed roundabout is required to ensure the increased traffic using Abraham Street can safely access Eastwood Road. It is recognised that further future amendments to the road network in this area are possible. These amendments include extending Abraham Street through the Turf Club to connect onto Flores Road and re-opening Eastward Road in the vicinity of the IGA store. As such the proposed roundabout has been referred to as an interim measure. For this reason, the proposed roundabout has been designed to minimise costs as far as possible. As many elements as possible from the roundabout will be reused in any future roadworks. The extent of this reuse cannot be quantified until the future roadworks are designed.

The scope of the works specified in the tender is to undertake all works associated with the construction of the roundabout (traffic management, assessment of neighbouring properties, dilapidation assessment, vibration and dust monitoring, demolition and disposal of existing pavements, footpaths, kerbs, driveways, drainage pipes & culverts; construction of earthworks,

stormwater drainage, road pavements, kerb, bitumen seals, footpath and concrete works, signs and line marking). The contractor will also be required to work in with essential services authorities whilst relocating services.

The tender process and assessment was completed in accordance with Council's Procurement of Goods and Services Policy (CP010). The RFT was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper and the City's TenderLink e-Tendering Portal on Saturday 19 March 2016. The RFT was closed on 11 April 2016.

The complexity of this project is associated with working under traffic. The contractor will need good customer service skills to manage traffic delays and to manage nearby residents whose home lives will be disrupted during the construction phase. If a project is very simple and straight forward, officers will place a high weighting on price (60%, 70%). If the project is very technical and complex, officers will reduce the weighting on price to as low as 30% to ensure the successful contractor has the required expertise to undertake the project. For this project, officers determined that it was appropriate to equally weight qualitative and non-qualitative requirements (50% qualitative, 50% quantitative).

The non-price (qualitative) assessment criteria represented a total of 50% of the overall score and was based on the following criteria:

- a) Relevant Experience (15%);
- b) Key Personnel Skills and Experience (10%);
- c) Tenderer's Resources (15%);
- d) Demonstrated Understanding (10%).

Twenty-One (21) suppliers registered to receive a copy of the RFT. Three (3) submissions were received. All three received submissions were deemed compliant by the City's Governance team as per the compliance assessment in the attached tender evaluation. The tender assessment was undertaken by a panel of four (4) City officers (3 voting and one non-voting). The maximum allowed benefit for local content was applied to the tendered prices. The contract period is for three (3) months from the date of the award of contract, with an extension of time exercisable at the absolute discretion of the principal.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Abraham Street and Eastward Road, Utakarra will improve traffic flow reducing travel costs for local road users. The project will also result in a considerable amount of funds spent in the local economy.

Social:

The construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Abraham Street and Eastward Road, Utakarra will improve traffic flow and reduce travel time for local road users. In addition, the Karloo-Wandina Road link will improve motorist safety and provide essential infrastructure for future City growth.

Environmental:

The contractor shall take adequate measures to control dust, noise and vibration levels on site and all roadworks will be undertaken in an environmentally aware manner.

Cultural & Heritage

There are no cultural and heritage issues.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

The City of Greater Geraldton has previously undertaken the Karloo-Wandina infrastructure headworks project as well as the Abraham Street bridge project.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There have been several community announcements and councillors' briefing notes on the combined projects. Affected residents will be contacted prior to the works commencing to endeavour to address their concerns.

The turf club have been consulted and their access point altered to improve safety and remove their issues from the project.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The works will be undertaken in accordance with road safety requirements. The design has been approved by the Main Roads Department.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The available project budget is \$900,000,00 which is solely funded by the City funds in this project.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	Sustainability
Strategy 2.3.2	Delivering projects utilising best practice to ensure timely, cost effective, and quality outcomes.
Title: Economy	Employment
Strategy 4.3.2	Encouraging the development of a variety of industries that will offer diverse employment opportunities.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

This project will enhance the safety for road users with the City of Greater Geraldton.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are always occupational health and safety risks during the construction phase of any roadwork project. These will be managed by the contractor by engaging a registered traffic management company who will undertake the traffic control in accordance with an approved traffic management plan.

There is a risk of causing disruption to local residents through the construction of the cul-de-sac at Plymouth Road, Utakarra. This will be managed by providing regular updates to the affected local residents and the community. The cul-de-sac will mean some residents will need to travel slightly further to exit the suburb. However, this route will be safer and amenity will be improved by reducing through traffic.

There is a risk associated with the traffic management and disruption to local businesses. This will be managed by providing regular updates to the affected groups and the community.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The installation of a signalised intersection was investigated but this was discounted due to the costs associated with undertaking the works.

IS124 RFT 16 1516 MULLEWA TRANSFER STATION CONSTRUCTION

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29877
AUTHOR:	G Sherlock, Manager Project Design & Delivery
EXECUTIVE:	R McKim, Director Infrastructure Services
DATE OF REPORT:	27 April 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	PM/4/0080
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2 Confidential)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Mullewa Waste Facility, located on Carnarvon Mullewa Road has historically been the primary landfill for the township of Mullewa and the surrounding region. The site is not staffed and users would deposit their waste to later be pushed up by machinery and covered. Burning of waste has also traditionally occurred at the site. The City and the Department of Environment Regulations (DER) have been working for some time to ensure the site is operated in an environmentally sensitive manner and in accordance with DER licence conditions. \$185,000 of City funds have been provided for this project in the 2015/16 capital works program.

The purpose of this item is to award RFT 16 1516 Construction of Mullewa Waste Transfer Station to the preferred tenderer and to request the additional budget required to undertake the works.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. AWARD the contract for RFT 16 1516 Construction of Mullewa Waste Transfer Station to the preferred tenderer;
2. RECORD the tender amount or RFT 16 1516 Construction of Mullewa Waste Transfer Station; and
3. COMMIT to providing an additional \$375,000 in funding to undertake the project

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

The City of Greater Geraldton and the Department of Environment Regulation (DER) raised concerns with the standard of maintenance and compliance of the Mullewa Waste Facility. As a result, in 2015 the Mullewa Optimisation Plan was put into action to address the concerns. This plan included construction of the Waste Transfer Station and remediation of the site. The DER licence has now been amended to reflect this plan.

The scope of the works specified in this tender is to undertake all works associated with the construction of the Waste Transfer Station. These include but are not limited to:

- Removal and replacement of existing fencing
- Construction of new concrete slabs and retaining walls
- Gravel road upgrades
- Signage upgrades
- Safe removal of existing waste stockpiles

The Tender Process and assessment was completed in accordance with Council's Procurement of Goods and Services Policy (CP010). The RFT was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper and the City's TenderLink e-Tendering Portal on 20 February 2016. The RFT closed on 18 March 2016.

If a project is very simple and straight forward, officers will place a high weighting on price (60%, 70%). If the project is very technical and complex, officers will reduce the weighting on price to as low as 30% to ensure the successful contractor has the required expertise to undertake the project. For this project, officers determined that it was appropriate to equally weight qualitative and non-qualitative requirements (50% qualitative, 50% quantitative) due to the nature of the works to be undertaken, the remote working location and the fact that the works are to be undertaken in a hazardous environment.

The non-price (qualitative) assessment criteria represented a total of 50% of the overall score and was based on the following criteria:

- a) Relevant Experience (15%);
- b) Key Personnel Skills and Experience (5%);
- c) Tenderer's Resources (15%);
- d) Demonstrated Understanding (15%).

Forty-Three (43) downloads of the documentation were made from TenderLink. Seven (7) submissions were received. All seven received submissions were deemed compliant by the City's Governance team as per the compliance assessment in the attached tender evaluation. The tender assessment was undertaken by a panel of three (3) City officers (2 voting and one non-voting) and one (1) independent expert (Bruce Bowman – project designer). The maximum allowed benefit for local content was applied to the tendered prices.

The contract period is for three months from the date of the award of contract, with an extension of time exercisable at the absolute discretion of the Principal.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:

Economic:

The transfer station will result in a reduction in operational costs and maintenance of the site as waste will be placed in skips bin and transported back to Meru waste Facility through our current collection contract.

Environmental:

One of the primary reasons for undertaking this project is to ensure sound environmental management of the region's waste. Construction of the Waste Transfer Station will reduce the local environmental impact as follows:

- No waste will be buried at the Mullewa Site
- Wind-blown waste will be better managed as general waste will be placed into skip bins rather than dumped on the ground.

Social:

The provision of sound and reliable waste services is a core function of Local Government. Poor waste management can lead to environmental and health related issues for the community.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

The City endeavours to comply with all State Legislation. This is a compliance issue with respect to the disposal of waste generated in the region. City officers have been working with State Government officers for some time to resolve the existing compliance and environmental issues at this site.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

Briefing notes have been provided to Council and a recent site visit was conducted with Councillors where the scope of the works to be undertaken was outlined.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

DER – Mullewa Landfill L6913-1997-10.

The Mullewa Landfill Licence L6913-1997-10 is the current licence under which the Mullewa Landfill has been operating. This licence has been put on hold until the Works Approval is completed and the Mullewa Landfill is transformed to a Transfer Station. As a result, waste is no longer buried at the site and is now transferred to Meru. In addition, the DER has suspended the City's Liquid Pond licence at the location until the transfer station is built and the City re-applies for the licence.

DER – Works Approval for the Waste Transfer Station at Mullewa Landfill.

The Work Approval for the Waste Transfer Station at the Mullewa Landfill was submitted to the Department of Environment and Regulation in November 2015 stating the scope of work the City will be undertaking to transform the site from a Waste Facility to a Transfer Station. The final scope of works has been agreed. Full details of the works to be undertaken are contained within the briefing note.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

An additional \$375,000 will be required over and above the current \$185,000 budget allocation. The initial budget was put forward prior to the full scope of

works being agreed with the Department of Environmental Regulation (DER). The final agreed scope has changed considerably from what was originally envisaged. The original intention was to undertake the work in-house and to utilise gravel from a local property owner to undertake the bulk filling for the earthworks and roads. As a result of the recent reductions in staff and the compliance changes to how the City sources gravel, the project was advertised externally. These internal changes plus the additional scope have led to the change in budget required to undertake the full scope of works.

Currently, the Mullewa Landfill is generating an average of around 40 tonnes per month, all of which is getting carted back to Meru.

The current operational costs are as followed:

Skip Bin Rental	\$195	Per Skip
Servicing of Station Skips	\$600	Per trip per skip

The Landfill contractor is servicing the skip bin twice a week. The location has a total of three 15m³ skips. The operational cost of the Transfer Station has been included in the 2016/17 budget for the total amount of \$60,000.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Environment	Reduce – Reuse – Recycle
Strategy 2.2.2	Promoting, researching and implementing green practices such as improved and innovative waste management, water reuse and renewable energy production

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The Mullewa Waste Transfer Station will provide a service to City of Greater Geraldton suburbs that are not eligible under the waste collection route.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not delivering the facility as per the agreed scope will be a breach of the current agreement with The Department of Environmental and Regulation.

The City's licence to operate to facility as a Class II Waste Facility is currently on hold until such time as the agreed scope of works have been completed. Should the works not be completed in its entirety then the City will have to re-apply for a Class II Licence and there is always a danger of this being refused.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The following options were considered by City Officers:

Do nothing: Reject all tenders and do not undertake the construction of the Mullewa Waste Transfer Station within the 2015/16 financial year. This is not really an option because of the associated legislative compliance issues and environmental issues associated with this option. The current issues at the site need to be addressed.

Reject all tenders: Reduce the scope of the works and readvertise. The scope has already been reduced as far as possible. Further scope reduction will mean the proposed transfer station will not function to the required standard. This option would also involve the need to renegotiate the current DER Works Permit and licence. The DER may not agree to any further amendments at this point in the process.

Undertake all works as documented and provide the additional \$375,000 to complete the works. The recommendation is to proceed with this option and to undertake all works as documented and provide the additional \$375,000 to complete the works.

15 REPORTS OF OFFICE OF THE CEO

CEO042 VOTING DELEGATES FOR THE 2016 WA LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (WALGA) ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-30538
AUTHOR:	K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer
EXECUTIVE:	K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer
DATE OF REPORT:	10 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/6/0006
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the upcoming 2016 Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Annual General Meeting and to seek approval to nominate voting delegates to attend the meeting on behalf of the City of Greater Geraldton.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION;

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

1. NOMINATE Mayor Shane Van Styn and Deputy Mayor Cr Neil McIlwaine to represent the City of Greater Geraldton as voting delegates at the 2016 WALGA Annual General Meeting; and
2. NOMINATE Councillor _____ and Councillor _____ to represent the City of Greater Geraldton as proxy voting delegates at the 2016 WALGA Annual General Meeting.

PROponent:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton

BACKGROUND:

The 2016 Annual General Meeting for the WALGA will be held on 3 August 2016. In order to exercise their voting entitlements, member Councils must register their voting delegates.

Only voting delegates or proxy registered delegates will be permitted to exercise voting entitlements. Voting Delegates may be Elected Members or serving officers of a member Council.

In 2015, the Council's voting delegates were [then] Mayor Ian Carpenter and Deputy Mayor Councillor Neil McIlwaine.

As the conference will include debate, discussion, and decision making on matters that directly impact upon the management and operations of regional local governments, it is considered appropriate that Cr. McIlwaine attend as a voting delegate because of his role as Deputy Mayor and as a senior member of our Council.

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

There are no economic impacts.

Social:

There are no social impacts.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

Each year two Councillors are appointed as delegates to the Annual General Meeting of WALGA.

COMMUNITY/COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

No community consultation is required; however, this report is presented to Councillors to appoint voting and proxy voting delegates.

LEGISLATIVE/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Pursuant to the WALGA Constitution, all member councils are entitled to be represented by two (2) voting delegates.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The approximate cost of the City's attendance at the 2016 WALGA Local Government Convention is \$1,500.00 travel and accommodation costs per delegate, plus the registration fee of \$1,475.00. There is no registration fee associated with attending the Annual General Meeting.

INTEGRATED PLANNING LINKS:

Title: Governance	Advocacy and Partnerships
Strategy 5.3.1	Active participation in regional, state and national alliances such as the Western Australian Regional Capitals Alliance and Regional Capitals Australia.

REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

The WALGA Annual General Meeting is a good opportunity to represent the Greater Geraldton area and actively participate in state alliances.

RISK MANAGEMENT

If the City doesn't appoint delegates, the City will not have a voting entitlement at the Annual General Meeting.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY CITY OFFICERS

The alternative option to recommend the Mayor and an alternate Councillor, other than the Deputy Mayor, was considered. This was discounted as it is the City Officers belief that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor are best placed to fill the role of voting delegates at the conference due to their senior roles and as Council's representatives on the Northern Zone Committee.

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

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-29690
AUTHOR:	K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer
EXECUTIVE:	K Diehm, Chief Executive Officer
DATE OF REPORT:	9 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/6/0012-04
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To receive the Reports of the City of Greater Geraldton.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:**PART A**

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

1. RECEIVE the following appended reports:
 - a. Reports – Development & Community Services:
 - i. DCS277 – Public Arts Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes- 28 January 2016;
 - ii. DCS278 – Public Arts Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 6 April 2016;
 - iii. DCSD110 – Delegated Determinations and Subdivision Applications.
 - b. Reports – Infrastructure Services:
 - i. IS125 - HMAS Sydney II Memorial Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – 13 January 2016

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. CCS184 – Corporate Business Plan Third Quarter Report;
 - ii. CCS185 - Confidential Report – List of Accounts Paid Under Delegation – April 2016

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.

17 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

ROAD SAFETY RISKS - MULLEWA – WUBIN ROAD

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-25844
AUTHOR:	Cr T Thomas
DATE OF REPORT:	26 April 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/6/0008
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	Council
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x2)

Councillor Comment

Wubin-Mullewa Road is the main road between Mullewa, Morawa, Perenjori and Wubin. It is narrow single lane bitumen road which is very dangerous for traffic passing one another, with vehicles having to move off onto the gravel shoulder to pass an oncoming vehicle. Light vehicles have had to move off the road completely and come to a stop for all oncoming heavy vehicles.

The State government has recognised the poor state of the Wubin-Mullewa Road and funds have been spent upgrade the road between Perenjori and Morawa. Residents are concerned that finances will not be provided for the road between Mullewa and Morawa and would like the State Government to commit finances for this section of road.

Other uses of the Wubin-Mullewa Road are general day-to-day traffic, freight, and tourists in wildflower season. Wubin-Mullewa Road has become a popular route in wildflower season for caravans and tourism.

Reasons for the Councillor Motion:

1. The road is the last Main Road's single sealed road in the Mid-West.
2. The road is of a substandard condition with shoulders barely existent to create a safe passing method for more than one vehicle.
3. The Wubin Mullewa Road has become a popular route for tourists towing caravans increasing the risk of danger for passing on the roads due to the unsafe shoulders

Executive Comment

As Mullewa-Wubin Road is a Main Roads responsibility, City officers asked the A/Regional Manager for the Mid West Gascoyne Region for comment. The following advice was received:

The upgrade of the Wubin Mullewa Road between Morawa and Mullewa is a priority for Main Roads. This section of road remains the last single lane seal section main road in the Mid West-Gascoyne Region.

Unfortunately, due to the low traffic volumes on the road it is difficult to attract funds to secure upgrades when comparing to other roads on our network. Notwithstanding this, in addition to the widening of the Perenjori to Morawa section of the road, in the 2014 calendar year Main Roads spent approximately \$1.76m

widening 2.2km of road approximately 28km north of Morawa, as well as extending 17 culverts.

Planning and development works have commenced to assist the progressive upgrade of the road. We have prioritised the overlay and widening of a further six short sections and will be undertaking further development activities on these sections during 2016-17. However, at this stage there is no construction funding available.

COUNCILLOR MOTION:

That Council by Simple Majority pursuant to Section 5.2 of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. WRITE to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Police and Road Safety, the Honourable Liza Harvey MLA to request the provision of priority funding in the 2016/17 State budget to widen and overlay the full length of the Mullewa-Wubin Road to a dual lane formation suitable for heavy vehicles; and
2. ADVISE the Minister in the letter that the road is used for general traffic, freight, tourist, Brookfield rail repairs, cartage of lime, grain, fertiliser and other agricultural purposes.

18 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**19 URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PRESIDING MEMBER OR BY DECISION OF THE MEETING****20 DEFERRED 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 due to its confidential nature.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority RESOLVES to MOVE behind Closed doors.

CCS186	CONFIDENTIAL	ITEM – CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL SERVICES
--------	--------------	--

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-16-32225
AUTHOR:	A Van Der Weij, Financial Accountant
EXECUTIVE:	B Davis, Director Corporate and Commercial Services
DATE OF REPORT:	19 May 2016
FILE REFERENCE:	FM/12/0002
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes (x1 Confidential)

Confidential Item, details of which have been circulated separately.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

As per the confidential item.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council by Simple Majority RESOLVES to MOVE from behind closed doors.

21 CLOSURE

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/council-meetings/>