



AGENDA FORUM

MINUTES

20 MARCH 2012

Departmental Guideline for Agenda Forums

Council Forums

Local government forums range from a once-only event to discuss and explore a particular issue, a number of sessions to address matters such as a specific project or the compilation of a report for internal or external use, through to forums held at regular intervals with a consistent structure and objectives.

Regular forums run in local governments exhibit two broad categories which we have titled *agenda* and *concept*. They are differentiated by the stage of development of issues which are discussed by elected members and staff. The two types are described below along with the variations in procedural controls and processes suggested for each.

Agenda Forums

For proper decision-making, elected members must have the opportunity to gain maximum knowledge and understanding of any issue presented to the Council on which they must vote. It is reasonable for elected members to expect that they will be provided with all the relevant information they need to understand issues listed on the agenda for the next or following ordinary Council meetings. The complexity of many items means that elected members may need to be given information additional to that in a staff report and/or they may need an opportunity to ask questions of relevant staff members.

Many local governments have determined that this can be achieved by the elected members convening as a body to become better informed on issues listed for council decision. Such assemblies have been termed *agenda forums*. It is considered they are much more efficient and effective than elected members meeting staff on an individual basis for such a purpose with the added benefit that all elected members hear the same questions and answers.

To protect the integrity of the decision-making process it is essential that *agenda forums* are run with strict procedures.

There must be no opportunity for a collective council decision or implied decision that binds the local government to be made during a forum.

Agenda forums should be for staff presenting information and elected members asking questions, not opportunities to debate the issues. A council should have clearly stated rules that prohibit debate or vigorous discussion between elected members that could be interpreted as debate. Rules such as questions through the chair and no free-flowing discussion between elected members should be applied.

Procedures Applying to Both Concept and Agenda Forums

The Department recommends that councils adopt a set of procedures for both types of forums which include the following:

- Dates and times for forums should be set well in advance where practical;

- The CEO will ensure timely written notice and the agenda for each forum is provided to all members;
- Forum papers should be distributed to members at least three days prior to the meeting;
- The mayor/president or other designated elected member is to be the presiding member at all forums;
- Elected members, employees, consultants and other participants shall disclose their financial and conflicts of interest in matters to be discussed;
- Interests are to be disclosed in accordance with the provisions of the Act as they apply to ordinary council meetings. Persons disclosing a financial interest will not participate in that part of a forum relating to their interest and leave the meeting room;
- There is to be no opportunity for a person with an interest to request that they continue in the forum; and
- A record should be kept of all forums. As no decisions will be made, the record need only be a general record of items covered but should record disclosures of interest with appropriate departures/returns.

Procedures Specific to Agenda Forums

The Department recommends that councils adopt specific procedures for *agenda forums* which include the following:

- Agenda forums should be open to the public unless the forum is being briefed on a matter for which a formal council meeting may be closed; and
- Items to be addressed will be limited to matters listed on the forthcoming agenda or completed and scheduled to be listed within the next two meetings (or period deemed appropriate).

Meeting Record

Meeting Name	Agenda Forum	Meeting No.	4 - 2012
Meeting Date	20 March 2012		
Meeting Time	5.30pm		
Meeting Location	Chambers, Edward Road		
Attendees			
Mayor Ian Carpenter Cr R Ashplant Cr N Bennett Cr C Gabelish Cr J Clune Cr P Fiorenza Cr N McIlwaine Cr N Messina Cr I Middleton Cr T Thomas Cr S Van Styn Cr R Ramage Cr G Bylund (arrived at 5.52pm) Officers: A Brun, Chief Executive Officer C Wood, Director of Corporate Services B Davis, Director of Commercial Enterprises A Selvey, Director of Creative Communities N Arbutnot, Director of Community Infrastructure K Paine, PA to the Director of Creative Communities M Connell, Manager Town Planning (Acting for P Melling – Director of Sustainable Communities) K Chua, Manager Financial Services (Acting for C Wood – Director of Corporate Services) M Chadwick, Manager Environmental Health & Sustainability M Atkinson, Manager Infrastructure, Planning & Design T Harman, District Manager – Mullewa District Office M Bell, Planning Officer K Elder, Senior Strategic Planner		By Invitation Member of Public Press	
		Leave of Absence	Cr B Hall
		Apologies	Cr D Brick P Melling, Director of Sustainable Communities C Wood, Director of Corporate Services
		Absent	
		Distribution	

1 Declaration of opening

Mayor I W Carpenter opened the meeting at 5.30pm

2 Apologies/leave of absence (previously approved)

Existing Approved Leave

March 2012		
Cr B Hall	4 March 2012	31 March 2012
April 2012		
Cr T Thomas	23 April 2012	30 April 2012

3 Declarations of conflicts of interest

Cr Florenza declared an interest in item *CI013 – Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace*

Cr Ramage declared an interest in item *CI013 – Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace*

4 Presentations

Presenter	Details	Agenda Item Reference
Tony Lambert, Chappell Lambert Everett	Final Approval of Local Planning Scheme Amendment No.6 –Residential Rezoning, Deepdale	SC039
Ms Patsy Gould	Proposed Demolition of Heritage Listed Dwelling – Lewis Street, Geraldton	SC038

5 Public Questions

Mr R Pitman, 9 Gaskin Drive, Cape Burney WA6532

SC040 Proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment – Resort Development Rezoning Greenough River Road, Cape Burney

Question

Is the Document of 20.07.2011 Cape Burney Freehold Update discussing the same planning application as was mooted in 2009 or is this another planning submission?

Response

This is the same rezoning and submission resolved by council at its meeting of 25 August 2009.

Question

If that is the case why was the first planning approval of 2009 if indeed one was granted, not accepted by council?

Response

As above.

Question

If this current submission is the only one that has been recommended for planning approval since Bayform folded, why has this procedure taken so long to finalise, given your response in Authorising the Chief Executive Officer on Aug 25th 2009 to “progress freehold sales following rezoning and submission approvals”.

Response

The rezoning and subdivision process is one of complexity and rigor of regulatory compliance obligations. Extensive environmental, geotechnical, engineering, aboriginal heritage, coastal engineering (including a storm surge analysis) studies were required to be conducted as well as ground water monitoring over a two year period. Timing of these processes is not dictated by the City.

Question

How many times has Council submitted applications for planning approval for Lot 200 and Gaskin Drive since Bayform Holdings contract expired?

Response

Since the Bayform Holding contract expired, the City has been undertaking the relevant studies to progress the rezoning and subdivision of Lot 200 Greenough River Road and Gaskin Drive for WAPC approval.

Question

How much has Council paid for planning conceptions and planning approvals for Lot 200 and Gaskin Drive since the collapse of Bayform Holdings contract?

Response

\$174,692.

Question

In the latest planning submission what zoning is Council applying for with respect to the above?

Response

The proposed zoning for the Lot 200 is 'Resort Development' and 'Parks and Recreation'

Question

Did the Council indeed put aside money for the headworks of Gaskin Drive in order for Freeholding to be permitted prior to 2009, and if yes, what happened to that money?

Response

Money has been budgeted for the rezoning and subdivision of Lot 200 commencing in the 2009/10 budget.

Question

What is the specific process going forward...ie What still needs to be done to move forward toward free holding and what is the approx. date for finalisation of that?

Response

The Town Planning Scheme Amendment is going before council at its meeting on 27 March 2012. The proposed amendment must be submitted for Minister for Planning approval, advertised for public submissions, with submissions to be considered before going back for Ministerial approval. It would be prudent to allow a further 9-12 months for the proposed amendment to flow through the State agency and Ministerial approval process.

The subdivision process cannot be initiated until the scheme amendment for rezoning is finalised, and the actual land development process for roads and services infrastructure cannot proceed before subdivision is approved by State agencies. The City is bound by the same mandatory compliance obligations and formal State Ministerial and WAPC approval processes as any other land developer. The formal subdivision process would be expected to take around 3 months, for the City to get conditional WAPC approval. Then we would have to apply consequential subdivision conditions to the detailed final design, and allow a construction timeline of 12 months. On the assumption that the subdivision process will not be delayed by State agency processes - it is anticipated that titles could be ready before late 2014 or early 2015.

Question

And finally.....Why is that in all of the time since Bayform Holdings was first given permission to develop all of the above land, that not once to my knowledge has the Councillor of the Hills Ward or The Council in general asked ANY of the LEASEHOLDERS what they would like to see done with the area? Perhaps you may feel that it is "None of our business"

Response

The City of Greater Geraldton understands that extensive consultation with stakeholders was undertaken by the Shire of Greenough, before that Council made firm resolutions on the development directions for this land. The City of Geraldton-Greenough subsequently inherited the project and resolved to continue to pursue the same directions, consistent with the decisions and conditions determined by the past Council on free-holding of the land. The City of Greater Geraldton has progressed the project effectively, within the timelines imposed by external processes.

Further questions taken at the meetingQuestion

Residents have option to buy land for \$75K once freeholding granted up to level of \$45K for headworks. Lots of residents would like to sell properties, but can't because the City won't freehold them. If I can buy land for \$75K once freeholded, why can't I add \$75K that City agreed to buy land onto price of house if I get a legal document drawn up by a lawyer stating that land is freeholding? City has said that they are not going to renew leases. Residents would like to just go ahead. How about the City come and have a meeting with residents of Gaskin Drive – if I can cover you legally and me legally by lawyer to draw up agreement don't see a problem.

Response

CEO advised that when dealing with land to covert 10 year olds, we need to deal with the whole division not just the subdivision. There is a statutory process we need to follow and obtain environmental approvals as per other responses. The City is not in a position to give you a title hence which is why you are unable to buy the land for \$75K now. CEO advised he would be happy to provide a report to Council for consideration but would need to investigate what the legalities of this matter would be.

Question

Mr Pitman advised that he had never received notification of meetings held on 21 May 2007 and 4 February 2008, he asked where were these held and were they advertised?

Response

CEO has taken this question on notice and will provide a response in writing.

Kevin Higham, 56 Polo Road, Geraldton

SC039 Final Approval of Local Planning Scheme Amendment no. 6 – Residential Rezoning, Deepdale

Question

What sewerage system will be in the area if the subdivision goes ahead?

Response

Sewer is not required to be provided for lots 2000m² and below.

Question

Will there be restrictions to the amount of stock on the subdivided blocks. What will they be?

Response

The stocking rates currently applicable to Deepdale will only apply to the Rural Residential zoned land and not the proposed Residential area.

Question

Are there any granny flats allowed to be put on the land?

Response

The scheme allows for granny flats to be put on the land.

Question

If deep sewerage goes ahead, he doesn't want to pay extra for the deep sewerage as he is quite happy with current sewerage system. Will this occur?

Response

Sewerage is governed by the Water Corporation but possibility for infill sewer is highly unlikely.

Questions taken at the meeting

Paul Connolly, 63 Gregory Street, Geraldton

SC038 *Proposed Demolition of Heritage Listed Dwelling – Lewis Street, Geraldton*

Question

Agenda suggest seven (7) residuals in Geraldton that have been refused demolition – are there any other heritage listed building within the City which have been refused demolition?

Response

At the time of the report, the author's knowledge is that the residents listed are the most recent up to date.

Question

Was mentioned that this property doesn't have concrete footings – how many houses in Geraldton have these? I would think Nil. I would like Council to seriously consider demolition of this building being on a City centre block, has a high potential and owner keep the to develop.

Response

Will consider your comments following Councillor recommendation in the report.

6 Review of the Agenda Items for the forthcoming Ordinary Meeting of Council dated 27 March 2012

Please Note that this forum does not allow for debate or decision making on any item within this agenda. [Briefings will be given by staff or consultants for the purpose of ensuring that elected members and the public are more fully informed](#)

5.1 Petitions, Deputations or Presentations in Relation to the Agenda.

Tony Lambert – Chappell Lambert Everett

SC039 Final Approval of Local Planning Scheme Amendment No.6 – Residential Rezoning, Deepdale

Presentation done by Mr Lambert on residential rezoning in Deepdale. Current proposal is to rezone to R2.5 and R5 on northern portion of the site south of Chapman river. Council supported this proposal but planning did not. The northern portion of the site shown on the map was identified in 2010 as future urban. After being advertised for public comment there were a number of submissions received. Some of the negative comments were:

- Change.

- Increase in density (advised that the design will have minimal impact).
- Traffic impact (advised that there has been a traffic assessment undertaken by AECOM and been advised that there will be very minimal traffic impact).
- Crime increase.
- Equestrian conflict (advised survey of existing houses/activities indicates less than 15% of homes are used for equestrian purposes. 35M corridor will be landscaped and used as bridal trail. Public Open Space is usually about 10% - this site will have 26%).

Questions from Councillors:

Question

Cr Bennett asked about linkages to other areas, sub divisions – to him bridal pathways can serve number of purposes. Linkages up through Moresby – can see linkages across but not North / South

Response

Mr Lambert advised that it allows 24ha provided which will enable connectivity to Hoorwood Road to North West, existing shown on plan will facilitate North / South connection to open space.

Question

Cr McIlwaine noted the discussion about linkage to north west and noticed Horwood parade had a future crossing – these are not on original plans. What is the thought behind this?

Response

Mr Lambert advised that discussions were held with engineers, City planners and was suggested that connection should be made if north side developed, there is sufficient land for a connection. Most desirable place for connection is across Chapman River.

Statement by proponent

Mrs Horwood referred to Public Open Space – there is a huge amount of public open space that can be used for whatever and insisted on putting a road right around the river so everyone has access.

Ms Patsy Gould**SC038 PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF HERITAGE LISTED DWELLING – LEWIS STREET, GERADLTON**

Heritage Value – this is not a true reflection of building. Cost of repairs to building are prohibited and not detailed.

Building - there is serious foundation movement and termite damage. Built on stumps on the side of hill which will need to be replaced. Roof is corroded and leaks.

In 2001 a letter was received asking if we wanted this heritage listed and we advised that we did not. This is also on your website but have been advised for photographic purposes only.

Heritage not just about old buildings, argument about demolish or preserve will always be debateable.

Seek approval to demolish my home as it is poorly structured, termite damage is extensive and the cost involved to fix these things which some may be prohibited and not an known as the original building and many alterations. This building will be replaced with a liveable home to fit in with street.

Questions from Councillors:Question

Cr Middleton asked for confirmation that there are no concrete footings?

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities advised that this is correct.

Question

Cr Bennett asked what the height restrictions on Chapman Road from Forrest Street to Lewis Street?

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities Response advised that there is no defined height restriction for that area. Should be gradual increase in height is City centre. Looking at around 3 stories as a rough guide.

Question

Cr Bennett referred to the draft development plan, Bill Sewell complex proposal to sell and develop 2 story and undercover parking in George Road, would this be inconsistent with this proposal?

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities advised that we are unable to comment as at this stage have only seen the lot plans for the Bill Sewell complex.

Cr Bylund arrived at 5.52pm

Question

Cr Van Styn asked how much communication Councillors have had with Ms Gould and what was the feedback and thoughts on this?

Response

Ms Gould advised that the dwelling is built on stumps on side of sand hill with no concrete footing, plan to build in spot that is with 1 story with carport.

5.2 Public Questions in Relation to the Agenda

Nil.

5.3 Councillors Questions With Out Notice in Relation to the Agenda

Nil.

Reports of the Chief Executive Officer

CEO002 Mullewa Community Trust – Allocation of Funds 2012

Question

Cr Gabelish advised that the review of grant scheme was discussed last meeting or meeting before that looking at small grants, \$2K pay 100% of grant application. Are the Mullewa grants treated differently to other grants?

Response

CEO advised that there is differential treatment with Mullewa trust and the assessment is slightly different. If consistent with the policy it falls under the CEO delegated authority but this one is clearly outside of this. Future rounds, the committee would take into consideration the policy for these. We have not been able to test policy to the full extent as yet and do not want to change policies until fully tested.

Statement

Cr Gabelish made a comment that the policy needs tempering with and bought back to Council.

Statement

Mayor Ian Carpenter advised funding for this comes from a mining company.

Question

Cr McIlwaine asked that the maximum individual grant is \$10K, Mullewa Muster & Rodeo Inc is \$15K, is there substantial reasoning behind this?

Response

District Manager – Mullewa District Office advised that this has been extended for the committee to review submissions above \$10K if warrant to community.

Question

Cr Bennett asked when the current assistance of Mt Gibson expires?

Response

District Manager – Mullewa District Office advised that it expires in 2023 which is when the contract is terminated.

Question

Cr Bennett asked when the matter comes up again, would ask to review whole thing.

Question

Cr Gabelish advised that departure from policy, recent questions, are not clear in report why this has happened.

Response

Mayor Ian Carpenter advised that the relevant officer can put an addendum in there.

Cr Clune returned to Chambers at 6.21pm

Reports of Corporate Services

CS055 Approval of Financial Policies
Nil.

CS056 Compliance Audit Return
Nil.

CS057 Structure of the Audit Committee

Question

Cr Gabelish asked why we are recommending to increase audit committee to 4 elected and two external members – very similar to original resolution that was lost, don't see that this is major departure from motion already lost a month or two ago?

Response

CEO advised that rescinding motions can only apply to a motion that has been carried. Yes there is a slight variation in this recommendation.

Question

Cr McIlwaine made a comment relating to the ability to pay members of Council or members of others?

Response

CEO advised that under the act we were unable to pay sitting fees. However, a review of other local governments and the Department of Local Government found that payments can be made for advisory services of external committee.

Question

Mayor Ian Carpenter requested that the recommendation be amended as it needs to have a part b for the nomination of Councillors on this committee.

Response

CEO advised that this change will be made ready for the Council meeting.

CS058 Mid-Year Budget Review
Nil.

Reports of Sustainable Communities

SC037 Final Adoption of Local Planning Policy 'Residential Design Codes-Vehicular Access'
Nil.

SC038 Proposed Demolition of Heritage Listed Dwelling-Lewis Street, Geraldton
Nil.

SC039 Final Approval of Local Planning Scheme Amendment No.6 – Residential Rezoning, Deepdale

Question

Cr Clune noted that there were 28 signatures on objections – where did these come from (ie local, adults)

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities advised that the City is able to provide you a copy of what was received if requested. It is very hard to determine from the information provided if they are locals, adults etc....

CEO advised that we will have a look at the petition and prepare a map (red – against, green – agree)

Question

Cr Messina asked if the circle around land can be left as open space?

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities advised that in terms of design, planning point of view we feel it would be far more beneficial to have public open space within Chapman River foreshore reserve area. Have widened the foreshore area which can be used for open space.

CEO advised there is a different shade of green which is parks on this drawing. If you need a larger plan to show these, we are happy to provide.

SC040 Proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment- Resort Development Rezoning Greenough, River Road, Cape Burney

Nil.

SC041 Final Adoption of Climate Change Policy

Nil.

Reports of Creative Communities

CC048 Exploring Wildflower Country Midlands Route Product Development Plan

Nil.

Reports of Community Infrastructure

CI013 Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace

Cr Florenza declared an interest in item CI013 – Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace and left Chambers at 6.38pm

Cr Ramage declared an interest in item CI013 – Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace – Cyclist Enabling Facilities, Marine Terrace due to landlord of public member asking questions and left Chambers at 6.44pm

Question

Cr Thomas asked if the City has documentation on how many car parks available on marine terrace from Forrest Street to Cathedral Avenue as well as number of truck unloading bays and other parking areas?

Response

CEO advised that the City can provide upon request from Councillor.

Question

Cr Bennett asked if there is a reason why we don't have the names of the people who made submissions especially property owners?

Response

CEO advised that this information is available on request from Councillors and it is standard practice. This is standard practice.

Statement

Cr Bennett advised that he would like a copy of the list of names of people who made submissions.

Question

Cr Clune asked if there are any plans to carry out survey on bike facilities if adopted?

Response

Director of Community Infrastructure advised that no not at this stage but can do if we need to.

Question

Cr Bylund asked is we will see the proposal for alfresco dining in this area also if adopted?

Response

Acting Director of Sustainable Communities advised that we did have discussions with planning & health, who would police area. Purpose is simply for bike facilities not for business' to apply for alfresco dining. Business' can apply for areas around it but not within facility.

Question

Cr Gabelish asked what the meaning of "noting" is in the recommendation?

Response

CEO advised this means is it noted but with no action arising.

Trevor Melotte - 61 Waldeck Street, Geraldton WA 6530Question

Will either of these business' be allowed to set up an alfresco around the garden bed areas? I run Topalini's and have put in requests to do alfresco after hours.

Response

This question has been answered already.

Question

One of business directly opposite me doesn't open till 4pm most days, has there been any consultation with our neighbouring business' in relation to this proposal?

Question

Location and proposal for these plans, were they an initiative of Council or a proposal received?

Response

There is an agreement between the City and we are looking for opportunities for cycling as per discussions with tenants from the Provincial and Salt Dish. The City was happy to push for cycling facilities.

Ms Lara Dalton – Salt Dish

I am supporting the cycle enable facilities as I run Salt Dish. Have discussed with customers, many are bike riders, all believe a very positive initiative by City and hopefully will stop some congestion. Creativity is a positive. Understand it is a public facility and already have to police the smoking issue.

Mick Davey – Mick Davey Butchers

Concerned about number of bays losing down Marine Terrace. How many more bays are we going to lose on Marine Terrace, as we currently battle for parking for customers?

Councillor QuestionsQuestion

Cr Gabelish asked was it land owners and tenants or just land owners that were consulted?

Response

Manager Infrastructure, Planning & Design advised that both tenants and land owners were consulted in this in both instances and sites.

Question

Cr Gabelish referred to submission number 13 in the attachment about the laneway - have you had discussions with the business' who will be affected by this (directly adjacent to it)?

Response

Manager Infrastructure, Planning & Design advised the whole of the community was consulted. There was no direct consultation with that particular business. We had limited consultation and could have written to a numerous number of people but where do we stop. There is currently no turning area in that laneway so we are not going to be taking up any extra space.

Question

Mayor Ian Carpenter asked if there is a loading zone in that general area?

Response

Manager Infrastructure, Planning & Design advised that there is a loading zone to the west.

Question

Mayor Ian Carpenter asked would it be possible to relocate this?

Response

Manager Infrastructure, Planning & Design advised that yes we could look into this if became an issue.

Cr Fiorenza returned to Chambers at 6.57pm

Cr Ramage returned to Chambers at 6.57pm

Reports of Commercial Enterprises

CE032 Delegation by Local Government to Chief Executive Officer Pursuant to the Local Government Act 1995

Question

Cr Clune asked if this is the same situation as airport café not coming up to council?

Response

CEO advised if no submissions are received it would not need come back to Council. If submissions are received then yes it will come back to Council.

Question

Cr Clune asked if competing bids would it needs to come back?

Response

CEO advised yes as it would be classed as a tender process.

Question

Cr Ramage asked if the CEO in past had any authority for leases?

Response

CEO advised no.

Question

Cr Middleton asked if \$1M is a large sum by commercial standards delegating to CEO without going to Council.

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised that it depends on what kind of lease it is.

Question

Cr Thomas asked if the lease is for 1year?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised no it is a lifetime lease.

Question

Cr Thomas asked what sort of business' would apply for these leases (examples)?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises made an observation – this delegation will save a month in process' that are currently in place.

Question

Cr Ramage asked if Council should have some say in what they want to lease and what they don't.

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised that Council currently doesn't have a policy of what kinds of property can be leased out. Council must be advised.

Question

Cr Van Styne asked if this refers to any value of lease exceeding \$1M. Can lease be reworded?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised that Delegations can be amended.

Question

Cr Gabelish asked if other Local Governments have this policy in place and if so, would like list of these. Tenure - has there been any consideration about tenure?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised that in relation to long term, for issues over 20 years, there is a separate process. Section 3.58 is just to do the lease. Would have to come to council to get permission to ask planning commission to do lease.

Question

Cr Messina referred to \$1M long term of lease. Can wording be changed to reflect so much per year?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised that the CEO is authorised to spend \$500K. We are not looking at collecting revenue.

Question

Cr Middleton asked if the reason for being raised due to the fact that missed out on leases for length of time taken to approve them?

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised no.

Question

Cr Gabelish referred to Non for profit included in policy principles. Commercial leases are not clear on 2nd page. Greyness area for non for profit not being commercial.

Response

Director of Commercial Enterprises advised when a pure commercial lease this is where the policy has it's affect.

CE033 Adoption of Council Policy No. CPO 040 – Property Management Leases

Nil.

CE034 Item of Expression of Interest – Lease Tenure Gordon Garrat Drive, Geraldton Airport

Question

Cr Bylund noted on original map, wasn't the carpark meant to be extending?

Response

CEO advised this is to the north of the existing carpark.

CE035 Theatre 8 Geraldton Inc- Reserve 29388 Eight Street, Wonthella Nil.

Reports to be Received

<i>Office of the CEO</i>	
CEO003	WA Regional Cities Alliance Minutes – 17 February 2012
CEO004	WA Regional Cities Alliance Minutes – 4 August 2011
<i>Reports of Corporate Services</i>	
CS059	List Of Accounts Paid Under Delegation
CS060	Audit Committee Meeting Minutes 21 February 2012
CS061	Monthly Financial Report February
<i>Reports of Sustainable Communities</i>	
SGDD061	Reports to be Received Delegated Determinations
<i>Reports of Creative Communities</i>	
CC049	Report - Seniors Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
CC050	Report - Australia Day Debrief Meeting Minutes
CC051	Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
<i>Commercial Enterprises</i>	
CE036	FORC - MINUTES - Forum of Regional Councils - Chairs and CEO Group 27 February 2012

7 Councillor Questions Without Notice

Nil.

8 Confidential Business

Nil.

9 Meeting closure

The meeting closed at 7.15pm.

Cr Bylund advised that he will be an apology for the meeting in Mullewa on 27 March 2012.

FOR PUBLIC REVIEW - NOT FINAL COUNCIL AGENDA