



TOWN OF
VICTORIA PARK



Agenda Briefing Forum Meeting notes – 7 May 2019



WE'RE OPEN
VIC PARK

Please be advised that an **Agenda Briefing Forum** was held at **6:30 pm** on **Tuesday 7 May 2019** in the **Council Chambers**, Administration Centre at 99 Shepperton Road, Victoria Park.

His Worship the Mayor Trevor Vaughan
10 May 2019

Table of contents

Item	Page no
1 About the Agenda Briefing Forum	3
2 Opening	4
3 Announcements from the Presiding Member	4
4 Attendance.....	5
4.1 Apologies.....	6
4.2 Approved leave of absence	6
5 Declarations of interest.....	6
6 Public participation time.....	7
6.1 Public participation time.....	7
7 Presentations.....	8
8 Deputations	8
9 Method of dealing with agenda business	9
15 Questions from members without notice on general matters.....	19
16 Public participation time	19
17 Confidential matters	20
18 Closure	20

1 About the Agenda Briefing Forum

The purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum is to ask questions and seek clarity on the draft Ordinary Council Meeting agenda, in line with the Agenda Briefing, Concept Forum and Council Workshops Policy.

The meeting is open to all members of the public, except during the consideration of matters deemed confidential in line with the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Members of the public that are directly impacted by an item on the agenda may participate in the meeting through any of the following methods.

1. Deputation

A deputation is a presentation made by a group of between two and five people affected (adversely or favourably) by a matter on the agenda. A [Deputation Form](#) must be submitted to the Town no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting and is to be approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

2. Presentation

A presentation is a submission made by an individual affected (adversely or favourably) by a matter on the agenda. A [Presentation Form](#) must be submitted to the Town no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting and is to be approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

All others may participate in the meeting during the allotted Public Participation Time. While it is not required, members of the public are encouraged to submit their questions and statements in advance by [email](#) or by completing the [Public Question/ Statement Form on the Town's website](#). Please note that questions and statements related to an agenda item will be considered first. All those dealing with matters of a general nature will be considered in the order in which they have been received.

For any questions regarding the Agenda Briefing Forum or any item presented in the draft agenda, please contact the Governance team at GovernanceVicPark@vicpark.wa.gov.au

Disclaimer

Any plans or documents in agendas, minutes and notes may be subject to copyright. The express permission of the copyright owner must be obtained before copying any copyright material.

Any advice provided by an employee of the Town on the operation of written law, or the performance of a function by the Town, is provided in the capacity of an employee, and to the best of that person's knowledge and ability. It does not constitute, and should not be relied upon, as a legal advice or representation by the Town. Any advice on a matter of law, or anything sought to be relied upon as representation by the Town, should be requested in writing.

Noting that the Agenda Briefing Forum is only for the purpose of seeking further information on the draft Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda, and does not constitute a decision-making forum, any person or entity who has an application or submission before the Town must not rely upon officer recommendations presented in the draft agenda. Written notice of the Council's decision, and any such accompanying conditions, will be provided to the relevant person or entity following the Ordinary Council Meeting.

2 Opening

Mayor Trevor Vaughan opened the meeting at 6:30 pm.

Acknowledgement of the traditional owners

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land on which we are meeting, the Wadjuk people of the Noongar Nation, pay my respects to their past, present and emerging elders and thank them for their continued sharing of knowledge and leadership.

3 Announcements from the Presiding Member

3.1 Purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum

The purpose of this forum is to provide an opportunity for Elected Members to ask questions and obtain additional information on officer reports in the draft Ordinary Council Meeting agenda. It is not a decision-making forum, nor is it open for debate.

Members of the public that may be directly affected by an item on the agenda can make presentations, deputations, statements, and ask questions, prior to the matter being formally considered by Council at the next Ordinary Council Meeting.

3.2 Notice of recording

All participation in the meeting will be audio recorded. The audio recording will be archived and placed on the Town's website after the meeting.

3.3 Conduct of meeting

All those in attendance are expected to extend due courtesy and respect to the meeting by refraining from making any adverse or defamatory remarks regarding Council, the staff or any elected member. No one shall create a disturbance at a meeting by interrupting or interfering with the proceedings through expressing approval or dissent, by conversing, or by any other means.

All questions and statements made by members of the public are not to personalise any elected member or member of staff. Questions and statements are to be directed to the Presiding Member, who may choose to call upon an officer of the Town, or another elected member, to assist with responses.

3.4 Public participation time

There are two opportunities to ask questions and make statements at the beginning and at the end of the meeting. Each public participation time will be held for 30 minutes. Any additional time must be by agreement from the meeting and will be in five-minute increments.

In line with the intended purpose of the Agenda Briefing Forum, questions and statements relating to an agenda item will be considered first. All others will be considered in the order in which they have been received.

3.5 Questions taken on notice

Responses to questions taken on notice that relate to an agenda item will be presented in the officer report for the Ordinary Council Meeting agenda under the heading 'Further consideration'.

Responses to general matters taken on notice will be made available in the relevant Ordinary Council Meeting agenda under the section 'Responses to public questions taken on notice'.

3.6 Additional Comments

Mayor Vaughan announced that he was pleased to see the next stage of GO Edwards Reserve started as well as work starting on John McCallum Park (Mactivation). He said that all of these things happening around the Town are going to be great for the Town in the future. He also announced that he went to the opening of The Crest, which is the new building on Goodwoode Parade and was very pleased to be able to assist in opening it, but also the compliments that our planning staff received for all the good work that they have done. He commented that they have built a really good iconic building, which is great for that area of Goodwoode Parade.

4 Attendance

Mayor	Mr Trevor Vaughan
Banksia Ward	Cr Julian Jacobs Cr Ronhhda Potter
Jarrah Ward	Cr Jennifer Ammons Noble Cr Bronwyn Ife Cr Brian Oliver Cr Vicki Potter
Chief Executive Officer	Mr Anthony Vuleta
Chief Operations Officer A/Chief Financial Officer Chief Community Planner	Mr Ben Killigrew Mr Luke Ellis Ms Natalie Martin Goode
Manager Development Services Manager Governance and Strategy	Mr Robert Cruickshank Ms Danielle Uniza
Secretary	Mrs Alison Podmore

4.1 Apologies

Banksia Ward

Cr Claire Anderson

Cr Karen Vernon

4.2 Approved leave of absence

5 Declarations of interest

Declaration of financial interests

Nil.

Declaration of proximity interests

Nil.

Declaration of interest affecting impartiality

Name/Position	Cr Vicki Potter
Item No/Subject	11.3
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	I have two children at Ursula Frayne Senior School

Name/Position	Ben Killigrew
Item No/Subject	11.3
Nature of interest	Impartiality
Extent of interest	Child attends Ursula Frayne (Junior School)

6 Public participation time

6.1 Public participation time

6.1.1 Kim Holland

1. *With regards to the noise at Ursula Frayne; can anyone explain why tonal siren noises were ignored from the acoustic report?*

The Manager Development Services said he wasn't able answer that. The Town has a noise consultant, that has been engaged by the Town to review the work that has been undertaken by the schools own consultant, so would have to ask them the question as to whether that should have been included and what impact that may or may not have had, so will have to get back to Mr Holland on that.

6.1.2 Sam Zammit

1. *Is that a new audio system?*

Mayor Vaughan said not quite yet.

Mr Zammit said you could hardly be heard in the gallery.

2. *I heard you mention something about John McMillan reserve dug up, did you mention that earlier Mr Mayor?*

The Mayor said the Mactivation project around John McMillan, which is going to have a new toilet and facilities for the community to use. So it is not being torn up, rather improvements.

3. *I went past there this week and they are doing up all the carpark at the Hawaiian complex and they have got rubble everywhere and across the road they have got all that fenced off in the same fencing as in the Park Centre; does that land belong to the Hawaiian group?*

The Chief Executive Officer said that all of the carpark that Mr Zammit is referring to, is owned by Hawaiian, not by the Town, apart from a small section of parking that is near the Billabong childcare centre, which is a bit offset from the main carpark, that is the Town's, but everything else that is being resurfaced in red asphalt is under the control of the Hawaiian shopping centre.

4. *I didn't even know that the Perth City Council sold Sussex Street to the Hawaiian group. I'd like some verification what was sold and how much for, if there was any money paid for it?*

Mayor Vaughan said that as Mr Zammit mentioned, it was before the Town of Victoria Park so will have to look up the records from the City of Perth to see what it was to get you that answer.

Mr Killigrew added that we would endeavour too, something these sorts of records are difficult to find.

5. *If we don't own Sussex Street, why have we got parking meters down there?*

The Chief Executive Officer said he thought he'd mentioned it once before, where Sussex Street, or a small portion of about 100m is actually road reserve and under the Town's control. But the section from the childcare centre to the library is part of the carpark.

6. *What does that actually mean? Is that part of Sussex Street still ours?*

The Chief Executive Officer said yes it is.

6.1.3 John Vivian

Mr Vivian thanked the author of the Ursula Frayne for a well written report. It was well balanced document that considered all the views and well put together. It is commendable that a report like that is being given to council so they can make a decision on it.

There were a few points Mr Vivian made - one was the state of Teague Street, mentioned before, but mainly referring to the state of the four house blocks. They look like a rubbish tip, can it be cleaned up? Has council ever consider checking it over for asbestos?

Mr Vivian made a statement regarding the destruction of the four heritage homes and reinforced his feelings about that. Mr Vivian mentioned the legislation that allows people to demolish houses.

Mr Vivian said he hadn't received any community consultation from Ursula Frayne to this date; have been a regular reporter of traffic management, that does not exist in Teague Street. Cars/motorbikes speed through that area. The development applications have not been transparent. What is Ursula Frayne's masterplan?

1. Can Council ask the Ursula Frayne, will they be making a statement of school student and staff numbers, perhaps the last five years, current and the next five years, so we can establish what their plans are for growth? If so, when will they do that, and if not, why not?

6.1.4 Phillip Barnett

Mr Barnett made a statement saying that he is a parent of four kids, lived in the Town for 46 years, two of my kids have been through the Ursula Frayne, two are still there. With regards to the green space proposal, they just want some grass for the children to play on, it's that simple. The school is using the space to the best of their ability, so the kids can have everything they can. They're lovely kids, it's a great school, I feel privileged to be able to send my kids to a private school that is affordable. Give them a chance; see if they will be well behaved; see if it works.

7 Presentations

The Mayor announced that presentations and deputations would be taken when the items come forward for discussion.

8 Deputations

9 Method of dealing with agenda business

10 Chief Executive Officer reports

10.1 Policy 001 - Policy management and development

Questions and responses

Cr Jennifer Ammons Noble

1. Will Management Practices ever be endorsed by Council and are will they be made public as well?

The Manager Governance & Strategy said that at this time it is not intended that Council endorse the Management Practices as these practices are intended to be operational. If Council were to endorse every practice, it would make it difficult for the administration to be agile in changing the direction or process in which policies that are adopted by Council are carried out. At this point in time, the policy doesn't stipulate that they will be public, but that is probably more due to the fact that the administration needs to look at all of its Management Practices internally, which will be the next step. We will look at it again in a years time and then when they are up to date, we would look at making those public in the interest of transparency.

2. What is a policy response?

The Manager Governance & Strategy said the policy response is just the term that is being used in the policy to signify when council would opt to use a policy route to resolve an issue. Not all issues will be resolved by policy, some are by Council Resolution, some are by strategy or plans. It is just a term that is being used.

Cr Brian Oliver

In regards to part 2 of the recommendation, it mentions a full review of the policy, what information can Elected Members expect to receive in the June report back to council?

The Manager Governance & Strategy said that it is the administrations intent for the full review of the policy manual is to take the existing policy manual and make sure that it fits with the new format going forward. The intent is to do a minor review, in the first instance, migrating them all over, but also making recommendations on policies that need to be reviewed in full.

10.2 Policy 023 - Provision of Information and Services - Elected Members

Questions and responses

Cr Ronhhda Potter

1. With regards to the concept forums, how are the elected member required to bring these topics to a concept forum?

The Manager Governance & Strategy advised that there would be prescribed form to use. Elected Members (EM) would lodge the form to the administration and it would be added to the topic list.

2. What officer support is given through this process and what happens in the lead up to those concept forums?

The Manager Governance & Strategy said that because the role of officers is to make sure they provide the right information to EM, particularly around, either in a Council report or a concept forum setting, when an EM submits a request to put a topic on the agenda, depending on the complexity of the item, perhaps book a meeting with the officer and the EM to make sure there is a shared understanding of the topic needs. It would then be up to the officer and the administration to determine the next steps, as far as gathering the right information which would clarify the nature of the concept forum request.

10.3 Review of Finance and Audit Committee

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

10.4 Review of delegations

The Manager Governance & Strategy said that she had received an email from Cr Karen Vernon, suggesting a number of amendments to the delegations themselves, all are pretty minor in nature, so the administration will do those. Some more notable ones, is an amendment for Delegation 1.1.2, which is Councils conditions on this delegation. The change will be to replace the word 'settlement' with 'compensation payments'; and under 2.1.2 relating to the delegation on the dog local law, the administration will add a condition saying that 'it be exercised in line with Councils resolution' which was made at the previous OCM.

10.5 Town of Victoria Representative on Burswood Park Board

Questions and responses

Cr Brian Oliver

1. What are the current area of focus and priorities for the Burswood Park Board (BPB)?

The Chief Executive Officer said the main focus is getting good governance frameworks in place for the organisation. The resourcing has been low for many years and has now been increased with one part time ranger and an events officer now, which has been an internal focus. Other are looking at master planning the areas of land that they control across the peninsula, so the old southern 9 if the golf course, land around what was the Dome and the Dome site itself. Looking at the area near the causeway as well as part of their land holding and undertaking a full master plan for the whole area. Another main focus has been attracting events on the site. In the past, there was no real proactive approach to get events on the site. Together with the Minister for Tourism, which is the oversight Minister for the board, they have been looking at getting major events on the site. You would have seen new events starting to come up like WA Day, Chung Wah, Chinese boat racing happening, this weekend, and recently there were a couple of events, the Pineapple Club and En Blanc, not on BPB land, but supported by Board itself. They are the three main areas of focus at this time.

2. How does the Town work in partnership with the BPB to achieve shared outcomes or priorities?

The Chief Executive Officer said that the Town, prior to the last couple of years, didn't do a lot of work in collaboration with BPB. In the last couple of years, the Town has done a lot of collaboration with them by supporting some of their work administratively, providing feedback and guidance on some of their strategies moving forward, we have now got a better understanding of events that happen on both the Town owned land as well as BPB land. Looking at participating in some of the event on the BPB land as well, which hasn't been done in the past either.

3. In the attachment 10.5.1, the letter requests the Town's nominee by the 15 May 2019; has or will Council seek an extension to this deadline?

The Chief Executive Officer said yes, an extension has been given to just after the Council meeting, 24 May, 2019.

11 Chief Community Planner reports

11.1 Proposed Scheme Amendment 82 to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 - Burswood Station East

Chief Community Planner provided a presentation on the proposed amendment.

Questions and responses

Cr Jennifer Ammons Noble

1. Is there much consideration given to expanding the Parks and Reserve designation, given that there might be greater density in the future?

The Chief Community Planner advised that the reserve is consistent with the Burswood Peninsula District Structure Plan which contains a significant amount of public open space, existing pattern of development and extent of Town of Victoria Park (ToVP) owned land. If the Town were to expand the reserve it would need to obtain privately owned land at considerable cost or expand the reserved area and be open to injurious affection claims - with limited practical benefit to the community. However, we are exploring options to create additional small public spaces around the PTA rail reserve or sumps. These are not short-term prospects and not appropriate for inclusion in the Scheme. The Town is also preparing design guidelines and working with PTA to improve the walkability and connectivity of the site, so that future residents can enjoy easier access to nearby foreshore and parkland.

2. There is a chart in the report that talks about the risk to service interruption if the DPLH fails to support any draft amendment Council chose to endorse? What does that mean?

The Chief Community Planner said that the Amendment provides a base standard for development in Burswood Station East (BSE) and will be augmented by a Local Planning Policy (LPP). If the amendment is held up or not supported, the Town can continue to progress the LPP for which it has greater ownership of the process. The LPP can then be used to guide decision making under clause 29 of TPS1 until such time as a new LPS, Scheme or Activity Centre Plan (ACP) is prepared. The amendment also provides weight to a potential public realm contribution fund, although this is explicitly established in the LPP. The fund, if it proceeds, may need to be reworked if the amendment is not successful. However, this should not impact the general built form intention. The amendment/LPP approach has been prepared as an alternative to progressing a local structure plan and "Special Control Area" rezoning. We have been struggling to get consistent support for this latter approach from DPLH and the new approach is an attempt to simplify the process.

3. What are the risks if we bypass the structure plan, are we exposing ourselves to any risk?

The Chief Community Planner advised that the Town received legal advice. For various planning reasons, the detail of what would be in a structure plan, the Town could put in a scheme amendment and the local planning policy.

11.2 Events Calendar 2019/20

Questions and responses

Cr Brian Oliver

1. With regards to the proposed time capsule to be buried at John McMillan, what is proposed to be put in the time capsule?

The Chief Community Planner said that they haven't got to that detail yet.

2. With regards to \$115,000 proposed to be spent on Christmas decorations for Albany Highway, did the Administration explore other initiatives to decorate and light up the Town in the festive season, outside of our regular approach and if so, what were they?

The Chief Community Planner said she could only speak in general terms as opposed to specifics. There is a paragraph in the report that talks about them being revamped, looking at doing some different things, not just the standard. Happy to find out that detail for you.

11.3 Change of use to Educational Establishment (Green Space) and associated works - No 28 and 30 Teague Street

Veronica Parker provided a deputation on this item. Ms Parker read a statement and answered questions from EM's.

Several questions were asked by Elected Members and responded to by Mrs Parker and other staff from Ursula Frayne.

Questions and responses

Cr Bronwyn Ife

Is there anything that the Town's Planning framework, policies, plan, strategies and so on, that prevents the school from using their existing rooftops, for sport, passive recreation and outdoor learning? If the school was willing to make those changes, is that something Council could consider for approval?

The Manager Development Services said no there is nothing from stopping the school from applying to do that.

Cr Ronhhda Potter

If we were to support the officers recommendation, that we will not support the development application, where do you see it going from there?

The Manager Development Services said that if the officers recommendation was to be adopted, then that is the decision that the applicant needs to make as to where they would take it from there. There would be two choices: One would be to proceed to a full hearing of the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) where the applicant would put forward their case as to why the application should be approved and both parties would have to engage their own consultants to defend their position and the SAT would make their decision based on that. The other alternative is that the applicant may decide not to proceed, but it is a decision of the applicant.

Cr Vicki Potter

1. A number of our parks are on land that is zoned for residential use; does Ursula Frayne need to apply for a change of use, in order to be able to plant this space out as a green space with the trees and grass etc.?

The Manager Development Services said that the subject land is zoned residential. The use of residential land for open space purpose is not automatically approved or exempt from approval, so yes, there would need to be an application made to change the use of the site to 'unlisted use of open space' and in considering that application, Council would have to have regard to relevant clauses and provisions in the Town Planning Scheme, including clause 16 which talks about unlisted uses and the Council would have to be satisfied that such as use is consistent with the intent of residential zone land.

Cr Julian Jacobs

1. In regards to the time being 8am - 4pm and 70 students, from a council point of view, how would we police that?

The Manager Development Services said that the applicant has undertaken that if the development was to be approved there would be a Management Plan prepared. A Management Plan would contain a number of commitments from the school as to how that space would be used and managed. That would then form a condition of planning approval. There would be a degree of self-policing by the school, but it would also be an opportunity for Council officers to ensure at any time that that condition was being met.

2. If the community wanted the change of use to use on the weekend, would this be tough from a council point of view, or would it be quite easy if the community change their mind and want to use it after hours.

The Manager Development Services said that as explained previously, the original proposal was there was opportunity for it to be opened to the public but there was concern expressed by members of the public, particularly about the security implications of having an open park next door to those residential properties. The school as part of its amended proposal have chosen a different tact, where they are proposing to restrict the use of that space after and outside of school hours. The administration has considered things on the basis of what has been put forward to date. If the applicant was to still be open, as indicated to the park being open to

other hours than that would be given further consideration. The Town would have to know how that was going to be managed and how the security concerns that were previously expressed were going to be resolved.

11.4 Local Planning Policy - Tree planting and retention policy

Questions and responses

Cr Bronwyn Ife

1. Is a "medium tree" as defined in the policy going to be sufficient to replace "A tree worthy of retention"? Surely some of these "trees worthy of retention" could be large or significant trees, in which case, is replacing it with a medium tree actually going to ultimately reduce our canopy coverage rather than work to increase it?

The Manager Development Services said on its own, the removal of a 'tree worthy of retention' and its replacement with a 'medium tree' is not going to increase the canopy coverage. However trees that would be regarded as 'trees worthy of retention' can be removed currently by property owners without any replacement planting. Furthermore the Policy requires new tree planting for developments. The net impact of the proposed Policy is an increase in the canopy coverage throughout the Town, with the retention of existing trees being incentivised through a reduction in the extent of new planting required.

2. Is reducing the requirement of trees to be planted if a "tree worthy of retention" is retained, going to be a positive step in increasing our canopy coverage? It sounds like if a property retains one tree worthy of retention (which may not be of a very significant size) then they only need one other medium tree planted – two possibly only medium trees may not contribute to increasing our canopy coverage. Is there some other kind of incentive we can use in place of this one? An incentive that doesn't reduce the number of trees planted? Have we given thought towards perhaps a small grant to contribute towards the purchase of the trees to be planted if a tree worthy of retention will be retained?

The Manager Development Service said that if the Town comes from its current position, where there is no provisions incentivising requiring the retention of existing mature trees. Similarly, where there is no provisions requiring the planting of new trees, the Town will be stepping in the right direction with this new policy because we will be increasing the canopy coverage. If EM this there are other option to be considered, then that is open to EM, but just to remember at this time, all we are doing is seeking councils consent for this policy to go out for public comment, so would be opportunity for the public to make submissions on other alternatives to incentivise retention and to increase the Town canopy coverage. One option may be to require additional trees to be planted where a 'tree worthy of retention' is proposed to be removed ie. 2 or 3 new medium trees for every 'tree worthy of retention' removed. In terms of the last part of the question has the Town looked at brand or subsidy for purchasing trees, no that hasn't been considered.

The Chief Community Planner added that she understands the community and councils sentiment to increase tree canopy, but wanted to remind people that this is not just about trees that are on private land, the proposed policy also requires additional verge trees, which is 1 per 10 metres of frontage, so you will get additional canopy coverage, not just from trees on private land, but on the verge also.

Cr Jennifer Ammons Noble

1. On page 71 the text notes that the local planning policy can't be applied to exemptions from development approval —are there some common examples of where the plan would not apply due to exemptions?

The Manager Development Services said that an example of a development that would be exempt from development approval would be a proposed Single House on a lot that complies with the requirements of the R-Codes (or those requirements of the R-Codes varied by a Local Planning Policy). In such a situation, as development approval is not required for a Single House, then any Local Planning Policies of the Town cannot be applied to the proposed development (including the proposed draft Policy for tree retention and planting). A Building Permit is still required, but planning requirements cannot be enforced on building permit applications. Fortunately, most Single Houses do propose some variation to the requirements of the R-Codes and therefore require development approval, in which case the proposal would be assessed against all relevant Local Planning Policies.

Cr Vicki Potter

1. If someone decides to demolish the house, as it doesn't require planning approval and they also bole over a few trees at the same, that would not be affected by this policy, is that correct?

The Manager Development Services said yes, that is correct. This policy and the incentives for retaining existing trees and the provisions for new tree planting apply where something needs planning approval, so a new development. Unfortunately that is one loop hole that does exist now, someone could quite lawfully apply for a demolition permit only and demolish trees at the same time. When Council was to deal with an application for the replacement development, the best that could be negotiate is 1 new tree for each new house.

Cr Brian Oliver

1. With regards to the policy, what will the financial impact on applicants who are required to plant either a medium tree or a large tree be?

The Manager Development Services said he didn't have a dollar value in terms of the financial impact would be, but would say that it is becoming increasingly standard requirement across Local Governments (LG) that a number of LG have planning policies requiring new tree planting to be provided. So it is becoming more accepted and understood in the development industry that there is an objective and a reason to do so, so I would like to think that the development

industry would be fairly receptive to it, albeit yes, there is going to be cost, but what that will be, I'm unsure.

2. In regards to section 5 of the policy, what would the consequence or how could the town enforce to ensure that any new trees remain well and living and how would this be monitored?

The Manager Development Services said section 5 of the policy talks about tree maintenance and replacement, so it would be a condition of the development approval that the trees need to be maintained. It would be fair to say, that Council officers don't check on every approval of every development, but there is certainly is the ability for council officers to check on things at random times, as well as if we are aware that certain conditions may not be being complied with, then they will be investigated.

11.5 77 (Lot 31) Burswood Road, Burswood -Amendment to Development Approval for Change of Non-Conforming Use from Warehouse to Light Industry (Motor Vehicle Servicing)

Steve Allarding from Allarding & Associates and Bob Peters, the owner of the property were present to make a statement regarding this application, in response to the officers report.

There were no questions asked in relation to this item.

11.6 No. 16 (Lots: 221, 222, 236, 237 and 238) Hampton Street, Burswood for Modifications to existing Lodging House

Deputation: *Michael Kiernan and Larissa Muir were in attendance and provided a presentation on this application.*

Questions were asked by Elected Members and responded to by the applicants.

Questions and responses

Cr Jennifer Ammons Noble

On page 91, can I have some clarification. It talks about several canopy trees that would need to be removed to make way for carbays, at the rear lot; can you tell me how many and what will the shortfall in parking if they were not removed?

The Manager Development Services said that under the Town's parking policy, it requires one car bay per bed, so technically this development would require 34 car bays. If the Council was to insist upon the 34 car bays, there will be a need for the car park to be bigger than what the applicant currently is proposing and that would require the removal of 8 existing trees to facilitate that. The applicant is proposing a lesser number of onsite car bays, in 21, for reasons

outlined in the report, the administration is satisfied that that number is appropriate and will meet the needs and the demands of the proponent. If council were to accept the lesser number of car bays proposed, which the administration support, then there is no impact on trees, and there will be no trees needed to be removed to facilitate that.

11.7 No. 915 (Lot:123) Albany Highway, East Victoria Park for Modifications to Existing 'Consulting Rooms' (Remedial Massage)

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

12 Chief Operations Officer reports

12.1 Appointment of preferred Tenderer - McCartney Crescent Parking Works

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

14 Chief Operations Officer reports

14.1 Recommendation from the Finance and Audit Committee - Financial statements for the month ending 31 March 2019

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

14.2 Recommendation from the Finance and Audit Committee - Schedule of Accounts for March 2019

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

14.3 Recommendation from the Finance and Audit Committee - FIN3 - Debt Collection Policy

There were no questions asked or presentations made in relation to this item.

15 Questions from members without notice on general matters

There were no questions asked by members without notice.

16 Public participation time

15.1.1 Luana Lisandro

1. With regards to Item 11.4, it states that you will be doing a coordinated public communication campaign, which seeking feedback; what engagement will you have with the community to educate them on the policy.

The Manager Development Services said that he would need to get back to Ms Lisandro about her questions, but suggests that the author of the report had in mind that it would go above and beyond a minimum standard community consultation process of putting a notice in the newspaper and seeking public feedback. I think the intention is to go beyond that, but what that will comprise of, would be provided after this meeting.

2. Is there a statutory process in terms of communicating a strategy as opposed to consultation?

The Manager Development Services said that this is a Local Planning Policy (LPP). In the planning and development policy, they talk about minimum requirements for consulting on LPP, so without having those to refer to immediately, I'm sure it would be a public notice in the newspaper and advising directly affected land owners, in this instance there are more widely reaching implications, so the commitment would be beyond that, needs to be confirmed. This will be clarified in the report that will come back to the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 May 2019.

3. If it's going to be a public consultation campaign, then 21 days isn't long enough, can that be extended?

The Manager Development Services said that the report says minimum 21 days, but believes it should it should be a longer period.

4. On page 7, it talks about mitigating the ongoing decline of tree canopy associated with development; has that been outlined, has the council got a set of strategies or are they seeking further information?.

The Chief Community Planner said that P57 of the report talks about other mechanisms adopted by other LG. As this is a TPP adopted under the planning scheme, we focus on what other LG are doing, certainly there is nothing stopping the Town from advocating to the State Government that this is a LPP, so happy to take that onboard.

5. Given that the Town has done Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with surrounding councils, and given that the City of Bayswater is looking to advocate for the retention of trees, could the council look at writing it in to the policy to further investigate that?

The Chief Community Planner in terms of what other LG's are doing, there is an attachment to the report. Nothing has been ruled out, the Town is happy to look at other strategies.

6. With regards to the Ursula Frayne development and the green space, the officer mentioned there would have to be some sort of Management Plan put in place for use of that green space, would that include that if perhaps the school were having external events, would they be using that outside of their normal tuition hours, as mentioned by the application, would that be incorporated into the Management Plan and what is the impact on future expansion when the school grows?

The Manager Development Services said that the applicant in their submission to the Town has suggested some recommending conditions that would go into the Management Plan and it would appear that events

haven't been contemplated, it is purely for staff and students during the hours of 8am to 4pm, so that is what is proposed by the applicant and that is what is being dealt with at the moment. That is not to say that the school could not receive an approval based upon those conditions, and then with any other development in the Town, the applicants can always seek an amendment to their approval at some future time, but that would have to go through a review and assessment process.

15.1.2 Rowena Holland

Just for clarification with regards to the mature trees that were on the property before it was demolished. It wasn't two or three, for memory it included many more mature trees. It was professionally landscaped in its day.

15.1.3 Kim Holland

I would recommend you go back to an aerial photographs that were taken, you would be able to see what was there and what wasn't there in both properties. Mr Holland referred to the acoustic report and said they have noise is higher than allowed. I'd be happy with the green space, it's the use that is the problem.

15.1.4 John Vivian

In respect to earlier comment, there has been no mention of 20 & 22 Teague Street - is that going to be green space too? Is there going to be a takeover of other houses? The draft plan is not complete and there isn't anything written about the traffic plan.

15.1.5 Luana Lisandro

In regards to 11.2 and the event calendar - I was the ratepayer that put forward to have the Moreton Bay Fig festival. The report states that the festival ceased because of low attendance numbers, that wasn't the case. The event was outsourced in its last two years and previous to that the Town organised it internally and the attendance was very popular. When it outsourced, it was badly run and didn't attract a lot of people because of that. Perhaps the event could be incorporated into the time capsule and the opening of John McMillan park. Ms Lisandro said she would like the Town to look at expanding its event and bringing back the Moreton Bay Fig festival as a children's event.

17 Confidential matters

There were no confidential matters to be heard behind closed doors.

18 Closure

There being no further business, Mayor Trevor Vaughan declared the meeting closed at 8:34pm.