

Policy Committee
Minutes – 26 October 2020





Please be advised that an **Policy Committee** was held at **5:30 pm** on **Monday 26 October 2020** as an electronic meeting.

**Cr Brian Oliver- Presiding Member** 

28 October 2020

# **Table of contents**

| lte | em   | Page no |
|-----|--|---------|
|     |  |         |
| 1   | Declaration of opening   | 3       |
| 2   | Attendance   | 4       |
|     | 2.1 Apologies  | 4       |
|     | 2.2 Approved leave of absence  | 4       |
| 3   | Declarations of interest   | 5       |
| 4   | Confirmation of minutes  | 5       |
| 5   | Presentations  | 5       |
| 6   | Method of dealing with agenda business                                       | 5       |
| 7   | Reports  |         |
|     | 7.1 Review of Policy 206 Temporary vehicle stands at building sites          | 6       |
|     | 7.2 Review of Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property | ·11     |
|     | 7.3 Review of Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation                           | 16      |
| 8   | Motion of which previous notice has been given                               | 20      |
| 9   | Meeting closed to the public   | 20      |
|     | 9.1 Matters for which the meeting may be closed                              | 20      |
|     | 9.2 Public reading of resolutions which may be made public                   | 20      |
| 10  | Closure  | 20      |

## 1 Declaration of opening

Cr Brian Oliver opened the meeting at 5.31pm.

## **Acknowledgement of Country (by Presiding Member)**

I am not a Nyungar man, I am a non-Indigenous man. I am honoured to be standing on Whadjuk - Nyungar country on the banks of the Swan River.

Ngany yoowart Noongar maam, ngany wadjella maam. Ngany djerapiny Wadjak – Noongar boodja-k yaakiny, nidja bilya bardook.

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land and respect past, present and emerging leaders, their continuing cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land, which continues to be important today.

Ngany kaaditj Noongar moort keny kaadak nidja Wadjak Noongar boodja. Ngany kaaditj nidja Noongar birdiya – koora, ye-ye, boorda, baalapiny moorditj Noongar kaadijtin, moort, wer boodja ye-ye.

I thank them for the contribution made to life in the Town of Victoria Park and to this region.

Ngany youngka baalapiny Noongar birdiya wer moort nidja boodja.

## 2 Attendance

Mayor Karen Vernon

**Banksia Ward** Cr Wilfred Hendriks

Cr Claire Anderson Cr Ronhhda Potter

**Jarrah Ward** Cr Jesvin Karimi

Cr Brian Oliver (Presiding Member)

Deputy Mayor Bronwyn Ife

Chief Operations OfficerMr Ben KilligrewChief Financial OfficerMr Michael Cole

Manager Infrastructure OperationsMr Gregor WilsonCoordinator Parking and RangersMr Amadeus Rainbow

**Governance Advisor** Mr Liam O'Neill

**Secretary** Ms Amy Noon

# 2.1 Apologies

Nil.

# 2.2 Approved leave of absence

Jarrah WardCr Luana LisandroBanksia WardCr Vicki Potter

## 3 Declarations of interest

**Declaration of financial interest** 

Nil.

**Declaration of proximity interest** 

Nil.

**Declaration of interest affecting impartiality** 

Nil.

## 4 Confirmation of minutes

## **COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:**

**Moved:** Cr Bronwyn Ife Seconded: Cr Brian Oliver

That the Policy Committee confirms the minutes of the Policy Committee held on 21 September 2020.

**CARRIED (7 - 0)** 

For: Cr Brian Oliver, Cr Claire Anderson, Cr Ronhhda Potter, Mayor Karen Vernon, Cr Wilfred Hendriks, Cr

Bronwyn Ife, Cr Jesvin Karimi

Against: nil

## 5 Presentations

Nil.

# 6 Method of dealing with agenda business

## **COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:**

**Moved:** Cr Bronwyn Ife Seconded: Cr Jesvin Karimi

That Policy Committee in accordance with clause 58 of the *Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019* suspends clause 50 - Speaking twice of the *Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019* for the duration of the meeting.

**CARRIED (7 - 0)** 

For: Cr Brian Oliver, Cr Claire Anderson, Cr Ronhhda Potter, Mayor Karen Vernon, Cr Wilfred Hendriks, Cr

Bronwyn Ife, Cr Jesvin Karimi

Against: nil

## 7 Reports

# 7.1 Review of Policy 206 Temporary vehicle stands at building sites

| Location            | Town-wide   |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Reporting officer   | Amadeus Rainbow   |  |  |
| Responsible officer | Michael Cole  |  |  |
| Voting requirement  | Simple majority   |  |  |
| Attachments         | 1. Policy 352 Temporary vehicle stands at building sites Final [7.1.1 - 4 pages]      |  |  |
|                     | 2. Policy 206 Temporary vehicle stands at building sitesTrack Changes                 |  |  |
|                     | [EMVH] [ <b>7.1.2</b> - 5 pages]  |  |  |
|                     | 3. Policy 206 Temporary vehicle stands at building sites - Current [ <b>7.1.3</b> - 2 |  |  |
|                     | pages]  |  |  |

#### Recommendation

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council, effective from the commencement of the Vehicle Management Local Law 2020:

- 1. Repeals existing Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites as attachment 3
- 2. Adopts amended Policy 352 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites as attachment 1

## **Purpose**

To review the existing Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites.

## In brief

- Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites was last reviewed in August 2015.
- At its Policy Committee meeting of March 2020, it was resolved to request a review of 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites by October 2020. This is part of the broader timetable for review of policies in the 2020/2021 financial year.
- Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites guides the principles to provide for the management of temporary vehicle stands at building sites.
- This report recommends a number of amendments:
  - 1. Removing inequity requirements,
  - 2. Adding permits
  - 3. Clear and concise signage to inform everyone on the parking conditions
  - 4. Allow enforcement for unauthorised usage

## **Background**

- 1. At its meeting on 21 April 2020, Council adopted a work plan to complete the review of a number of policies. Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites was one of the policies identified for review.
- 2. Temporary authorised work zones/vehicle stands adjacent to building sites may be provided as required for demolition and/or during the construction period for the delivery of materials to the site.

- 3. Written applications to be submitted 2 weeks prior to commencement of the work zone being required. Application to define the site, day of week and time of day
- 4. Temporary authorised work zones/vehicle stands can assist with keeping the road network free of conflicts and obstructions
- 5. From a safety point of view, it can prevent private vehicles being parked in close proximity to a building site, thus limiting interaction of unauthorised vehicles or persons adjacent to the site
- 6. Temporary work zone signage will be installed to allow enforcement.

## Strategic alignment

| Environmental   |   |
|---|---|
| Strategic outcome   | Intended public value outcome or impact   |
| EN2 – A safe, interconnected and well-maintained transport network that makes it easy for everyone to get around. | Regulating and allowing the parking in front of building sites, reduces congestion and inconvenience to road users by helping keep the road networks clear.   |
| EN5 – Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed.  | Facilitating temporary delivery areas and drop off points helps allow<br>for the appropriate materials to be accessed for building purposes,<br>and increases the safety factor for workers and the general public. |

## **Engagement**

| Internal engagement |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Stakeholder         | Comments   |  |  |  |
| Compliance Officer  | Review of policy and how it currently operates           |  |  |  |
| Town Rangers        | Reviewed policy, offered feedback on current practices   |  |  |  |
| Ops staff           | Analysis of how current policy operates and any pitfalls |  |  |  |
| Planning Officers   | Approval of DRAFT policy                                 |  |  |  |

# **Legal compliance**

Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995

Activities on Throughfares and Trading in Throughfares and Public Places Local Law 2000

Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2008

# **Risk management consideration**

| Risk impact<br>category                      | Risk event<br>description   | Consequence<br>rating | Likelihoo<br>d rating | Overall risk<br>level score | Council's<br>risk<br>appetite | Risk treatment option and rationale for actions   |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Financial                                    | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |
| Environmental                                | Material being incorrectly delivered onto verges/parks                      | Low                   | Possible              | Low                         | Medium                        | Provide<br>designated area  |
| Health and safety                            | Failure to allow<br>designated delivery<br>areas causing traffic<br>hazards | Medium                | Possible              | Medium                      | Low                           | Allow for designated delivery/short term storage area in appropriate hardstand location |
| Infrastructure/<br>ICT systems/<br>utilities | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |
| Legislative<br>compliance                    | Failure to update policy stops ability to enforce rules                     | Low                   | Likely                | Medium                      | Low                           | Update policy to allow for enforcement  |
| Reputation                                   | Inconsistent application of rules   | Low                   | Possible              | Low                         | Low                           | Follow revised policy   |
| Service<br>delivery                          | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |

# **Financial implications**

| Current budget impact | Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation. |
|-----------------------|---|
| Future budget impact  | Not applicable  |

# **Analysis**

7. Changes to the policy are set out in the below table.

| Clause  | Proposed                | Reason   |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| Policy Statement:<br>Clauses 1 through to 16                        | Reworded in more detail | Allows for stronger enforcement of any breaches      |
| New section: Signage to be implemented Examples of standard signage |                         | To provide an example of minimum signage requirement |

- 8. The current policy's intent was to allow for temporary delivery and storage area for building/construction sites, to improve safety and minimize impeding the road network.
- 9. The policy has been reviewed for consistency of application against existing practice. Minor amendments have been made to clarify terminology and other requirements in providing conditions for Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites, as outlined with the attached Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites.
- 10. The Town has looked at how other local governments manage parking at building sites and found that the Town of Cambridge have a very similar policy in terms of conditions and signage requirements.

#### **Relevant documents**

Not applicable.

#### **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

#### The committee were advised of the following:

- 1. The area of a work zone is dependent on an application.
- 2. The verge area is the area between the edge of the road and the edge of the adjacent property.
- 3. The issuing of infringement notices for going against the policy depends on the availability of Ranger staff to do so.
- 4. People require the permission of the owner of an adjacent property to be able to park on a verge.
- 5. The purpose of a work zone is to enable the delivery of materials to a work site.

#### The committee discussed the following:

- 1. Whether the heading of the policy needs to be changed to better reflect its purpose and content.
- 2. Whether the term 'work zones' needs to be defined.
- 3. Inconsistencies with wording throughout the proposed policy.

- 4. Formatting issues throughout the proposed policy.
- 5. Whether parking in the median strip of a street is allowed, when verge parking isn't possible. This question was taken on notice with the answer to be provided to elected members following the meeting.

## COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:

**Moved:** Cr Brian Oliver Seconded: Cr Claire Anderson

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council, effective from the commencement of the *Vehicle Management Local Law 2020*:

- 1. Repeals existing Policy 206 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites as at attachment 3.
- 2. Adopts amended Policy 352 Temporary Vehicle Stands at Building Sites as at attachment 1.

## PROCEDURAL MOTION:

**Moved:** Mayor Karen Vernon Seconded: Cr Jesvin Karimi

That the item be referred back to the Chief Executive Officer.

**CARRIED (7 - 0)** 

**For:** Cr Brian Oliver, Cr Claire Anderson, Cr Ronhhda Potter, Mayor Karen Vernon, Cr Wilfred Hendriks, Cr Bronwyn Ife, Cr Jesvin Karimi

Against: nil

Against.

#### Reason:

To allow further refinement of the policy terms and title, and to correct some grammatical issues in the draft policy.

## 7.2 Review of Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property

| Location            | Town-wide   |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Reporting officer   | Gregor Wilson   |  |  |
| Responsible officer | Ben Killigrew   |  |  |
| Voting requirement  | Simple majority   |  |  |
| Attachments         | <ol> <li>Policy 224 Fences between Town property and adjoining property Final [L5VO] [7.2.1 - 2 pages]</li> <li>Policy 224 Fences between Town property and adjoining property - Track Changes [7.2.2 - 3 pages]</li> <li>Policy 224 Fences between Town property and adjoining property - Current [7.2.3 - 2 pages]</li> </ol> |  |  |

#### Recommendation

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council, effective from the d commencement of the Fencing Local Law 2020:

Repeals existing Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property as attachment 3 Adopts amended Policy 224 Fences Between Property owned by the Town and Adjoining Property as attachment 1

## **Purpose**

To repeal existing Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property and present amended Policy 224 Fences Between Property owned by the Town and Adjoining Property to the Policy Committee for a recommendation for Council adoption.

#### In brief

- Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property was last reviewed in August 2015
- At its Council meeting of April 2020, it was resolved to request a review of Policy 224 Fences Between Town
  Property and Adjoining Property by November 2020. This is part of the broader timetable for review of
  policies in the 2020/2021 financial year.
- Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property guides the principles that the Town will apply relating to contribution to the costs of fencing adjoining Town controlled land.

# **Background**

- At its meeting on 21 April 2020 Council adopted a works plan to complete a review of a number of policies. Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property was one of the policies identified for review.
- 2. The Town has an extensive list of parks and sumps that are adjoined by privately owned residential and commercial properties.

- 3. Under certain criteria, and as a responsible neighbour, the Town may contribute up to 50% of the costs of dividing fences.
- 4. Drainage sumps have the potential to be filled with water, so maintaining the fence integrity in these locations potentially becomes a safety issue.
- 5. In the case of parkland, a missing fence may create illegal access to the park by vehicles potentially causing damage, so it may be in the Town's interest to contribute to the cost of fencing.
- 6. The Town receives multiple requests each year for contributions to adjoining fences on Parks and Sumps.
- 7. Local governments are not exempt from the requirements of the *Dividing Fences Act 1961* however crown land managed by the local government would be.

# **Strategic alignment**

| Environment   |   |
|---|---|
| Strategic outcome   | Intended public value outcome or impact   |
| EN05 - Appropriate and sustainable facilities for everyone that are well built, well maintained and well managed. | Maintaining the integrity of boundary fences, keeps them to a standard, and restricts inappropriate access for safety, and limiting damage to parkland. |
| EN06 - Appropriate, inviting and sustainable green spaces for everyone that are well maintained and well managed. | Well maintained fence networks help define park<br>boundaries, stop unauthorized vehicle access and<br>maintain the aesthetics of the sites.            |

# **Engagement**

| Internal engagement                         |  |
|---|--|
| Stakeholder                                 | Comments   |
| Engineering staff                           | Feedback on maintaining sump fences                      |
| Park Staff                                  | Review document relating to Park boundary fencing issues |
| Planning Department                         | Approval of changes consistency with planning policies   |
| Governance, and Land and Properties Officer | Review of policy wording                                 |

# **Legal compliance**

Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995

**Dividing Fences Act 1961** 

# **Risk management consideration**

| Risk impact<br>category                      | Risk event<br>description   | Consequence rating | Likelihoo<br>d rating | Overall risk<br>level score | Council's<br>risk<br>appetite | Risk treatment<br>option and<br>rationale for<br>actions     |
|--|---|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Financial                                    | Not adopting a<br>fencing policy may<br>lead to<br>inconsistency in<br>financial<br>contributions for<br>boundary fencing | Moderate           | Likely                | High                        | Low                           | Adopt a policy that clarifies council contributions,         |
| Environmental                                | N/A   |                    |                       |                             |                               |  |
| Health and safety                            | Failure to protect<br>residents from<br>issues caused by<br>missing fences  | Moderate           | Possible              | Moderate                    | Low                           | Ensure fencing policy is followed.                           |
| Infrastructure/<br>ICT systems/<br>utilities | Failure to protect public open space and infrastructure   | Moderate           | Likely                | Moderate                    | Medium                        | Ensure fences are replaced                                   |
| Legislative compliance                       | N/A   |                    |                       |                             |                               |  |
| Reputation                                   | Complaint over<br>Town's handling of<br>fencing requests  | Low                | Possible              | Low                         | Low                           | Ensure policy is<br>followed, and<br>available on<br>website |
| Service<br>delivery                          | N/A   |                    |                       |                             |                               |  |

# **Financial implications**

| Current budget impact | Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Future budget impact  | Town needs to maintain current level of budget in parks and drainage sumps to deal with any future requests for contributions to fencing. |

# **Analysis**

- 8. The Town assessed the Dividing Fences Act as part of the research into this policy. The policy is consistent with our requirement under the Act.
- 9. The Town also sought comparison with other local government policies relating to fencing. Four councils were contacted, with the City of Stirling providing feedback. The City of Stirling indicated that they rarely pay a contribution to dividing fences, and follow guidelines from the Dividing Fences Act.

10. The policy has been reviewed for consistency of application against existing practice. Minor amendments have been made to clarify terminology and other requirements in providing for the Town's contributions to Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property, as outlined with the attached Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property.

### **Relevant documents**

Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property

Western Australian Legislation - Dividing Fences Act 1961

## **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

#### The committee were advised of the following:

- 1. Fence heights are guided by planning policies.
- 2. Any fences that the Town would need to replace would be replaced like for like and would have to meet relevant planning policies.
- 3. The definition of fee simple being land that the Town owns.
- 4. The policy doesn't include any property abutting the road reserve, only fences on land that the Town owns.
- 5. Rights of way are usually Crown land or privately owned land which means this policy would not apply. The Dividing Fences Act would apply in this case.

## The committee discussed the following:

- 1. A specific example of Town involvement in a fence between Town property and adjoining property in St James.
- 2. Whether the policy needs to be repealed to be amended.

## COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:

**Moved:** Cr Wilfred Hendriks **Seconded:** Cr Claire Anderson

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council, effective from the commencement of the *Fencing Local Law 2020*:

- 1. Repeals existing Policy 224 Fences Between Town Property and Adjoining Property as attachment 3
- 2. Adopts amended Policy 224 Fences Between Property owned by the Town and Adjoining Property as attachment 1

**CARRIED (7 - 0)** 

**For:** Cr Brian Oliver, Cr Claire Anderson, Cr Ronhhda Potter, Mayor Karen Vernon, Cr Wilfred Hendriks, Cr Bronwyn Ife, Cr Jesvin Karimi

Against: nil

## 7.3 Review of Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation

| Location                  | Town-wide   |  |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Reporting officer         | Gregor Wilson   |  |  |
| Responsible officer       | Ben Killigrew   |  |  |
| <b>Voting requirement</b> | Simple majority   |  |  |
| Attachments               | 1. Policy 254 Remnant native vegetation - Track changes [ <b>7.3.1</b> - 2 pages] |  |  |
|                           | 2. Policy 254 Remnant native vegetation - Current [ <b>7.3.2</b> - 2 pages]       |  |  |
|                           | 3. Policy 254 Remnant native vegetation final [U8R7] [ <b>7.3.3</b> - 2 pages]    |  |  |

#### Recommendation

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council:

- 1. Repeals existing Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation as attachment 3
- 2. Adopts amended Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation as attachment 2

## **Purpose**

To repeal the existing Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation and present the amended Policy 254 on Remnant Native Vegetation to the Policy Committee for a recommendation for Council adoption.

## In brief

- Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation was last reviewed in August 2015.
- At its Council meeting of April 2020 it was resolved to request a review of Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation by November 2020. This is part of the broader timetable for review of policies in the 2020/2021 financial year.
- Policy 254 on Remnant Native Vegetation guides the principles that the Town will apply to provide for the management of remnant native vegetation on land under the control or management of the Town.

# **Background**

- 1. At its meeting on 21 April 2020 Council adopted a work plan to complete the review of a number of policies. Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation was one of the policies identified for review.
- Remnant vegetation or bushland can be defined as those patches of native trees, grasses and shrubs still left. The vegetation can be any shape and size and can include all types of native vegetation communities.
- 3. Remnant vegetation can provide an area with a distinct character and a link to the past.
- 4. The Town of Victoria Park has largely been cleared for urbanisation and only contains two bushland reserves (Kensington Bushland and Hillview Bushland), with the remaining sites with indigenous flora largely consisting of individual trees or small stands on roadsides, parks (such George St Reserve and Harold Rossiter Reserve) and sumps.
- 5. The remaining vegetation is an asset to the Town of Victoria Park and need to be actively managed to retain their aesthetic, cultural, and ecological values.

6. The Town has a dedicated Team Leader Natural Areas as well as other staff and contractors who maintain these areas.

# **Strategic alignment**

| Economic          |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Strategic outcome | Intended public value outcome or impact   |
| ·                 | Well maintained track networks and controlled weeds help allow for accessibility and reduced fire hazard. |

| Environment   |  |
|---|--|
| Strategic outcome   | Intended public value outcome or impact  |
| EN06 - Appropriate, inviting and sustainable green spaces for everyone that are well maintained and well managed. | Well preserved aesthetically pleasing bushland allows opportunities for passive recreation fauna habitat and education on the value of remnant vegetation. |
| EN07 - Increased vegetation and tree canopy.  | Preservation of existing trees and revegetation works help preserve and increase vegetation within the Town and add to biodiversity.                       |

# **Engagement**

| Internal engagement   |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Stakeholder           | Comments                                 |
| Parks staff           | Provide information on current practices |
| Environmental Officer | Reviewed policy and provide feedback     |

# **Legal compliance**

Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995

# **Risk management consideration**

| Risk impact<br>category                      | Risk event<br>description                             | Consequence<br>rating | Likelihoo<br>d rating | Overall risk<br>level score | Council's<br>risk<br>appetite | Risk treatment option and rationale for actions                                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Financial                                    | Failing to fund required preservation works           | Moderate              | Likely                | High                        | Low                           | Continue to appropriately fund parks maintenance budgets for remnant vegetation works |
| Environmental                                | Failing to properly<br>maintain remnant<br>vegetation | Moderate              | Likely                | High                        | Medium                        | Preserve remnant vegetation and contain weeds   |
| Health and safety                            | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |
| Infrastructure/<br>ICT systems/<br>utilities | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |
| Legislative compliance                       | Not applicable  |                       |                       |                             |                               |   |
| Reputation                                   | Public backlash due<br>to vegetation<br>degradation   | High                  | Likely                |                             | Low                           | Preserve remnant vegetation   |
| Service<br>delivery                          | Failure to keep up with maintenance requirements      | Moderate              | Likely                |                             | Medium                        | Continue current<br>level of<br>maintenance<br>works                                  |

# **Financial implications**

| Current budget impact   | Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Future budget<br>impact | The maintenance and preservation of the remnant bushland areas will continue to require maintenance funding in subsequent future budgets. |

# **Analysis**

7. The Town sought comparison with other local government policies relating to remnant native vegetation. Four councils were contacted, with the City of Stirling provided feedback. The City of Stirling manages its bushland guided by the City's Local Biodiversity Plan and Green Plan 2. They do

- not have a specific individual policy just relating to remnant native vegetation. The Town also obtained a copy of the Town of Kwinana's policy from their website. The policy is similar to the Town of Victoria Park's, with minor differences regarding Pytophthora control (dieback) and milling of removed timber.
- 8. The policy has been reviewed for consistency of application against existing practice. Minor amendments have been made to clarify terminology and other requirements in providing for the preservation of remnant bushland, as outlined with the attached tracked changes version.

#### **Relevant documents**

Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation

## COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

## The committee were advised of the following:

- 1. The policy applies to Hillview Bushland, Kensington Bushland and smaller sites around the Town that include some remnant native vegetation.
- 2. It can be difficult to control weeds with steam in these areas due to vehicle access and hose lengths.
- 3. The policy does not cover George Street Reserve and parts of sandpit that are not remnant native vegetation. Management practices for the sites are however similar.
- 4. The policy allows for authorised vehicles to access the sites, if needed.

#### COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:

**Moved:** Cr Ronhhda Potter

That the Policy Committee recommends that Council:

- 1. Repeals existing Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation as attachment 3
- 2. Adopts amended Policy 254 Remnant Native Vegetation as attachment 2

**CARRIED (7 - 0)** 

Seconded: Cr Brian Oliver

**For:** Cr Brian Oliver, Cr Claire Anderson, Cr Ronhhda Potter, Mayor Karen Vernon, Cr Wilfred Hendriks, Cr Bronwyn Ife, Cr Jesvin Karimi

Against: nil

| Nil.  |  |           |         |      |  |
|---|--|-----------|---------|------|--|
| 9   | Meeting closed to the public                             |           |         |      |  |
| 9.1   | Matters for which the meeting may be closed              |           |         |      |  |
| Nil.  |  |           |         |      |  |
| 9.2   | Public reading of resolutions which may be               | made      | public  |      |  |
| Nil.  |  |           |         |      |  |
| 10  | Closure  |           |         |      |  |
| There   | being no further business, Cr Brian Oliver closed the me | eeting at | 6.36pm. |      |  |
| I confirm these minutes to be true and accurate record of the proceedings of the Council/Committee. |  |           |         |      |  |
| Signe   | d:   |           |         |      |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |
| Dated   | I this: Da   | y of:     |         | 2020 |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |
|   |  |           |         |      |  |

Motion of which previous notice has been given

8