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## Declaration of Opening/Announcement of Visitors

The Chairman declared the Council Meeting open at 6:02pm and welcomed all present.

## Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

### 2.1 Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr B Sammels (Mayor)</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr B Warner (Deputy Mayor)</td>
<td>Coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr R Smith</td>
<td>Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr P Ellis</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr A Prince</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr J Stewart</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr L Dodd</td>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr L Dunkling</td>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr D Hamblin</td>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr L Liley</td>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr R M Jeans</td>
<td>A/Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms G I Thornton</td>
<td>Director Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Rogers</td>
<td>A/Director Engineering &amp; Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Pearson</td>
<td>Director Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr N Fimmano</td>
<td>Manager Executive Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Members of the Public:

- 18

### Press:

- 2
2.3 Apologies: Nil
2.4 Approved Leave of Absence: Nil

3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice
Nil

4. Public Question Time

4.1 Ms Rosalie Cameron, Rockingham - Rockingham District Hospital Parking and Bus Service

The Mayor invited Ms Cameron to present her questions to Council. Ms Cameron presented the following questions:

1. Through Councils various Committee meetings since September, could you give a community update concerning State Government Carpark zoning at Rockingham General Hospital?

The Mayor advised that Council has written to the WA Local Government Association to lobby the State Government for the Department of Health to provide free parking for staff at all metropolitan health facilities. No response has been received to date.

2. Would Station 6 visitors parking facility remain under Local Government or would this also come under Southern Metropolitan Access Parking Department?

The Mayor advised that Parking Station 6 at the Rockingham Hospital is not under the control of the City of Rockingham as it comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health.

3. With our 15 million dollar RCCTS transit scheme wouldn’t it be ‘travel smart’ to extend bus route 555 along Elenora Drive to service the hospitals growth?

The Mayor advised that this is not a decision for Council, however, the idea has merit and this matter will be pursued.

4.2 Ms Lotta Mellows, Safety Bay - Suggested Development for Safety Bay Road

The Mayor invited Ms Mellows to present her questions to Council. Ms Mellows presented the following questions:

1. How could Council contemplate a development of the magnitude suggested for the Safety Bay Road development, particularly without reliable and complete impact data such as traffic increase, air and noise pollution, shading of beach and nearby dwellings?

The Mayor advised that all applications received need to be dealt with and appropriate Community Consultation will take place, Officers will then submit a report to Council for consideration.

2. Why is it even being suggested as it is breaking WAPC policy in every aspect? ie:
   a. legal height of 8 storey building is 32m, the proposed 8 storey buildings are 36.5-38m high
   b. density rating being changed from 60 to 160
The Mayor advised that the building can go up to 8 storeys with community support. The Planning Department will look at and address all issues pertaining to the application.

3. If the development is being taken seriously have Council selected a Committee for the development as yet? We would want representation from the residents in the area as part of that Committee.

4. Is there a Coastal Planning Policy and Strategy? Where can we obtain copies?

5. Who will pay for the requirement for new infrastructure exceeding that which would normally be required with lower density development? Ie: more parking needed in surrounding areas including by the beach, more children attending local schools, day care, libraries, sporting clubs, etc.

6. Will rates go up to cover development costs?

7. What other consultations have gone on between the Council and the Developer of Safety Bay Road?

The Mayor advised that these questions will be taken on notice and a response provided.

5. Applications for Leave of Absence

Nil

6. Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Moved Cr Stewart, seconded Cr Warner:
That Council CONFIRM the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 26 October 2010, as a true and accurate record.

Carried – 10/0

7. Matters Arising from Minutes of Previous Meeting

Nil.

8. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion

The Chairman announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the Council meeting.

9. Declarations of Members and Officers Interests

Nil.

10. Petitions/ Deputations/ Presentations/ Submissions

10.1 Petitions

Cr P Ellis tabled a petition on behalf of the Rockingham Retail Trading Hours Alliance requesting that Council retains the existing retail trading hours for Rockingham.
11. **Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed**

Nil.

12. **Receipt of Minutes of Standing Committees**

*Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Stewart*

That Council *RECEIVE and CONSIDER* the minutes of the:

1. Community Development Standing Committee meeting held on 8 November 2010;
2. Planning Services Standing Committee meeting held on 15 November 2010; and
3. Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee meeting held on 16 November 2010

Carried – 10/0

13. **Officers Reports and Recommendations of Standing Committees**
## Community Development Standing Committee

### Community Development

**Community Infrastructure Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ref-002/10</strong> Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CPR/328 RCS/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Carly Kroczek, Community Infrastructure Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Michael Quirk, Manager Community Infrastructure Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>8 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>CD32/6/09, CES204/6/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Reserve R43022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>Lot 4604 on P191468, 8.5 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1 – Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan Final Report (copy available in the Councillors Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1 – Lawrie Stanford Reserve Aerial Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Lawrie Stanford Reserve Landscape Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – Lawrie Stanford Reserve Aerial Location Map

---
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1. **Purpose of Report**


2. **Background**

Lawrie Stanford Reserve is an 8.5 hectare site located on Cavendar Street, Singleton that currently accommodates a range of community infrastructure including a community centre, community hall, lawn bowling club, tennis courts, active playing field/s, cricket nets, volunteer fire brigade shed, playgrounds, basketball court, Skate Park, and associated amenities.

Given the population growth within the City’s Coastal Ward, including Singleton, and the subsequent increases in sporting and social activities there have been numerous requests to improve and/or redevelop the facilities at Lawrie Stanford Reserve over a number of years. Subsequently, Council allocated an amount of $10,000 within its Five Year Development Program for City Projects, Parks and Reserves No. 16 in 2006/07 to upgrade toilet/change room amenities and improve accessibility. In 2007/08, Council allocated a further $100,000 within its Five Year Asset Creation Program to enable the preparation of detailed plans for the Singleton Community Centre with a view to meeting longer term community needs, and for the purposes of attracting funding through the Department of Sport & Recreation Community Sporting & Recreation Facilities Fund (CSRFF). This budget allocation was ultimately reduced to $30,000 and resulted in a redevelopment for the community centre being prepared on consultation with key user groups. The
indicative capital cost for these works was $361,410 however given the ‘social amenity improvements’ rather than the delivery of core infrastructure that supports increased physical activity the City’s CSRFF application was unsuccessful.

In 2008/09 a further $500,000 was allocated in Council’s Five Year Asset Creation Program for the proposed extension and improvements to the community centre based on the previously prepared plans. In addition, an amount of $250,000 was included in the Program following public advertising for the construction of public toilets to serve the users of Lawrie Stanford Reserve. Rather than pursuing two standalone buildings it was considered appropriate to consider the integration of these capital projects. Notably, when the Program was endorsed at the Ordinary Council Meeting in June 2008 the following imperative was included in relation to the project:

“There are a range of stakeholders in this project with management complexities and issues that are required to be addressed. Further consultation will be undertaken in order to ensure the involvement and participation of all stakeholders involved in this project. Subject to the outcome of this consultation the allocation of $500,000 within the 09/09 financial year will enable detailed design to be prepared and tenders sought for construction”

On this basis, in November 2008 the City initiated a review of the proposed community centre extensions and improvements plan in consultation with key community stakeholders through the collaborative Singleton Recreation & Community Club (SRaCC). However, in December 2008 the Singleton Social Club formally advised the City’s Mayor and Chief Executive Officer that it had withdrawn its involvement with SRaCC and the project due to the proposed facility improvements not being in the best interests of the general community. The Singleton & Golden Bay Tennis Club also withdrew from the process as it saw limited benefits for the additional costs that may be incurred with their involvement. In January 2009 the Singleton Social Club sent a delegation to meet with the City’s Mayor, Coastal Ward Councillor, Chief Executive Officer, Director Community Development and Director Engineering & Parks to specifically raise concerns about the role of SRaCC, the scope of the proposed community centre redevelopment and any proposed management model for the centre. The key outcome of this meeting, as directed by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer, was that the proposed redevelopment would not occur unless all stakeholders were agreeable to the concept and a single management entity comprising all key users groups was re-formed.

Towards this end an independent facilitator, Community Project Solutions, was appointed to conduct a mediation workshop between the key community groups and the resultant recommendations included that the City revisit the design of the proposed community centre within a broader Master Planning process for the whole reserve, expedite the construction of toilets on the reserve (subject to the outcomes of the master planning process), and assist with the appointment of an independent and suitably qualified professional to develop SRaCC’s Business Plan and Governance Model. As a result, a report was presented to the Ordinary Council Meeting in June 2009 with the following actions being resolved:

1. Endorse the allocation of $250,000 within the Five Year Asset Creation Program for City Projects, Parks and Reserves (Review No.17) for the construction of standalone toilet amenities on Lawrie Stanford Reserve, Singleton.

2. Note the allocation of $1,500 within the draft 2009/10 budget (Account No. 200438.1726- Consultant Fees) to assist the Singleton Recreation & Community Club with the preparation of A Business Plan and Governance Model.

3. Note the allocation of $20,000 within the draft 2009/10 budget (Account No. 200724.1700 – Sport & Recreation Planning Projects) for the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan Study.
4. Request the Chief Executive Officer to distribute the outcomes of the Singleton Community Centre Stakeholder Workshop, and related Council resolutions, to the stakeholder groups as a matter of priority.

5. Allocate $500,000 in 2010/11 within the Five Year Asset Creation Program for City Projects, Parks & Reserves (Review No. 17) for the ‘Singleton Community Centre Extension, Hall Upgrade & Improvements’ subject to the outcomes of the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan.”

Subsequently, the City’s Community Development Division embarked upon the preparation of a Master Plan for Lawrie Stanford Reserve in November 2009. Notably, whilst the Master Plan was still under development an amount of $500,000 was retained within the City’s 10 Year Business Plan and allocated in 2014/15 due to other infrastructure priorities. The previous amount of $250,000 for standalone toilets was increased to $300,000 (based on a revised cost estimate from the City’s Engineering and Parks Division) and included within the 2010/11 budget following adoption of the City Business Plan 2010/11 to 2019/20 at the Ordinary Council Meeting in April 2010.

The Master Plan has now been prepared as a guide for the future development of the reserve and for consideration within the City’s 10 Year Business Planning process.

3. Details

Project Methodology

The Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan was project managed by the City's Community Infrastructure Planning Team in consultation with a cross-Divisional Project Team consisting of representatives from Engineering & Parks Services, Community Development and Corporate Services. In addition a Stakeholder Reference Group was formed for the purposes of the project with representation from Singleton Social Club, Comet Bay Bowling Club, Peel Junior Soccer Association, Singleton Cricket Club, Singleton & Golden Bay Tennis Club, Singleton Recreation & Community Club, and a general community member. These key stakeholders were engaged on the basis that there was a collaborative vision for Lawrie Stanford Reserve to remain a significant sporting and community asset for the community of Singleton that continues to serve the needs of current user groups and retain the capacity to accommodate additional usage in the future.

Initially the project team in liaison with these stakeholders identified a number of key factors influencing infrastructure provision at the Reserve including, but not limited to, the following:

- Compilation and analysis of demographic profile and projected population growth trends for the City of Rockingham, Coastal Ward and Singleton
- Identification and analysis of existing community/sport/recreation infrastructure within the Coastal Ward and Singleton, and a review of contemporary trends in facility provision
- Review of relevant State/Local Government planning and policies
- Audit of existing infrastructure at Lawrie Stanford Reserve
- Determination of current membership and projected growth for key community groups
- Identification of current infrastructure issues, and future infrastructure needs, for key community groups

Community Needs Analysis

Preparation of the Master Plan was informed by a community infrastructure needs analysis that determined stakeholder views on infrastructure and service delivery gaps at the Reserve. The key issues raised included the following:

- Lack of accessible public toilets for general community use, and poor location of existing toilets/change rooms from a surveillance perspective for sporting clubs
- Insufficient car parking and traffic calming, and related safety issues
- Lack of suitable social space and associated kitchen/bar to accommodate both sporting club and general community type activities
- Insufficient meeting spaces to accommodate existing community groups
- Insufficient storage to accommodate existing community, and in particular, sporting groups
- Ageing community infrastructure onsite, in particular, the Singleton Hall and cricket nets
- Poor relationship between the community centre and the active playing fields (separated by car parking)
- Poor perspective from existing lawn bowling club to bowling greens (looking westward)
- The number of lawn bowls greens and tennis clubs are deemed appropriate for current and future demands, however indicative footprints for future infrastructure of this type should be identified

These community perspectives were balanced with City of Rockingham technical officer perspectives that, consistent with organisational strategic and operational policies, included the following on-negotiable principles:

- Rationalise Council assets where possible without compromising community infrastructure outcomes. This was particularly relevant given the high number of buildings and other assets located at the Reserve.
- Determine the appropriate level of community infrastructure relevant for a ‘district active reserve’ that meets the needs of the local Singleton community as well as the broader district catchment
- Deliver generally multipurpose community infrastructure that meets the needs of current user groups, where usage can be maximised during peak and non-peak times, and that can provide flexibility for future community demands
- Comprise infrastructure improvements that cater for both active and passive recreational demands, and include elements that are eligible for CSRFF funding
- Deliver community infrastructure outcomes strictly within the indicative $4 million budget that had previously been identified during the City’s Major Capital Project evaluation process that led to the preparation of the Business Plan 2010/11 to 2019/20

The Master Plan

The City’s Project Team and Stakeholder Reference Group worked in collaboration with an appointed consultant architect to prepare an overall landscape plan for the reserve and building concept plan/s that generally responded to key issues and non-negotiable principles identified during the needs analysis, and adhered to the indicative $4 million budget. On this basis, the Plan includes the following key components:

- Construction of one multipurpose community facility that can meet the needs of current user groups, as well as providing flexibility for future uses (and the related rationalisation of other existing community buildings on a staged basis)
- Provision of a large multipurpose social space with bar/kitchen/external servery, and adequate meeting and storage spaces within the multipurpose community facility
- Relocation of the multipurpose community facility to the north
- Provision of toilet facilities that are accessible to the public
- Provision of substantially more formalised car parking areas across the Reserve
- Provision/upgrade of supporting infrastructure including shade shelters for the bowling club and tennis club (and active playing field where possible), cricket nets and tennis club

It was generally accepted that the active playing fields remain suitable for both current and future demands, and therefore only minor infrastructure improvements are required. In addition, it was generally accepted that the existing skate park/basketball court/playground were sufficient and do
not require either relocation or redevelopment. Based on these design responses, and in consultation with the Stakeholder Reference Group, the Reserve Master Plan specifically includes the following elements at a total cost of $3,991,475:

**Community Building**

There are currently three buildings which provide amenity to the users of the Reserve - Singleton Community Centre, Singleton Hall and Comet Bay Bowling Clubroom. The Master Plan proposes to replace these facilities with one new community facility, with the current buildings demolished in a staged program as per current asset management practice. Key features of the proposed new facility are:

- Three separate multipurpose areas (2 x 100m² and 1 x 150m²) which can be used for a variety of uses, with two areas having the capability of being combined to create a single larger space (200 m²)
- Two meeting rooms (13m² and 15m²)
- Central kitchen facility (54m²) to commercial kitchen standards with the capabilities to service two of the multipurpose areas
- Several storage areas (67m² in total) to accommodate the storage needs of community user groups and sports clubs as well as facility furniture
- Change rooms, showers and toilets accessible and visible from the northern side of the building
- Separate toilets facilities inside the building finished to a slightly higher standard and accessible from all three multipurpose areas
- External kiosk (9m²) located on the northern side of the building to maximise usage by sporting clubs
- Enclosed break-out area adjacent to one the multipurpose areas to meet playgroup and general community group needs
- External veranda on the northern side of the building to provide Reserve spectators with an undercover area that retains view of the playing fields

Notably, the Master Plan identifies that the location of the building further north than the existing community centre to provide an improved relationship with the playing fields whilst still maintaining accessibility from the lawn bowling greens.

**Car Parking**

Increased car parking, achieved through the demolition of the current Singleton Community Hall and Singleton Community Centre, to 141 off-street bays and 60 on-verge compared to the current 72 off-street bays and 60 on-verge. This represents an increase of some 69 off-street car parking bays in response to the significant car parking and traffic management issues experienced at the Reserve.

**Landscape/External Works**

A number of general reserve works have also been included in the Master Plan, including the following:-

- Additional shade shelters, including one next to the tennis courts that will also perform a storage/social function given its disconnectedness from the community centre and four shelters on the western side of each bowling green
- Retention of the volunteer fire brigade, and suitable access, until such time as their building may be relocated to Rhonda Scarrott Reserve in Golden Bay (timeframe and funding yet to be determined)
- Retention of the proposed dual use path on the eastern side of the Reserve as identified within the Lot 1002 Singleton Beach Road Local Structure Plan
- Allowances for general landscaping and improvements
- Allowances for other external works including stormwater drainage, sewer drainage, utilities headworks and connection, and building/car park lighting

Notably the Master Plan also identifies the retention of the skate park, cricket nets, basketball court and playground in their current locations.

**Additional Works**

During the Master Plan process the Stakeholder Reference Group identified a number of additional works regarded as ‘optional’ that were understood to be beyond the ‘priority’ infrastructure improvements. These works included the following:

- Additional shade shelters on each side of the Reserve to with clear aspects to the playing fields
- Replacement of the cricket nets in their current location (it should be noted that repairs have recently been undertaken and the bats are now of an acceptable standard for the time being)
- Additional reserve floodlighting to accommodate training/competition for large ball sports (to the Australian Standard)
- Retention of the volunteer fire brigade, and suitable access, until such time as their building is relocated to Rhonda Scarrott Reserve in Golden Bay (timeframe and funding yet to be determined)
- Additional car parking including the construction of a further 48 off-street bays
- Consolidation of on-verge car parking along Cavendar Street to formalised on-street bays to improve traffic management and pedestrian safety (it should be noted that this will actually reduce capacity from 60 on-verge to 40 on-street bays)
- Community building sustainability initiatives including rainwater collection, photovoltaic cells and increased insulation

These additional works are estimated to cost $805,000, and as they were regarded as beyond the indicative $4 million Master Plan budget, they are subject to alternative funding mechanism and subject to demonstrated community demand.

**Public Toilet Amenities/Ablutions**

During the Master Plan process the Stakeholder Reference Group clearly indicated that standalone toilets were not desirable given the proposed provision of visible, externally accessible toilets as part of the redeveloped community building. On this basis, the provision of standalone toilets was not included within the Master Plan works budget however a proposed location was identified for standalone toilets in the event that there is an extended timeframe before funding is available to implement the Master Plan.

Subject to the time frame for redevelopment of the community building there are three options for standalone toilets:

- Construct permanent ablution facilities
- Hire high quality portable toilets
- Purchase high quality portable toilets

Given the availability of more contemporary, portable toilets that are acceptable from an aesthetics perspective and provide amenities for male/female/accessible it is considered appropriate to proceed on this basis rather than a permanent, built structure. The provision of such portable toilets is estimated to cost $110,000 including $80,000 for the structure and approximately $30,000 for connection to services.
4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan has been undertaken in direct consultation with a Stakeholder Reference Group including representation from the key community groups, as well as a general community member and the Coastal Ward Councillor. At the Final Stakeholder Reference Group Meeting on 29 July 2010 the Master Plan was unanimously endorsed. In addition the City’s Community Infrastructure Planning Team, in partnership with representatives from Planning & Development and Engineering & Parks Services, continue to liaise with the landowners of Lot 1002 Singleton Beach Road regarding proposed cash-in-lieu of public open space and their proposed relocation of the skate park and cricket nets. It is considered that further justification is required to relocate either or both assets, and regardless, any proposed relocation must be funded outside of the cash-in-lieu of public open space arrangement. This remains consistent with the intent of the Council resolution regarding adoption of the Lot 1002 Singleton Beach Road Local Structure Plan in May 2010.

b. Consultation with Government agencies

Not applicable however eligible elements within the Master Plan including change rooms/toilets, externally accessible kiosk, shade shelters and cricket nets have been identified in terms of their eligibility to seek funding through the Department of Sport & Recreation CSRFF Scheme.

c. Strategic

The continued delivery, and improvement, of infrastructure at Lawrie Stanford Reserve remains consistent with the intent of the City’s Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 and Community Development Plan 2007 – 2011. Specifically the Master Plan relates to Functional Area 2 (Social and Cultural Development) Strategies 3 and 4 within the Strategic Plan, those being, to develop and implement plans programs and projects to empower and support residents and visitors and meet the needs of specific sectors of the community, and to develop and manage community facilities to meet social, cultural and economic needs.

In addition, the Master Plan relates to three of the key focus areas within the Community Development Plan including to connect people to services, facilities and experiences that enhance their physical, social and overall health (personal development & wellbeing), to plan, develop and manage community facilities that meet the social, recreation, education, housing and transport needs of the community (infrastructure development) and to encourage and facilitate community involvement through consultation, improved access and recognition of achievements (community participation. The Place Based Action Plan for the Coastal Place (Ward) also specifically identifies the need for upgrades to the Singleton Community Centre and Hall.

d. Policy

Not Applicable

e. Financial

Master Plan Scope of Works

The estimated cost for the Master Plan implementation is $3,991,475 (excluding the additional/optional works at $805,000 and standalone toilets at $110,000). The specific scope of works includes

- Demolition of existing community buildings and car parking where required
- Construction of new community building
- Earthworks, landscaping and new car parking areas
- Construction of tennis shelter with tea point and storage
- Construction of four shelters adjacent to bowling greens
- External works including stormwater drainage, sewer drainage, utilities headworks and connection, and building/car park lighting
- Design development and construction contingency and professional fees

These costs are ‘current day’ and an escalation assumption of approximately 2.5% per annum may need to be applied.

City Business Plan 2010/11 to 2019/20

There is currently $500,000 identified in the Business Plan in 2014/15 for upgrades at Lawrie Stanford Reserve subject to the outcomes of the Master Plan. In addition, there is currently $300,000 allocated in the 2009/10 budget for the construction of stand alone toilets.

Master Plan Capital Funding Model

Recognising the limitations of the City’s Business Plan, it is considered that the implementation of the Master Plan could be staged, with the highest priority elements (main community building, associated car parking and related external works) being constructed in 2014/15. These works will cost approximately $2,997,000 and may be implemented through the following capital funding model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
<td>1,697,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space Cash in Lieu</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government (CSRFF)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotterywest</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,997,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that $500,000 is already allocated for the project in 2014/15, and it is likely that only $110,000 of the $300,000 allocation for standalone toilets will be expended in 2010/11, this proposed funding model will require an additional $1,097,000 to be identified within the Business Plan. The cash-in-lieu of public open space amount is yet to be negotiated however the amount of $600,000 is regarded as a conservative amount likely to be received. The CSRFF contribution is based on eligible infrastructure elements within the community building, and the Lotterywest contribution is based on previous funding of similar type facilities.

Future Staged Works

The implementation of the Master Plan on a staged basis will mean that various works will need to be undertaken as a stage two phase, including the following:

- Construction of shade shelters, including one next to the tennis courts with a storage/social function given its disconnectedness from the community building, and four shelters on the western side of the bowling greens
- General landscaping and improvements including paving around the community building, signage, playground fencing, plantings and landscaped seating across the Reserve, pergola around the community building and CCTV services
- Demolition of other community buildings on the Reserve (community hall, toilets, lawn bowling clubroom, sheds)
- Associated contingencies and professional fees

These works are estimated to cost $994,475 and would be implemented subject to the availability of additional funding within the Business Plan, the availability of external funding opportunities and/or further confirmation of community demand. In addition, the optional works estimated at $805,000 will only be implemented as a stage three phase subject to
the identification of alternative funding arrangements and confirmation of community demand.

Lifecycle Costs

The costs to maintain and upgrade a facility over its lifespan (over 80 years) are significant and need to be considered. The estimated total whole of life costs in today's dollars for the new facility is $11,779,600, with whole of capital expenditure estimated at $9,387,600 and whole of life operating expenditure estimated at $2,392,000. The estimated life span of the new facility is 80 years which equates to an annual expenditure of $147,244. These figures do not include escalations such as CPI, and it should be noted that the operating deficit will be offset to some degree through facility income received throughout the life of the asset.

In comparison, the whole of life costs for the current facilities (including the Singleton Hall, Singleton Community Centre and Comet Bay Bowls Club that would be replaced by one community building) is estimated at $6,640,000 including whole of life capital expenditure estimated at $2,080,000 and whole of life operating expenditure estimated at $4,560,000. Assuming the same life span of 80 years, the estimated annual expenditure equates to $83,000. It should be noted that these figures do not include escalations such as CPI and will be offset to some degree through facility income generated over the life of the asset.

Toilet/Ablution Facilities

An important element of the Master Plan, and the subject of ongoing community concern, relates to the provision of accessible public toilets at the Reserve. There are three options available in this regard:

- Construct a stand alone facility at a cost of $300,000
- Purchase a portable facility at a total cost of $110,000 being $80,000 building costs and $30,000 installation costs
- Hire a portable facility at a cost of $17,388 per annum plus installation costs of $30,000

Given that well located, accessible toilets will be provided as part of the new community building (regardless of when construction occurs) it is not considered prudent to construct standalone toilets at the Reserve. This is particularly relevant given that a focus of the Master Plan has been to reduce the number of standalone buildings on the Reserve. The purchase of a portable toilet facility will meet current community demands for an extended period if necessary, and Council then has an asset that may be transferred to other reserves in the future or sold when no longer required. Whilst a portable toilet will cost approximately $80,000 to purchase it is estimated that it may cost up to $30,000 to connect to services. Given the extended time frame for the broader Master Plan works, it is recommended that portable toilets to the value of $110,000 are constructed in 2010/11. This option has been supported by the City's Engineering & Parks Services Division.

f. Legal and Statutory

In May 2010, Council endorsed the Local Structure Plan for Lot 1002 Singleton Beach Road that is located adjacent to Lawrie Stanford Reserve. When Council adopted the Structure Plan it required a covenant to be placed on relevant titles making purchasers aware of the current skate park and basketball half court. The Landowners have recently identified their desire to have both the skate park and cricket nets relocated due to their proximity to future residences. Such a request will need to be considered from a statutory planning perspective, as well as from a functional and social/community perspective within the context of the Master Plan.

In addition, the Structure Plan was adopted on the basis that several pocket parks be removed due to the topography and subsequent lack of functionality. On this basis, it is considered that the payment of cash-in-lieu will be received to be applied to the upgrading of public open space in the local area. The use of funds for the purpose, and in relation to the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan, must adhere to the Western Australian Planning
Commission’s Policy DC 2.3 – Public Open Space in Residential Areas that identifies specific allowable uses. Such uses may include earthworks and clearing, spectator shelters, change rooms, lighting, playground equipment, car parking and reticulation. Use of cash-in-lieu funds would generally not be allowable for community halls or recreation centres, enclosed tennis courts and bowling greens for clubs.

5. Comments

The preparation of the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan has identified that existing infrastructure is ageing and no longer meets community demands, that the reserve has a large number of standalone buildings, that the lack of formalised car parking to meet reserve usage levels is a significant problem, and that the reserve plays an import role in meeting community/sport/recreation demands for both Singleton and the broader Coastal Ward. Given these issues, and the significance of Lawrie Stanford Reserve as an important community asset given its size and existing infrastructure, the upgrading of facilities is necessary.

However, it is acknowledged that the implementation of the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan needs to be considered amongst other major infrastructure projects across the City of Rockingham. In this regard, a major benefit for Lawrie Stanford Reserve is the significant funding to be attracted through cash-in-lieu of public open space and the proposed facility design features that increases the likelihood of attracting further funding from both the Department of Sport & Recreation and Lotterywest. The consideration of a staged approach with a focus on the delivery of a multi purpose community building and additional carparkng will reduce the cost of the Master Plan implementation to $2,997,000 within the context of the current City Business Plan. Notably, such an approach will require the identification of an additional $1,097,000 amongst other priorities within the Business Plan. Any further infrastructure development including a stage two phase at $994,475 and optional stage three phase at $805,000 will then be subject to the availability of funding (both Council and external) and clear demonstration of community demand.

Regardless of the likelihood and/or timeframe for the implementation of the Lawrie Stanford Reserve Master Plan consideration must be given to the immediate resolution of the public toilet access issues that have been raised by the community for some time. Recent feedback from the community has indicated a preference for good quality, temporary toilets as opposed to permanent, standalone toilets. This option is supported as it remains consistent with the Master Plan preference to simply provide accessible toilets as part of the proposed multi-purpose community building, and will also reduce the capital expenditure required in 2010/11 to $110,000 whilst meeting immediate community demands.

Existing infrastructure at Lawrie Stanford Reserve can continue to accommodate community, sport and recreation groups in the short term however localised population growth and increasing demands for district level sporting infrastructure will necessitate capital investment in the coming years. The completion of the Master Plan now provides Council with a guiding document for any future development that can also be utilised to inform any decision to allocate funds within the City Business Plan. In this regard any allocation of capital funds must be measured against the significant social, physical activity and community development benefits that will be realised for the local community and the broader district.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

2. **APPROVE** the installation of temporary, portable public toilet amenities on Lawrie Stanford Reserve at a total cost of up to $110,000.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:


2. **APPROVE** the installation of temporary, portable public toilet amenities on Lawrie Stanford Reserve at a total cost of up to $110,000.

   Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

    Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

    **Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Prince**

    That Council:


    2. **APPROVE** the installation of temporary, portable public toilet amenities on Lawrie Stanford Reserve at a total cost of up to $110,000.

    Carried - 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

    Not applicable.
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1 – Aerial Location Map
1. Purpose of Report

To seek Council endorsement of a submission for a Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grant to undertake refurbishment works to the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings.

2. Background

The former Baldivis Group Settlement School is located at 214 Fifty Road, Baldivis with the original school building constructed in 1923 and the second school building relocated to the site in 1954. The site is included on the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory (LGA Place No. 2) as a place of cultural significance for its aesthetic, historic and social values. The site comprises a pair of single-storey, timber framed, asbestos and weatherboard pavilion style gable buildings with corrugated iron roofs. Skillion weatherboard and timber verandas are located at the front and rear of the buildings, and timber ramps are located at the front of the buildings leading up to the verandas and main entrance. One of the buildings is occupied by the Baldivis Playgroup and second building has until recently been occupied by Rockingham Visual Arts Group.

An assessment of all Council owned/managed assets throughout the City of Rockingham has been undertaken throughout 2009/10 and 2010/11 as the basis for informing the City’s Asset Management & Services Plan. During these assessments a condition report was prepared for each of the two former Group Settlement School buildings in Baldivis which identified an extensive works schedule necessary to preserve the structures and enable their continued usage as community buildings. In particular, given the issues with building support stumps and subsequent distortion of one of the buildings it was necessary to relocate the Rockingham Visual Arts Group to Settlers Hills Community House whilst the City’s asset renewal options are considered. The recent Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings condition reports have identified asset renewal works required, and as a result an amount of $206,000 has been included within the City’s 2010/11 budget.

Subsequently, the City is preparing a comprehensive report on the options for the future of these two buildings based on condition reports and heritage values. Meanwhile, the City has become aware of the availability of heritage grants which close on 5 November 2010 and this opportunity should not be missed by the City.
3. **Details**

Given the availability of external funding through the Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grants to assist with the conservation of the State's cultural heritage it is considered appropriate to seek funding that may either supplement or substitute a portion of the allocated municipal budget. This grant scheme is regarded as particularly relevant given that priority will be given to projects where the community will directly benefit from any enhancement of heritage values.

Applications close in November each year and whilst there is no maximum grant amount the total funding pool is limited and therefore rounds are usually highly competitive. Given that the grants are generally only available once per annum the Chief Executive Officer has taken the action to make a submission on behalf of the City and lodged this with Lotterywest by the 5 November 2010 deadline. Council’s support for this action is requested.

Whilst the City shall seek a funding contribution towards refurbishment of the Group Settlement School Buildings, under *Planning Policy 3.1.7 – Heritage Conservation & Development Policy*, any proposed works will be subject to development control principles. In particular, any proposal to develop or demolish places entered on the Heritage List under the City’s Town Planning Scheme No. 2 may require the following information:

- A written submission describing the nature of the proposal including confirmation that the requirements of this planning policy can be achieved
- A break-up of the costs of the development including an itemised schedule of conservation works
- A Heritage Impact Statement may also be required if the proposed works will impact the significance of the place
- A Conservation Plan may be required if the proposal affects a place that is entered on the State Register of Heritage Places
- A structural condition assessment may be required is structural failure is cited as justification for the demolition of a heritage place

On this basis, whilst the availability of sufficient funding for asset renewal works to the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings is an important consideration any such future upgrade and capital budget allocation will be subject to a decision by Council regarding the scope of the proposed works. Given that this place has been classed as ‘Management Category A’ within the City’s Municipal Heritage Inventory (worthy of the highest level of protection) any proposal must be referred to Council for determination under *Planning Policy 3.1.7 – Heritage Conservation & Development Policy*.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

Nil

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**

The City’s Community Infrastructure Planning Team has liaised with Lotterywest regarding the proposed Baldivis Group Settlement School funding application under their Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grants Scheme.

c. **Strategic**

Council’s Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 (Functional Area 2 – Social and Cultural Development) identifies the objective to develop and manage community facilities and services to meet social, cultural and economic needs whilst (Functional Area 3 – Land Use & The Environment) identifies the objective to enhance the City’s planning and development and
infrastructure management processes in line with economic, social and cultural development requirements. Council’s Community Development Plan (Key Focus Area 2 - Infrastructure Development) identifies the objective to plan, develop and manage community facilities that meet social, recreation, education, housing and transport needs of the community. The Plan (Key Focus Area 4 - Place Activation) also identifies the objective to create vibrant and meaningful hubs as places of social interaction, creativity, and economic vitality.

d. Policy

Any conservation, protection and/or development of places of cultural heritage significance must be undertaken in accordance with the City’s Planning Policy 3.1.7 - Heritage Conservation & Development Policy. Due regard shall also be given to the conservation and protection of any place which is included in the Heritage List under clause 5.4.2 of the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2. The Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings are included as LGA Place No. 002 within the Municipal Heritage Inventory.

e. Financial

Following a structural condition report of the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings in 2009/10 an amount of $206,000 has been included in the 2010/11 budget for asset renewal purposes. It is estimated that works to refurbish both Group Settlement Buildings will be in the region of $333,000 and therefore external funding is being sourced through the Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grants to reduce any impact on the City’s Business Plan.

f. Legal and Statutory

The assessment, conservation, protection and/or development of places of cultural heritage significance must adhere to State Planning Policy 3.5 - Historic Heritage Conservation. In addition, given that the Baldivis Group Settlement has been nominated for inclusion on the State Register of Heritage Places due consideration will be required under the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990.

5. Comments

Based on the condition report for the former Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings it is evident that asset renewal works will be required, and given the imminent deadline for Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grants, it was deemed appropriate to submit an application by the 5 November 2010 deadline. Whilst any subsequent asset renewal works will be subject to further consideration by Council, in accordance with the City’s Heritage Conservation & Development Policy, the potential availability of external funding to assist with associated asset renewal costs may assist with any such decision making.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the actions of the Chief Executive Officer to submit a Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grant for refurbishment works to the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings, subject to further consideration of this matter through another report to Council relating to the City’s Planning Policy 3.1.7 - Heritage Conservation & Development Policy.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the actions of the Chief Executive Officer to submit a Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grant for refurbishment works to the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings, subject to further consideration of this matter through another report to Council relating to the City’s *Planning Policy 3.1.7 - Heritage Conservation & Development Policy*

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Prince**

That Council **ENDORSE** the actions of the Chief Executive Officer to submit a Lotterywest Conservation of Cultural Heritage Grant for refurbishment works to the Baldivis Group Settlement School Buildings, subject to further consideration of this matter through another report to Council relating to the City’s *Planning Policy 3.1.7 - Heritage Conservation & Development Policy*

Carried - 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
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**Proposed Site for the Community Garden (red)**
1. **Purpose of Report**

To seek Council’s approval for an approximate eleven hundred metre squared (1100m²) portion of Ennis Ave Reserve (Lot 766) on Unnaro St Hillman to be utilised for the purpose of constructing a Community Garden.

2. **Background**

A community workshop on Disability Access and Inclusion was organised by the City of Rockingham in August 2006. Sandra Krempl, Cultural Planner and Director of Espiri Tiva facilitated the workshop which was attended by approximately 90 people. This workshop was designed to identify the issues and barriers faced by people with disabilities living in Rockingham and to focus on ideas and future planning to break down these barriers in order to create a more accessible and inclusive City.

The main issues and barriers highlighted as a result of this consultation were as follows: lack of acceptance and understanding, lack of tolerance, feeling of not belonging, lack of opportunity (socially, physically and economically), lack of integration/inclusion in community life and lack of involvement in planning community activities.

One of the common suggestions to break down these barriers and encourage more involvement in community life for people with disabilities was the development of a community garden. The report showed that people believed a project like this would open the doors for social interaction, relaxation, physical activity and closeness to nature and the environment. It would also create a sense of belonging/purpose for these individuals and help to increase acceptance and tolerance within the community.

A group of community stakeholders was then identified and formed the original community garden group; this group established what a community garden would need to consider such as accessibility as well as some potential sites within the City.

Community consultation was undertaken, to assess broader community support as well as to allow the community full ownership of the project. This group established Ennis Ave Reserve (Lot 766), behind Hillman Hall as its preferred site for the garden. The site was identified as ideal due to its close proximity to a local primary school, the proximity of a community facility, the visual surveillance offered by Ennis Ave, accessibility to the majority of City of Rockingham residents, bus access along Unnaro Ave, the proximity of a local deli, and the gradient and direction of the land which made it the most optimal of all potential sites for growing fruit and vegetables.

Evidence for the need of such a project is also available in the Rockingham - Kwinana Health District Population and Health Profile which highlights the above average number of Rockingham residents who are overweight or obese, and the number of residents lacking in adequate intake of fruit and vegetables.

3. **Details**

A community garden is an outdoor space that is planned and managed by the community. A community garden is a place where people can learn from each other, seek self sufficiency, build community spirit and a shared purpose. They are also a way of facilitating neighbourhood development and health promotion.

The Capacity Building Team has been working with a group of local residents for approximately twelve (12) months to establish a community garden within the City of Rockingham. The primary focus of the group is:

- To be a cohesive group of community members who preserve, enhance and promote the Rockingham City Community Garden.
- To provide a place for community members to gather and garden together.
- To provide a community garden space where there is creativity, community pride and inclusion of all community members.
- To educate the community on growing food to eat, and healthy lifestyle options.
- To educate the community on sustainability and organic garden practices, and
- To provide a strong and independent voice promoting community spirit and cooperation.

The Steering Committee for the community garden is in the process of becoming an incorporated association under the name “Rockingham City Community Garden Inc.”. The association will be community managed and seek to become self-funded through the administration of affordable fees for members and garden plot holders. Funding will also be sought from Government agencies, Bendigo Bank, Lotterywest, and key businesses identified in the business plan.

The costs associated with establishing the community garden are estimated by the group to be approximately $100,000. The group has commenced communications with funding bodies to seek verbal support prior to them submitting funding applications once a site has been confirmed. A sponsorship agreement has been established with Bunning's Rockingham, who has already donated $500 worth of goods, and is committed to on-going support in the form of rain water tanks and labour. The Sound Telegraph has also provided sponsorship support to the group and is negotiating a sponsorship agreement with them. The financial plan identifies key fundraising activities as well as many potential product donations to reduce costs.

The community garden group applied for and was successful in gaining a Celebrate WA grant, which has enabled the group to organise its own launch day aiming to attract more members and community support. Currently the group has a membership base of fifty community members.

A lease agreement with Council for the use of the land is needed by the group for it to be able to proceed with applying for significant funding from major funding bodies.

The Community Garden Group has also formed strong relationships with the Hillman Residents Association, Hillman Primary School, Department of Health, Rockingham Volunteer Resource Centre, Rockingham Youth Station, RUAP Rockingham, Volunteer Task Force, Disability Services Commission, Malibu School, Challenger TAFE, Herb Society, Active Foundation, Rockingham Garden Club, Warnbro and Waikiki Community and Family Centres and Great Gardens WA.

It was also noted that the Department of Environment and Conservation regularly set up air testing stations behind Hillman Hall. The Department was consulted about the proposed community garden and advised that the air monitoring would cease before the construction of the garden began.

The concept plan for the community garden has been submitted to the Development Assessment Unit (DAU). The DAU found that Council support the proposed community garden subject to the following conditions:

1. Building licence approval from Council to be sought before construction of any building’s/shed’s
2. Any toilet structure needs approval from the City’s Health Services, under the Health (Treatment of Sewage and Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974.
3. Any bore system established needs to follow Council regulations in relation to a 30m distance from any toilet facility.
4. Water tanks will need mosquito-proofing to the satisfaction of the Manager of Health Services.

The DAU noted the air monitoring that is regularly set up behind Hillman Hall, but this issue has already been addressed as above. DAU stated no planning approval would be needed for the community garden.

Parks and Engineering also support the development and location of the community garden after assessing the site for potential issues from flooding, bore water quality and soil conditions. The City’s Horticultural Technical Officer has been providing advice and recommendations to the community garden group since it was originally formed.
The concept design for the community garden will have flat compacted surfaces, paths wide enough for wheelchair and pram access, and raised garden beds mixed with flat garden beds to facilitate community inclusion. This is in consultation with the City's Community Development Officer (Disability Access and Inclusion) and Disability Services Commission.

The L shape of the concept design was chosen because it is the most protecting from the southwest winds and requires the least amount of west wind break trees. It also ensure the compost is facing the optimal direction and the vehicle access entrance is user friendly.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Consultation has been completed with all residents of Hillman who share a boundary fence with Ennis Ave Reserve (Lot 766), with no objections raised. There are no tenants of Hillman Hall or the surrounding land who need to be consulted.

b. Consultation with Government agencies
   Department of Health, RUHAH, Department of Environment and Conservation and Disability Services Commission were consulted on the role and requirements of a community garden within the City of Rockingham.

c. Strategic
   Council’s Strategic Plan 2006-2011 (Functional Area 2- Social & Cultural Development) specifically details the intent to ‘develop partnerships with government, private sector and the community to work to common goals in relation to social and cultural goals’. In addition, Council’s Community Development Plan 2007 – 2012 (Key Focus Area 4 – Place Activation) identifies the objective to create vibrant and meaningful community hubs as places of social interaction, creativity, and economic vitality.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
   In negotiating any license or lease agreement, Council must adhere to the requirements of Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 30 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996.

   Section 3.58 deals with the disposal (including a license) of property and covers the requirements to give public notice and the consideration of submissions in respect of proposals.

   Regulation 30 provides for exemptions to the requirements of Section 3.58. One exemption is to charitable bodies and another exemption is for the leasing of land for a period of less than two (2) years during all or any of which time the lease does not give the lessee exclusive use of the land.

   Either one of these exemptions is applicable to the License for Rockingham City Community Garden and the requirement to give local public notice and consider submissions does not apply.

   Negotiate a Lease Agreement with Rockingham City Community Garden Group for the portion of Ennis Ave Reserve (Lot 766), Rockingham for a period of ten (10) years with the option to extend for a further ten (10) years at a mutually agreeable fee considered suitable for a not-for-profit community organisation.

   At the September 2010 Council meeting, report CES/155/9/10 Delegation of Powers to the Chief Executive Officer it was resolved that Council DELEGATE to the Chief Executive Officer
its powers under Section 5.42 of the Local Government Act 1995, authority to negotiate the following incidental terms and conditions on Leases once Council has granted approval to enter into a Lease and incidental terms and conditions need to be finalised:

- Administration fee payable by the Lessee;
- Authority to negotiate an extension, if deemed appropriate and is in line with original agreement;
- Insurance particulars;
- Care of the premises including repairs, damage and general maintenance;
- Requirement for the Lessee to submit audited Annual Financial Statements;
- To finalise outgoing and percentages to be paid by the Lessee.

5. Comments

The sound planning and strategic approach by the Rockingham Community Garden Group confirms their ability to oversee the establishment and ongoing management of the community garden. The social and mental health benefits that would result for many members of the Rockingham community are considerable and there is evidence that a high level of community support exists for such a garden to be established locally. The identification of the site by the community and its ideal positioning for the growing of fruits and vegetables also reaffirms Ennis Ave Reserve as an ideal location for the community garden.

Community Capacity Building has been working with Rockingham City Community Garden members to establish a sustainable not for profit community group. The capacity of the group has grown to such that they are now only seeking minimal assistance from a Community Development Officer. The group has developed governance structures and management protocols to ensure continued operation. To continue to develop as a grass-roots community garden group, the Rockingham City Community Garden group needs to enter into a professional relationship with the City, in the form of an accepted lease agreement.

The cost for creating a lease and negotiating its terms is $1200. This would be a minimal cost to the City to ensure that a community garden is established. The group has received minimal financial assistance from the City, receiving only one Sundry donation towards the cost of incorporation thus far.

Therefore it is considered appropriate for Council to now establish with the Rockingham City Community Garden Group a subsidised lease agreement for a period of ten (10) years with the option to renew for a further ten (10) years, for the use of an approximate 1100m² of land directly behind Hillman Hall, consistent with existing Local Government and Community Garden Group lease agreements.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the establishment of the Rockingham City Community Garden on a portion of Ennis Ave Reserve (Lot 766), Rockingham under lease arrangement, for a period of ten (10) years with option to extend for a further ten (10) years at a mutually agreeable fee considered suitable for a not-for-profit community organisation, subject to all appropriate health, planning and building approvals being obtained.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* the establishment of the Rockingham City Community Garden on a portion of Ennis Avenue Reserve (Lot 766), Rockingham *subject to suitable tenure arrangements being established to support use of the land for a period of ten (10) years with option to extend for a further ten (10) years and* all appropriate health, planning and building approvals being obtained.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

The Committee amended the Officer Recommendation as it had identified that further work was needed to establish the arrangements consistent with the Local Government and Planning and Development Acts.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Nil

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Prince

That Council *ENDORSE* the establishment of the Rockingham City Community Garden on a portion of Ennis Avenue Reserve (Lot 766), Rockingham *subject to suitable tenure arrangements being established to support use of the land for a period of ten (10) years with option to extend for a further ten (10) years and all appropriate health, planning and building approvals being obtained.*

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### Community Development
#### Community Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CCB-009/10 Appointment of Member to the Active Ageing &amp; Care Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CSV/1757-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Julie McDonald, Active Ageing Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>8 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>CD43/6/10, CD71/11/09, CD64/10/09, CCB-001/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Active Ageing &amp; Care Advisory Committee Nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Purpose of Report**

To seek Council approval for the appointment of a community member to the Active Ageing & Care Advisory Committee.

2. **Background**

**Active Ageing and Care Advisory Committee**

In order to assist Council to build the capacity of the Rockingham community through engagement including seniors, Council established an Active Ageing and Care Advisory Committee in 2006. Membership of the Committee will comprise of people with interest, knowledge and expertise in seniors planning, facilitating and implementation of the Active Ageing Strategic Direction.
As required by the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy 2009, all community memberships of Advisory Committees will be reviewed in the period between 1 July and 30 September in the year falling between ordinary elections with all new membership proposals being considered by Council no later than the October Ordinary Council meeting of that year.

**Purpose of the Committee**

To advise and guide Council through recommendations on the City’s active ageing strategic direction in accordance with agreed active ageing principles.

**City of Rockingham Active Ageing Principles**

Active Ageing is:

A dynamic life concept that optimizes opportunities for participation and decision-making in civic life in the community and society

Values older people and encourages them to:

- Value themselves,
- Maintain their dignity and independence,
- Optimise a sense of Health, Security, Participation and Belonging,
- Access least restrictive options, and
- Fulfil their responsibilities.

**Membership**

According to the (Council endorsed) Governance and Meeting Framework Policy 2009, the membership of the Committee shall comprise of 10 voting members consisting of:

- three Councillors of the City of Rockingham;
- seven community representatives with an interest in the provision of services to the aged within the City.

The Committee is to be supported by Officers of the City nominated by the Chief Executive Officer to act in a non-voting role.

It was determined that it was essential to have on the committee people known for their expertise in Ageing policy and planning, aged care services, seniors needs and contemporary active ageing programs. From a Community Development perspective this approach of obtaining a core group of dedicated experts in several fields provides a strong strategic planning base that can be enhanced with input from external information gathering from the broader community as and when required.

### 3. Details

The Active Ageing & Care Advisory community members positions were advertised in both local papers, with existing members written to and invited to re apply.

Currently the Committee comprises 8 members, three being Councillors and 5 community members.

One further nomination has been received for the community membership. The nominee is Gwen Nuth her details are attached.

The application was assessed by the relevant officer and the candidate is viewed as very suitable for the position on the Advisory Committee.

### 4. Implications to Consider

**a. Consultation with the Community**

  The Active Ageing & Care Advisory community members positions were advertised in both local papers.
b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   Not applicable.

c. **Strategic**

d. **Policy**
   In accordance with the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy 2009 – Item 5.1 Active Ageing and Care Advisory Committee.

e. **Financial**
   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   In accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 – Section 5.10 Appointment of Committee Members.

5. **Comments**

Appointing Ms Gwen Nuth as community member to the Committee complements the City’s approval of obtaining a core group of dedicated experts in several fields provides a strong strategic planning base that can be enhanced with input from external information gathered from the broader community as and when required

6. **Voting Requirements**

Absolute Majority.

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **APPOINT** ________________, as a community representative to the Active Ageing & Care Advisory Committee for a two year term.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **APPOINT** ________________, as a community representative to the Active Ageing & Care Advisory Committee for a two year term.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Smith

That this item be **REFERRED** back to the Community Development Committee for further consideration.

   Carried – 10/0
12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Council referred this item back to Community Development Standing Committee in order that a Community Representative could be nominated by the Committee for consideration by Council.
CONFIRMED AT A COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

MAYOR (B W SAMMELS)
4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling**

That Council *RECEIVE* the Minutes of the Cultural Advisory Committee Meeting held on 20 October 2010 for information.

Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
Community Development
Advisory & Occasional Committee Minutes
Community Capacity Building

Reference No & Subject: CCB-011/10 Community Grants Program Committee
File No: GRS/48
Author: Jillian Obiri-Boateng, Coordinator Community Capacity Building
Other Contributors: Michael Holland, Manager Community Capacity Building
Date of Committee Meeting: 20 October 2010
Terms of Reference: To consider and make recommendations to Council regarding the minor, major and event grant applications; and to provide feedback to staff on the Community Grants Program implementation guidelines.
Composition: 4 Councillors
Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:
Attachments: Minutes of meeting held on 20 October 2010
Maps/Diagrams:

1. Receipt of Minutes

That Council receive the minutes of the Community Grants Program Committee meeting held on 20 October 2010.

2. Recommendations to Standing Committee

2.1 Recommendation 1: Approvals from CGP Funding Round 2

Advisory Committee Recommendation:

That Council APPROVE the allocation of the funds for minor and events grants under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program Round Two as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Event/ Project</th>
<th>Subject To</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Rockingham Inc - Musselfest</td>
<td>Support been received either in writing or verbally from the school Principal</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Aqua Jetty Have A Go Day</td>
<td>The Warnbro Oval gate being open for parking on the day.</td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Anchorage Carols</td>
<td>Petanque Club Governance</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki P&amp;C Mini Fete</td>
<td>YouthCare Chaplaincy</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Amateur Swimming &amp; Lifesaving Club - Long Course Summer Carnival</td>
<td>Bridging The Gap Crossing Point Leaders Academy</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham Volunteer Resource Centre Operational Costs</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham District Historical Society</td>
<td>5,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham Regional Environment Centre</td>
<td>The financial management system being set up by nominated consultant Rod Lillis and Crunch Consulting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warnbro Family and Community Centre Garden</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COR RSL Sub Branch War Memorial Refurbishment</td>
<td>The two shrubs adjacent to the propeller be trimmed or removed to improve line of sight to the monument from both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,513</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. **Legal and Statutory**
   Nil

e. **Voting Requirements**
   Simple Majority

### Officer Comments & Recommendation if Different to Committee Recommendation
Nil

## 2.2 Recommendation 2: Non-Approvals from CGP Funding Round 2

**Advisory Committee Recommendation:**
That Council **NOT APPROVE** the applications from the Baldivis Children's Forest, Rockingham Environment Centre Event, South Coastal Women's Health and Star of the Sea Out of School Care Centre for funding under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program.

### Implications to Consider

- **a. Strategic**
  Nil
- **b. Policy**
  In accordance with the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy Section 4.4
- **c. Financial**
  Nil
- **d. Legal and Statutory**
  Nil
- **e. Voting requirements**
  Simple Majority

### Officer Comments & Recommendation if Different to Committee Recommendation
Nil

## 3. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **RECEIVE** the minutes of the Community Grants Program Committee meeting held on 20 October 2010.

2. **APPROVE** the allocation of the funds for minor and events grants under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program Round Two as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Event/ Project</th>
<th>Subject To</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Rockingham Inc - Musselfest</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Aqua Jetty Have A Go Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Anchorage Carols</td>
<td></td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki P&amp;C Mini Fete</td>
<td>Support been received either in writing or verbally from the school Principal</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Amateur Swimming &amp; Lifesaving Club - Long Course</td>
<td>The Warnbro Oval gate being open for parking on the day.</td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicant Event/ Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Event/ Project</th>
<th>Subject To</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Carnival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petanque Club Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthCare Chaplaincy</td>
<td>Unexpended funds totalling $7,950 held by YouthCare being utilised to bring the total contribution to $20,000</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging The Gap Crossing Point Leaders Academy</td>
<td>Information being received from BTG either in writing or verbally that the Sabah expedition is central to the program to ascertain if there is support from other Councils.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Volunteer Resource Centre Operational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham District Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Regional Environment Centre</td>
<td>The financial management system being set up by nominated consultant Rod Lillis and Crunch Consulting.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnbro Family and Community Centre Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR RSL Sub Branch War Memorial Refurbishment</td>
<td>The two shrubs adjacent to the propeller be trimmed or removed to improve line of sight to the monument from both sides.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83,513</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **NOT APPROVE** the applications from the Baldivis Children’s Forest, Rockingham Environment Centre Event, South Coastal Women’s Health and Star of the Sea Out of School Care Centre for funding under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program.

   Committee Voting - 4/0

### The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

### Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

### Council Resolution

Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling

That Council:

1. **RECEIVE** the minutes of the Community Grants Program Committee meeting held on 20 October 2010.

2. **APPROVE** the allocation of the funds for minor and events grants under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program Round Two as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Event/ Project</th>
<th>Subject To</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Rockingham Inc – Musselfest</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Aqua Jetty Have A Go Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Anchorage Carols</td>
<td></td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Event/ Project</td>
<td>Subject To</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki P&amp;C Mini Fete</td>
<td>Support been received either in writing or verbally from the school Principal</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Amateur Swimming &amp; Lifesaving Club - Long Course Summer Carnival</td>
<td>The Warnbro Oval gate being open for parking on the day.</td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petanque Club Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthCare Chaplaincy</td>
<td>Unexpended funds totalling $7,950 held by YouthCare being utilised to bring the total contribution to $20,000</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging The Gap Crossing Point Leaders Academy</td>
<td>Information being received from BTG either in writing or verbally that the Sabah expedition is central to the program to ascertain if there is support from other Councils.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Volunteer Resource Centre Operational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham District Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Regional Environment Centre</td>
<td>The financial management system being set up by nominated consultant Rod Lillis and Crunch Consulting.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnbro Family and Community Centre Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR RSL Sub Branch War Memorial Refurbishment</td>
<td>The two shrubs adjacent to the propeller be trimmed or removed to improve line of sight to the monument from both sides.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83,513</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **NOT APPROVE** the applications from the Baldivis Children’s Forest, Rockingham Environment Centre Event, South Coastal Women’s Health and Star of the Sea Out of School Care Centre for funding under the 2010/11 Community Grants Program.

Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
1. **Purpose of Report**

For Council to gain an understanding of the concept of the WA Companion Card and endorse the implementation of the card in the City of Rockingham.

2. **Background**

The National Disability Services WA has extended an invitation to the City of Rockingham to join their nationally recognised Companion Card Program which promotes access and inclusion related to City services, functions, and events together with fair ticketing for people with a disability. Hence the City is provided with the details on the benefits and costs of introducing such a card.
3. Details

Launched in 2006, the Companion Card program is currently underway with over 5,000 people with significant permanent disabilities in Western Australia already signed up, and over 300 affiliated business outlets and Local Governments supporting the program across the state.

Local Governments in WA that are involved in this initiative include: City of Albany, City of Armadale, City of Bayswater, City of Belmont, City of Bunbury, City of Canning, City of Cockburn, City of Geraldton, City of Gosnells, City of Joondalup, City of Kalgoorlie Boulder, City of Mandurah, City of Melville, City of Swan and City of Wanneroo.

The Western Australian Companion Card is a scheme to encourage access, inclusion and fair ticketing for people with a disability. It’s an initiative funded by the Western Australian Government through the Disability Services Commission, and implemented by National Disability Services WA. The program is currently recognised in every state across Australia.

The Companion Card is provided to a person with a permanent disability that requires a carer to undertake various living activities, and who without the carer, is unable to participate in them. The card enables a person with a disability to take his/her carer into a service, program or event without incurring a payment for the carer. The card has been developed as a tool to assist businesses and local governments to comply with existing disability anti-discrimination legislation, and to increase the participation of people with disabilities as active customers in their community and beyond.

The Companion Card boasts a rigorous application and audit process, which ensures that the card reaches its intended audience. To be eligible for a card, the applicant must fit strict selection criteria set by the National Disability Services to prove that due to the impact of their disability, they would be unable to participate at most community venues and events without attendant care and support. Attendant care and support includes significant assistance with mobility, communication, self-care, or learning, planning and thinking, where the use of aids, equipment or alternative strategies does not enable the person to carry out these tasks. It does not include providing only reassurance, social company or encouragement. Due to these criteria, the number of people with companion cards across Australia is expected to be kept at a low rate.

Affiliate organisations and businesses recognise the Companion Card when it is presented at a venue or event, and issue the cardholder with a second ticket for their carer/companion at no extra charge. The companion has the responsibility of ensuring that the person they are accompanying can participate in the venue or activity, without being intrusive to the program itself. For example, a companion could not take a place of a full fee paying customer at a school holiday program, but could be there to physically support the person with the disability to be able to access the holiday program. Becoming an affiliate of the program is free.

By affiliating the City of Rockingham with this Companion Card, all City of Rockingham venues, events and facilities will be listed as supporters of the program, which will in turn, promote to the community that the City is committed to access and inclusion for people in the community with a disability. This also meets the City's social responsibility by incorporating the rights of people with a disability into ticketing policies and practices.

Other benefits include evidence that the City has taken steps into removing discriminatory policies and practices in this area, and by doing so open up an untapped market of people that may decide to pay for services, or attend events in the City of Rockingham. This also supports the City of Rockingham’s Disability Access and Inclusion Plan for 2007 to 2011, specifically Outcome 1, Strategy 1.1 (ensure inclusion of people with disabilities in City of Rockingham events and services by being flexible, create and adaptable in responding to these barriers), 1.2 (ensure all facilities and services provided by the City of Rockingham comply with the policy of developing an inclusive community), and 1.3 (encourage and support commerce, community groups and organisations to develop facilities and programs that meet the needs of people with disabilities) and Outcome 2, Strategy 2.2 (encourage consideration and awareness of access issues for people with disabilities into Councils planning processes). It is therefore strongly recommended that the City of Rockingham participates in this program.
As most of the venues and events that the City provides have no entrance fee, the venues that would be affected by the implementation of this card would be; Mike Barnett Sports Complex, Rockingham Aquatic Centre, Warnbro Aquajetty, Warnbro Community Y, and any City of Rockingham events that require an entry fee for admission. Consultation with managers from these venues has shown a strong support for this initiative. The majority of the venues listed above are already aware of the companion card, and report that presentation of the card at the centres is very infrequent.

The number of people within Rockingham registered for a card is comparably low considering the number of people living in Rockingham with a disability is estimated at 20%. The breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldivis</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooloongup</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillman</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Kennedy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Harbour</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalwater</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnbro</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation with several other Local Governments who have endorsed the card has shown that little has changed in terms of service delivery and projected economic impact on implementing this program is small. For the most part, other Local Governments have reported that it has increased access to facilities for a small minority of card holders, which means that people who generally would not access the facility are now paying to enter, which evens out the economic impact of the carer being there for free. The likelihood of the number of people being eligible for a companion card increasing dramatically is low; however it is important to consider that there may be an impact as the City’s population increases over the coming decade. To prepare for this, it is suggested that a review process could be implemented to monitor the economic impact of the card on the City’s services every financial year. Another impact that may affect the City could be the cost of meals for the carer as an addition to the event or function, however this is minor and is expected to be low.

People with a disability who fit the criteria can apply for the card, and those who qualify are issued with a card. The Companion Card has been designed with a range of security features that can be used by affiliate organisations to check the validity of Companion Cards to avoid misuse. Organisations that wish to become an affiliate register for free with the National Disability Services. The City’s venues that will be affected by the card must be briefed on compliance with the features of this card, which will be part of the implementation phase.

### 4. Implications to Consider

#### a. Consultation with the Community

Consultation has occurred with the management of the facilities within the City that would be affected by this e.g. AquaJetty. Reports show that these facilities already respect the companion card program and allow companions to enter for free. It was reported declining this card access would feel like discrimination. Other consultation is proposed to occur with the City’s Disability Access Reference Group on 9 November 2010 and the results will be available prior to the November Council Meeting.
b. **Consultation with Government agencies**

Consultation with Disability Services WA presented the City's official number of card holders. Consultation with City of Cockburn and City of Wanneroo's Access and Inclusion Officers has identified low economic impact and strong support for the initiative.

c. **Strategic**

Council's Strategic Plan 2006 - 2011 (Functional Area 2:- Social & Cultural Development) highlights relevant strategies including, Strategy 3: Develop and implement plans, programs and projects to empower and support residents and visitors and meet the needs of specific sectors of the community.

Council's Strategic Plan 2006-2011 (Functional Area 2 - Social & Cultural Development) specifically details the intent to 'Implement the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan to improve access and inclusion in relation to Council’s facilities and services’

d. **Policy**

The companion card is consistent with the strategies included in the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2007-2011. An administration procedure may need to be developed to allow implementation, monitoring and review of the companion card across venues in the City of Rockingham.

e. **Financial**

Reports from other Local Governments show low financial impact of this program on venues and facilities. It actually encourages people who generally would not use the facility to enter, which then provides revenue for an untapped market.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Implementation of this program complies with the Disability Services Act 1993 and the City’s Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2007-2011.

---

5. **Comments**

The Companion Card provides more benefits to the City than negative impacts. Implementation of this program promotes to the community that the City is committed to access and inclusion for people with a disability in Rockingham. This also meets the City’s social responsibility by incorporating the rights of people with a disability into ticketing policies and practices. It actively demonstrates that steps have been taken into removing discriminatory policies and practices in this area, and by doing so open up an untapped market of people that may decide to pay for services, or attend events in the City of Rockingham.

This also supports the City of Rockingham’s Disability Access and Inclusion Plan for 2007 to 2011, specifically Outcome 1, Strategy 1.1 (ensure inclusion of people with disabilities in City of Rockingham events and services by being flexible, create and adaptable in responding to these barriers), 1.2 (ensure all facilities and services provided by the City of Rockingham comply with the policy of developing an inclusive community), and 1.3 (encourage and support commerce, community groups and organisations to develop facilities and programs that meet the needs of people with disabilities) and Outcome 2, Strategy 2.2 (encourage consideration and awareness of access issues for people with disabilities into Councils planning processes).

Consultation with City of Cockburn and City of Wanneroo has demonstrated low financial and economic impact, and the positive feedback from the community that access and inclusion is a priority for their cities is much appreciated. Consultation also demonstrated that this program actually brings a small number of paying customers to a facility that they would otherwise not be able to access.

---

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* the implementation of the Companion Card in the City of Rockingham.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* the implementation of the Companion Card in the City of Rockingham.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

*Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling*

That Council *ENDORSE* the implementation of the Companion Card in the City of Rockingham.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### Community Development
#### Occasional & Advisory Committee Minutes

**Community Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CSA-003/10 City Safe Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>COM/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Genevieve Rowles, Manager Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>8 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>To oversee the all of Council approach to crime prevention and community safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>3 Councillors, 9 Community Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Division – Community Safety Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting held on 14 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Receipt of Minutes

That Council receive the Minutes of the City Safe Advisory Committee Meeting held on 14 October 2010 for information.

#### 2. Recommendations to Standing Committee

There were no recommendations arising from the Rockingham City Safe Advisory Committee Meeting.

#### 3. Committee Recommendation

That Council **RECEIVE** the Minutes of the City Safe Advisory Committee Meeting held on 14 October 2010 for information.

Committee Voting - 4/0
4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**  
Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**  
Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**  
Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling  
That Council *RECEIVE* the Minutes of the City Safe Advisory Committee Meeting held on 14 October 2010 for information.  
Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**  
Not applicable.
Community Development
Ranger Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th><strong>CSA-004/10 Parking Restriction and Loading Zones on Settlers Avenue, Baldivis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LWE/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Kristi Milana, Coordinator Ranger Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>8 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>Settlers Avenue, Baldivis – Stockland Shopping Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Aerial map of Settlers Avenue indicating the areas for ½ hour restricted parking and loading bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td>Attachments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

For Council to approve the recommended parking restrictions imposed on Settlers Avenue to assist with, and better manage parking safety and access.

2. **Background**

The Baldivis Shopping Centre has proved to be a popular and busy outlet for local residents and retailers during its short time in operation. The combination of an expanding shopping centre and rapid residential growth has seen an impact on all available parking spaces along Settlers Avenue. In order to provide safe and manageable parking options, it is timely to introduce restricted parking initiatives along Settlers Avenue that cater for vehicles and loading trucks.

3. **Details**

There are currently 24 allocated parking bays along Settlers Avenue, mainly designed to provide parking for short term stays in the town centre to access takeaway food outlets and other stores such as the pharmacy, coffee shop and barber. There are no designated loading bay facilities at the western end of the shopping centre that would permit easy access for retailers and contractors to unload goods. Over recent months Ranger Services have been monitoring this area and have conducted site visits with Centre Management due to increasing complaints of illegal parking issues. Common issues include – parking on footpaths, trucks blocking the road while unloading, double parking, and retail owners parking for long periods close to their shop instead of using the bays allotted in the main shopping centre car park.

To date, Ranger Services have implemented the following strategies to define the parking spaces:

1. Have outlined the current parking bays with white line marking to indicate size and boundary;
2. Have line marked (in yellow) the paved area that leads from the west end of the shopping centre to the Chase Tavern to indicate “No Stopping” and;
3. Have line marked two (2) parking bays on both sides of Settlers Avenue in yellow striping to indicate “Loading Zone”. It is important to note that this strategy can act as a deterrent only for regular vehicle parking at this time. Loading zones can only be enforced when signage is in place to indicate the restrictions.

The marked Loading Zone locations do not impede on business activity and provide a defined area for the purpose of unloading goods without causing a traffic hazard or hinder access and aesthetic design.

It is proposed to introduce half hour restricted parking to the current parking bays that are available for general customer use. Primarily, this incentive is to indicate a short term parking area for customers to access the retail outlets quickly and efficiently and provide a system that offers equality and reduces congestion or traffic hazards.

Once parking signage is introduced to Settlers Avenue, all Rangers and Parking Officers will have the authorisation and ability to monitor, educate and enforce the parking restrictions.

Revenue raised as a result of any parking infringements issued for this area will remain with the City.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Engaged in discussions and site meetings with Stockland Baldivis Centre Management and gained complete support for parking initiatives and restrictions to assist in safety, access and customer satisfaction.
b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   Nil

c. **Strategic**
   Land use and environment – Strategy 7 - 7.10

d. **Policy**
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   The cost of supply of signs is approximately $2,000, currently in the 2010/11 budget. Installation will be carried out by Asset Maintenance. The average revenue estimated by the City per year (based on one infringement per week) would be $3,000.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2004 - Section 1.10 Powers of the local government apply together with 2.1 (1) (2) Determination of metered zones, as follows:

   “1.10 The local government may, by resolution, prohibit or regulate by signs or otherwise, the stopping or parking of any vehicle or any class of vehicles in any part of the parking region but must do so consistently with the provisions of this local law.

2.1 1) The local government may by resolution constitute, determine and vary and also indicate by signs, metered spaces and metered zones;

   2) In respect of metered spaces and metered zones the local government may by resolution determine, and may indicate by signs:

   a) permitted times and conditions of parking depending on and varying with the locality;
   b) classes of vehicles which are permitted to park;
   c) the amount payable for parking; and
   d) the manner of parking.”

5. **Comments**

   Signposts are presently in place along Settlers Avenue. The signage from these posts was removed when the road became gazetted and ownership was transferred from Stockland to the City of Rockingham. To ensure the most safe and manageable parking access and options it is considered appropriate to instigate signage and restricted parking along both sides of Settlers Avenue and includes designating loading bay areas.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council

   1. **APPROVE** the installation of half hour time restricted parking signage to the unused sign posts currently in place along Settlers Avenue only.

   2. **APPROVE** the installation sign posts and signage to indicate the two (2) Loading Bay areas on Settlers Avenue.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the installation of half hour time restricted parking signage to the unused sign posts currently in place along Settlers Avenue only.

2. **APPROVE** the installation sign posts and signage to indicate the two (2) Loading Bay areas on Settlers Avenue.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

   **Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the installation of half hour time restricted parking signage to the unused sign posts currently in place along Settlers Avenue only.

2. **APPROVE** the installation sign posts and signage to indicate the two (2) Loading Bay areas on Settlers Avenue.

   Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
1. **Purpose of Report**

To seek Council appointment of six (6) Autumn Centre Member’s and two (2) Community Member’s to the Autumn Centre Strategic Development Committee.

2. **Background**

The City of Rockingham Autumn Centre is a Council funded facility, which provides social, recreational and support services for people over the age of fifty five, their partners and mature aged people with disabilities and their carers. The City of Rockingham operates the Centre to promote active aging and wellness for the community by providing high quality affordable passive and active social and recreational opportunities and a range of other community services.
The Autumn Centre Strategic Development Committee comprises of two (2) elected members, six (6) autumn centre members and two (2) community members and provides recommendations to Council in line with their terms of reference.

The Autumn Centre Strategic Development Committee operates under the following Terms of Reference:

1. To promote the usage of the Autumn Centre by the wider community.
2. To provide a channel for feedback and communication between the Autumn Centre users and Council.
3. To provide a vision into future service delivery trends focusing on alignment with external best practice.
4. To provide feedback on customer service and to assist in provision of customer service surveys.
5. To identify marketing opportunities to improve the broader community's awareness of the Autumn Centre.

### Details

The Autumn Centre Strategic Development Committee (ACSDC) positions were advertised in both local community papers and on the notice board at the Centre, with existing members written to and invited to reapply.

Eight member nominations were received and one community member nomination received. The nominees include:

- **Esther Grogan** is a current community member on the ACSDC and recently made “life membership” in Rockingham Kwinana Business Group. Treasurer – Brand Electorate Council – ALP, Secretary / Events Coordinator for Rockingham Kwinana Business Group, Secretary for Preserve Point Peron Group, Member of Naragebup and on committee for Rockylets Group. Esther promotes the usage of the Autumn Centre to clients who have a need for the Centre. She has small home based business for secretarial services which has successfully been running for 18 years.

- **Lynn Davis** is a current Autumn Centre member. Recently moved to Rockingham in July 2010 following her retirement became a member of the Centre. Her qualifications are in librarianship and managerial experience at a strategic level which will be of value to the Centre and Committee.

- **Susan Williams** is a current member on the ACSDC who represents Autumn Centre members. Is currently a member with the Autumn Centre and has been for ten (10) years with five of these years as an associate member. Previously a Member of Community Consultation Committee for eight (8) years, Volunteer welfare worker for St Vincent De-Pauls from 2000 – 2005, Member of the Autumn Centre St Vincent De Paul group for six (6) years, Volunteer Tutor for the Autumn Centre “Comput Group” teaching Introduction to Computers for three (3) years and before moving to Western Australia in 1997 Susan spent 27 years as a scientific research officer for CSIRO, NSW.

- **Celine Low** is a current member on the ACSDC who represents Autumn Centre members. Celine has lived and worked in the Rockingham Community since 1971. During this time has been an active member on various committees. Communicates well with all ages and genders and is very passionate with the ageing population and people with disabilities. She advocates for the wonderful facilities and courses held at the Rockingham Autumn Centre.

- **David Bills** represents Autumn Centre members. David has lived in the Rockingham area since 2002 and joined the Autumn Centre at this time. David volunteers as a helper at the Autumn Centre including the Friday Night Dance Group and Melbourne Cup Day Function.

- **Peter Knowles** is a current member on the ACSDC who represents Autumn Centre members. Peter is currently a member of the Strategic Development committee. In the past has been the Chairperson for the Publicity Activity Group Committee for the Autumn Centre and currently the group leader for the Concert Group. Peter promotes the Centre to local nursing homes and
community centres. He also enjoys fund raising on an annual basis for Cancer Research and the Victorian Bush Fires appeal.

Frank Shaw is a current member of the ACSDC who represents Autumn Centre members. Frank has lived, worked and studied in the Rockingham area since 1970 and his children attended the local schools. During his working career he was a member of PEACH, the charity group operated by Alcoa employees who use payroll deduction to make donations to charitable organisations. Frank retired five (5) years ago and continued to volunteer at Rockingham TAFE to promote their programs to attract local youths to further their education, included mentoring and the LINK program. Frank joined the Autumn Centre and became an active member of the woodworking group. His main contributions were to help manage and submit funding application to Lottery West with requests been successful. Since becoming a member of the ACSDC in 2008 helping with the definition of the committee roles and is committed to the strategic direction for the Centre in the future.

Sheila Morris is a current member of the ACSDC who represents Autumn Centre members. Sheila has been a member and a volunteer for the past sixteen (16) years at the Autumn Centre. She has enjoyed watching the Centre grow during this time and is looking forward to help contribute for the future growth of the Centre.

Maureen Bills represents Autumn Centre members. Maureen has lived in Rockingham since 2002 and has been a member at the Centre since this time. Maureen volunteers as a helper in the Autumn Centre, Op Shop, Collecting fees from members, Friday night dance group and volunteers for Melbourne Cup Function and recently been on the now defunct General Purpose Fund Panel for the Centre.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
The Autumn Centre Strategic Development Committee membership positions were advertised in both local papers and the notice board at the Centre.

b. Consultation with Government agencies
Not applicable

c. Strategic
Council’s Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 (Functional Area 2 – Social & Cultural Development) specifically details the intent to develop partnerships with Government, Private Sector, and the Community to obtain common goals in providing facilities and services in relation to social and cultural needs.

d. Policy
In accordance with the City of Rockingham Autumn Centre Policy (June 2010).

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
Section 5.10 of the Local Government Act refers to the appointment of committee members, this process will be in accordance with that legislation.

5. Comments

At the completion of the advertised period, eight (8) member and one (1) community member nominations were received. All nominees demonstrated relevant experience and knowledge of Autumn Centre programs and activities.
Member Representative
- Lynn Davis
- Susan Williams
- Celine Low
- David Bills
- Peter Knowles
- Frank Shaw
- Sheila Morris
- Maureen Bills

Only six (6) of the above eight (8) nominees can be appointed as member representative.

Community Representative
- Esther Grogan

Only 1 nomination for community representative was received.
Furthermore, Councils acknowledgement of outgoing Committee members will be conveyed to each in a letter of appreciation.

6. Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:
1. **APPOINT** the following Autumn Centre Members for a two-year term:
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  

2. **APPOINT** the following Community Representative for a two (2) year term:
   -  

3. **NOTE** there is one (1) outstanding community representative vacancy to be filled at a later date should a suitable application be received.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:
1. **APPOINT** the following Autumn Centre Members for a two-year term:
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  

CONFIRMED AT A COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

MAYOR (B W SAMMELS)
2. **APPOINT** the following Community Representative for a two (2) year term:

   - 

3. **NOTE** there is one (1) outstanding community representative vacancy to be filled at a later date should a suitable application be received.

   Committee Voting - 4/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.</th>
<th>Council Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Smith**

That this item be **REFERRED** back to the Community Development Committee for further consideration.

   Carried – 10/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.</th>
<th>The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Council referred this item back to Community Development Standing Committee in order for the Committee to nominate appropriate members for consideration by Council.
Community Development
Community & Leisure Facilities

Reference No & Subject:

File No:
Proponent/s:
Author:
Other Contributors:
Date of Committee Meeting:
Previously before Council:
Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s role in this matter:
Site:
Lot Area:
Attachments:
Maps/Diagrams:

CLF-003/10 Tender T10/11-26 - Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex

T10/11-26
City of Rockingham
Mr Nick Brown, Manager Community and Leisure Facilities
Mr Mark Toomath, Coordinator Leisure Facilities
8 November 2010
No
N/A
Executive Function
Mike Barnett Sports Complex

1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the Tenders received for T10/11-26 - Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex (MBSC), documents the results of the Tender Assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the Tender.

2. Background

Council advertised for expression of interest (EOI) in the West Australian newspaper on Saturday, 12 June as the first stage of a two stage tender process. The aim of the EOI was to prepare a shortlist of companies considered capable of managing the Mike Barnett Sports Complex in accordance with the specifications outlined in the EOI documentation. The EOI closed at 2.00 pm on Wednesday, 7 July 2010, and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time. Five (5) EOIs were received as follows:

1. CASA Leisure Pty Ltd
2. Hudson (WA) Pty Ltd
3. YMCA Perth
4. Rockingham Basketball and Recreation Association
5. Professional Arena Management

A panel comprising of the Manager Community and Leisure Facilities, Coordinator Leisure Facilities and Community Development Officer Sport and Recreation undertook an evaluation of the EOI submissions.

Following the assessment, all five companies making a submission were requested to tender for the Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex. Documents were mailed to the companies on 1 October 2010 and were publicly opened immediately after closing time.

3. Details

Tenders were received as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. YMCA Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CASA Leisure Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YMCA Perth

The YMCA operates in excess of 382 facilities throughout Australia offering an extensive range of quality services and programs. This comprehensive experience has enabled them to gain a unique understanding of the leisure services business, and achieve financial and service standards that now serve as benchmarks for the industry.

Locally, YMCA Perth has an annual turnover of $30 million with YMCA Perth programs and services catering for over 30,000 weekly participants engaged in a variety of sporting and recreational activities.

With YMCA Perth already managing the Aqua Jetty and the Warnbro Y Community Recreation Centre, there exists substantial opportunity for building on existing local expertise to enrich the social and economic aspects of the Rockingham community. Many of the experienced staff who work at Aqua Jetty and Warnbro Y live close by to or in Rockingham, and some of these staff will be seconded to the MBSC to establish sound management of the centre from the outset. New staff will naturally be required also, and local residents will be looked favourably upon during the recruitment process.

The capacity to share resources such as casual staff and marketing supports both (current) centres to become more operationally efficient and has delivered flexibility to patrons in their choice of recreational activities. This would also be an immediate benefit to the YMCA management of the MBSC. However, the main point of difference offered by a not for profit organisation such as the YMCA is the ability to enrich the community on many levels, not just through the provision of recreation services.

CASA Leisure

CASA Leisure is a company with a nineteen year history of successfully managing leisure facilities. CASA Leisure manages five local government owned recreation centres with sports halls, health and fitness studios and gymnastics halls and a public golf course. Previously they have managed eight indoor and outdoor aquatic centres in South Australia and Victoria.

All CASA Leisure facilities are managed with the same philosophy – to continue community leisure opportunities and maximise benefits to the local community.

CASA Leisure offers low management overheads, thereby reducing the cost to the local community. They do not charge franchise or management fees for health and fitness programs or aquatic education programs.

CASA Leisure is a specialist facility management company with skills revolving around the professional management of multipurpose leisure centres. They have demonstrated a high capacity
to effectively operate leisure centres in a tight fiscal environment. A number of their facilities are located in financially stressed communities. As a result they have to use innovative strategies to increase participation and occupancy.

**Tender Evaluation**

A panel comprising Council’s Manager Community and Leisure Facilities, Manager Community Capacity Building, Coordinator Leisure Facilities and Community Development Officer Sport and Recreation undertook Tender evaluations.

Evaluation of Tenders, in accordance with the advertised Tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>YMCA Perth (%)</th>
<th>CASA Leisure Pty Ltd (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Business Plan</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>40.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>92.25</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points (%)</th>
<th>YMCA Perth (%)</th>
<th>CASA Leisure Pty Ltd (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Business Plan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>40.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.25</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Implications to consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   Not applicable

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   Not applicable

c. **Strategic**
   In accordance with Functional Area 2 – Social and Cultural Development;
   Strategy 4 – Develop and manage community facilities and services to meet social, cultural and economic needs.

d. **Policy**
   Purchasing Policy applies

e. **Financial**
   Should Council support the officer recommendation, the following annual operating deficits will be required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net operating result</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-$73,498</td>
<td>-$33,587</td>
<td>-$28,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   However officers intend to further negotiate these terms within the finalised management agreement.

   If Council choose to award the tender to CASA Leisure Pty Ltd there would be no operating deficit to be paid by the City

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 section 3.57, and Part 4 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 refers to legislation regarding tenders for providing goods and services.
5. Comments

The two tender submissions received were of a high quality with both companies displaying an understanding of the requirements to fulfil the contract. Each had experience in similar facility management roles.

It is interesting to note that CASA proposed operating budget indicated a surplus in each financial year of operation, where as the YMCA Perth budget forecasts an annual net operating deficit.

Although the proposed operating budget submitted by the YMCA indicates a net operating deficit, the panel recommend that the tender submitted by YMCA Perth would be of best value to Council due to the following:

- Existing relationship with the Rockingham community and proven track record with the management of existing Council facilities;
- Management of Aqua Jetty April 2003 to present, annual patronage - 844,000
- Management of Warnbro Recreation Centre 1996 to present annual patronage- 64,702
- Proximity to YMCA Head office for operational support
- Availability of experienced staff currently employed at YMCA facilities in Rockingham
- The YMCA Australia is accredited with the international quality standard 150 9001 2000. Registration covers the quality management system for management coordination, administration support and training services including program development and delivery to YMCA programs, services and facilities in Australia.

YMCA have prepared a detailed Marketing Strategy Outline ‘3 Year Strategy for MBSC’

- Opportunities for joint marketing and usage through existing YMCA managed facilities, programs and services in Rockingham
- Maximise the use of program available space across facilities, including the introduction of sports not currently played at the MBSC
- Proposed provision of licensed outside of school hours care and vacation care.
- YMCA has indicated initial extended standard opening hours which would provide customer service benefits.

YMCA recognises that RDNA and RBRA are key stakeholders of the MBSC and are seeking to establish a collaborative and mutually beneficial relationship with both associations. This process has already commenced with the YMCA holding consultative meetings with both associations whilst preparing the tender submission. The YMCA intends establishing a written agreement between the YMCA and each association.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **AWARD** T10/11-26 – Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex to YMCA of Perth Inc, 201 Star Street, Welshpool WA 6106, for a period of three (3) years in accordance with the tender documentation, subject to successful negotiation of a management agreement.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **AWARD** T10/11-26 – Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex to YMCA of Perth Inc, 201 Star Street, Welshpool WA 6106, for a period of three (3) years in accordance with the tender documentation, subject to successful negotiation of a management agreement.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Dunkling

That Council **AWARD** T10/11-26 – Management of the Mike Barnett Sports Complex to YMCA of Perth Inc, 201 Star Street, Welshpool WA 6106, for a period of three (3) years in accordance with the tender documentation, subject to successful negotiation of a management agreement.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
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1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider a modified Structure Plan for the Western Coastal Precinct at the Kennedy Bay Resort.

2. **Background**

A Structure Plan for the Western Coastal Precinct was lodged with the City in early 2007. The proposed Structure Plan provided for a range of residential densities, from R25 - R100, creating approximately 200 residential lots. The majority of the land was coded R25 - R40 with a contained R100 site located adjacent to the Foreshore Reserve.

The matter was considered by the Council in February 2007, when it was resolved that the Structure Plan be advertised for public comment subject to various matters being addressed.

Following consideration of the amended Structure Plan and submissions received during the public consultation period, the matter was tabled before the Council in April 2007, when it was resolved to take the following action:

1. **Purpose of Report**

   - **Background**

   A Structure Plan for the Western Coastal Precinct was lodged with the City in early 2007. The proposed Structure Plan provided for a range of residential densities, from R25 - R100, creating approximately 200 residential lots. The majority of the land was coded R25 - R40 with a contained R100 site located adjacent to the Foreshore Reserve.

   The matter was considered by the Council in February 2007, when it was resolved that the Structure Plan be advertised for public comment subject to various matters being addressed.

   Following consideration of the amended Structure Plan and submissions received during the public consultation period, the matter was tabled before the Council in April 2007, when it was resolved to take the following action:

   "1. Request that the Proponent undertake the following:

   (i) Amend the drainage network such that no drainage facilities are located within the foreshore reserve, unless it can be demonstrated that all other alternatives have been exhausted (including modifications to the draft Structure Plan to accommodate drainage on-site) and the requirements of Statement of Planning Policy No. 2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy are satisfied;

   (ii) Modify the Structure Plan such that the density of the R100 site is reduced to a maximum of R40, unless it can be justified that a higher density is consistent with the requirements of prevailing planning policy, particularly Liveable Neighbourhoods 3.

   2. Advise the Proponent that it supports maximum building heights in accordance with the requirements of the Residential Design Codes.

   3. Subject to the matters identified in points 1 (i) and (ii) above being addressed to the satisfaction of the Manager, Strategic Planning & Environment and the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to approve the Structure Plan be approved subject to the following:-

   (i) A Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan being prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the City and the Department of Water.

   The City subsequently received an amended Structure Plan that included the following modifications:-

   - The R100 site was reduced in density to R40;
   - The entire Structure Plan area was shifted 20m to the west, with the additional land incorporated into POS between the Structure Plan area and the boat launching facility;
   - The road layout was altered, including the realignment of internal roads and the addition of laneways; and
   - A 854m² POS reserve was included in the south-east corner of the Structure Plan, at the entry to the Estate.

   The amended Structure Plan was considered by Council in August 2007, when it resolved to take the following action:-

   1. Upon the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to adopt the Structure Plan, under clause 4.2.6.7 of the Scheme, subject to the following:-

   (i) A Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan being prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Rockingham and the Department of Water.
(ii) The Proponent demonstrating that the requirements of the Pork Kennedy Development Agreement Act 1992 can be satisfied with respect to the prescribed accommodation mix at the Eco-Tourism site.

(iii) An Indicative Landscaping Plan for the 854m² Public Open Space reserve being submitted and approved by the Manager, Engineering and Parks.

(iv) The provision and location of on-street parking within the Structure Plan area being to the satisfaction of the City of Rockingham.

2. Further to point 1(iv) above, require the Proponent to prepare a comprehensive Parking Strategy for Kennedy Bay that provides traffic generation forecasts and allocates sufficient public parking in appropriate areas, for Council’s consideration.

A further request to modify the Structure Plan was received in late 2007 seeking to increase the density of a 3,900m² portion of the Structure Plan from R40 to R100 and to delete twelve R25 lots along the western boundary from the Structure Plan area. The modified Structure Plan also identified ‘Short Stay Accommodation’ as a permissible land use within the Structure Plan area.

In October 2007, the Council resolved:-

‘1. Upon the land being zoned ‘Development’ under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to adopt the modified Structure Plan, under clause 4.2.6.7 of the Scheme, subject to the following:-

(i) A Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan being prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Rockingham and the Department of Water.

(ii) An Indicative Landscaping Plan for the 854m² Public Open Space reserve being submitted and approved by the Manager, Engineering and Parks.

(iii) The provision and location of on-street parking within the Structure Plan area being to the satisfaction of the City of Rockingham.

(iv) The manner in which the permissible land uses are depicted on the Structure Plan being to the satisfaction of the Manager, Statutory Planning to ensure compliance with the requirements of clause 4.2.9 of Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

2. Further to point 1(iii) above, require the Proponent to prepare a comprehensive Parking Strategy for Kennedy Bay that provides traffic generation forecasts and allocates sufficient public parking in appropriate areas, for Council’s consideration.

At this stage the subject land is not zoned ‘Development’ under the Scheme, therefore the Structure Plan is yet to be formally adopted.

3. Details

A modified Structure Plan has now been received encompassing 11.08ha over Lots 502 and 503.

The site directly abuts the existing ‘Long Beach Estate’ along the eastern boundary, Port Kennedy Scientific Park to the southern boundary, the future ‘Eco-Tourism site to the western boundary and Foreshore Reserve to the northern boundary.

The Structure Plan is proposed to be modified in the following manner:

- Removing the R100 site;
- Providing two R60 lots;
- Providing a revised lot layout;
- Providing rear loaded lots;
- Removing an east-west Pedestrian Access Way (PAW) / Public Open Space (POS) corridor;
- Providing a POS/Conservation ‘Keyhole’ abutting the Eco-tourism site;
- Modifying the central POS parcel into a POS/Conservation ‘Keyhole’; and
- Decreasing the overall POS provision from 10% to approximately 8%.
A Foreshore Management Plan has previously been drafted for the area but will require updating to ensure consistency with the Structure Plan.

Site Analysis
The site is gently undulating and has a ground level between 2m and 6m AHD. The majority of the landholding sits between 3m and 4m AHD.
Although the site is undeveloped, there is considerable degradation of the remnant vegetation given human influences in the area. The surface geology consists of 'Safety Bay Sand' which is well drained and highly permeable.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
The proposed variations to the Structure Plan are minor, and do not alter its general intent. As such, further community consultation is not warranted, particularly as the original proposal (showing the proposed R100 site) was advertised and no comment was received.

b. Consultation with Government agencies
Consultation with government agencies is not needed as they were given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Structure Plan previously and provided no input. In any event, the relevant Government agencies will be consulted in the normal manner during the subdivision process.

c. Strategic
Functional Area 3 - Land Use & Environment in Council's Strategic Plan under the Scope of Land Use Planning and Structure Planning.

d. Policy
Liveable Neighbourhoods
Planning Policy 3.4.1 - Public Open Space
Planning Procedure 1.6 - Preparation and Assessment of Structure Plans

e. Financial
N/A

f. Legal and Statutory
Clause 4.2.7 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 states that the Council may adopt a minor change to or departure from a Structure Plan if, in the opinion of the Council, the change or departure does not materially alter the intent of the Structure Plan.

Under the Port Kennedy Development Agreement Act 1992, the developer is only granted land to be developed and on-sold upon funds being expended on public works. When the land is granted, the Act provides for it to be automatically zoned 'Urban' under the MRS and 'Development' under the TPS.

5. Comments

Structure Plan Assessment
Community Design
The Structure Plan has been designed to integrate with the surrounding planning framework. The movement network is highly permeable and has been designed to provide convenient access to the foreshore area. The movement network also provides strong pedestrian and cyclist linkages to the wider area.
A range of density codes are proposed to accommodate a variety of housing product. Most of the lots are coded R25 with five R40 and two R60 sites also provided. It is noted that the current Structure Plan proposes an increase in the number of grouped housing lots compared to the previous design. This is considered acceptable as it results in a greater variety of housing form.

Total lot yield has slightly decreased due to the removal of the R100 site. It is considered that the decreased lot yield is acceptable when considered against the increase in housing variety depicted by the revised design.

**Lot Layout**

Under Liveable Neighbourhoods, the Structure Plan is required to achieve a target density of 20 to 30 dwellings per hectare within a 400m radius of the proposed Neighbourhood Centre and 12 to 20 dwellings per hectare outside this radius. The overall lot yield achieves approximately 22 dwellings per site hectare and satisfies the requirements of Liveable Neighbourhoods.

The indicative lot layout depicted over the Structure Plan is considered acceptable. Detailed Area Plans will be necessary to guide the development of the laneway lots, and the Proponent has indicated a preference to apply a Detailed Area Plan to all lots in the development. The need for Detailed Area Plans will be considered in more detail at the subdivision stage.

**Movement Network**

As detailed above, the Structure Plan generally provides a permeable movement network for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

Engineering Services has noted that the extension of Port Kennedy Drive should be an ‘Access Street B’ rather than an ‘Access Street C’. This will require a slightly wider reserve to accommodate dedicated on-street parking bays, however, the reserve width may be reduced given the road abuts a regional reserve.

It has also been noted that the Parking Strategy, as required by the Council previously for Kennedy Bay, should also make provision for bicycle parking.

**Public Open Space**

The location and configuration of POS is considered to be generally acceptable and provides good connectivity to the foreshore. The POS is distributed across the entire Structure Plan area and is within an acceptable distance (as prescribed under Liveable Neighbourhoods) to all proposed residential lots.

The Structure Plan provides 1.36 hectares of POS representing a total contribution of 8.1% in lieu of the standard 10% required. The applicant has provided justification that the total land area of both the Western Precinct and Long Beach Estate, includes 2.72 hectares of existing and proposed POS representing an overall POS contribution of 12.89%. Given the suitable access to POS and the presence of the Foreshore Reserve and abutting Regional Open Space, the applicant’s justification has merit and is supported.

A small pocket park adjacent to the south-eastern R40 precinct has been reduced from 854m² to 579m². Parks Services has indicated that, given the site is adjacent to another POS reserve, the small size of the reserve does not present a maintenance issue to the City. It is recommended, however, that the Council require the submission of an indicative landscaping plan, demonstrating that the site can be developed to an acceptable standard for passive use, prior to the Structure Plan being adopted. This is consistent with the Council’s previous decisions with respect to the POS.

The Proponent has sought to increase the POS provision by including corner truncations within the POS schedule. Engineering Services has advised that the truncations are not necessary, do not provide any value as POS, and should be deleted. This would have the affect of reducing the POS provision within the development from 8.1 to 7.5%, although the overall POS contribution (including Long Beach Estate) will still exceed 12% and is considered acceptable. The Structure Plan and POS Schedule should be amended accordingly.
Local Water Management Strategy
The LWMS has been assessed and is considered to be acceptable subject to the following matters being addressed:
- investigate the possibility of a salt water intrusion and possible impacts on the water requirements of the development;
- demonstrate that the performance of the underground infiltration is not affected by future sea level rises; and
- justify and provide further details on the City's future role in the Groundwater Monitoring and Management Program.

Other Comment
The proposed Structure Plan includes a number of 'Planning Policy Statements' referring to the subject lots, relevant scheme provisions, and the intent behind certain aspects of the Structure Plan. These 'Planning Policy Statements' have no statutory basis and are not considered necessary. As such, it is recommended that they be deleted from the Structure Plan.

Conclusion
In light of the above comments, the modified Structure Plan is considered suitable for adoption subject to the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2.

Given the proposed modifications to the Structure Plan are relatively minor, and are not seeking to increase density, advertising of the proposal is not considered necessary.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That upon the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to ADOPT the modified Structure Plan for Lots 502 and 503 Port Kennedy Drive, Port Kennedy under clause 4.2.6.7 of the Scheme, subject to the following matters being satisfactorily addressed:

(i) An indicative Landscaping Plan for the 579m² Public Open Space reserve being submitted.
(ii) A comprehensive Parking Strategy for Kennedy Bay being submitted that provides traffic generation forecasts and allocates sufficient parking in appropriate areas. The Parking Strategy should also consider the provision of facilities for the parking of bicycles.
(iii) The Local Water Management Strategy being amended to address the matters raised in the Officer Report.
(iv) The extension of Port Kennedy Drive being changed from an 'Access Street C' to an 'Access Street B', in order to allow for the provision of dedicated on-street parking bays.
(v) The proposed corner truncations adjacent to the Foreshore Reserve being deleted, and the POS schedule amended accordingly.
(vi) The 'Planning Policy Statements' being deleted from the Structure Plan.

8. Committee Recommendation

That upon the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to ADOPT the modified Structure Plan for Lots 502 and 503 Port Kennedy Drive, Port Kennedy under clause 4.2.6.7 of the Scheme, subject to the following matters being satisfactorily addressed:

(i) An indicative Landscaping Plan for the 579m² Public Open Space reserve being submitted.
(ii) A comprehensive Parking Strategy for Kennedy Bay being submitted that provides traffic generation forecasts and allocates sufficient parking in appropriate areas. The Parking Strategy should also consider the provision of facilities for the parking of bicycles.

(iii) The Local Water Management Strategy being amended to address the matters raised in the Officer Report.

(iv) The extension of Port Kennedy Drive being changed from an 'Access Street C' to an 'Access Street B', in order to allow for the provision of dedicated on-street parking bays.

(v) The proposed corner truncations adjacent to the Foreshore Reserve being deleted, and the POS schedule amended accordingly.

(vi) The 'Planning Policy Statements' being deleted from the Structure Plan.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner

That upon the land being zoned 'Development' under Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to ADOPT the modified Structure Plan for Lots 502 and 503 Port Kennedy Drive, Port Kennedy under clause 4.2.6.7 of the Scheme, subject to the following matters being satisfactorily addressed:

(i) An indicative Landscaping Plan for the 579m² Public Open Space reserve being submitted.

(ii) A comprehensive Parking Strategy for Kennedy Bay being submitted that provides traffic generation forecasts and allocates sufficient parking in appropriate areas. The Parking Strategy should also consider the provision of facilities for the parking of bicycles.

(iii) The Local Water Management Strategy being amended to address the matters raised in the Officer Report.

(iv) The extension of Port Kennedy Drive being changed from an 'Access Street C' to an 'Access Street B', in order to allow for the provision of dedicated on-street parking bays.

(v) The proposed corner truncations adjacent to the Foreshore Reserve being deleted, and the POS schedule amended accordingly.

(vi) The 'Planning Policy Statements' being deleted from the Structure Plan.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
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### Purpose of Report

To advise the Council of the content of the draft Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy released by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), and to seek its endorsement of a submission on the document.

### Background

To date, regional planning within the study area has been guided by the 1993 South West Corridor Structure Plan (SWCSP). The main purpose of the SWCSP was to identify land for future urban
development and it was the precursor to the zoning of land within Baldivis and Karnup as 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred' under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

Along with the identification of land for future urban development, a key element of the SWCSP was the protection of rural vistas along the Freeway, Old Mandurah Road and Mandurah Road, forming a 'green buffer' to urban development from these transport corridors.

In recent years, several Amendments to the Metropolitan Region Scheme have been progressed which resulted in the zoning of land for urban development beyond that which was proposed by the SWCSP.

In 2009, the WAPC released the draft Southern Metropolitan and Peel Sub-Regional Structure Plan ('the Sub-Regional Structure Plan') for public comment simultaneously with Directions 2031 - Draft Spatial Plan for Perth and Peel and State Planning Policy - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel. The Sub-Regional Structure Plan was intended to be the means by which the recommendations of the broader Directions 2031 document will be implemented.

Directions 2031, the Sub-Regional Structure Plan and the Activity Centres Policy were considered by the Council in August 2009 and submissions subsequently provided to the WAPC. The main issues raised by the Council included:

**General Comment**
- Concern that the target of 15 dwellings per gross hectare is considered ambitious, particularly given it did not take into account land lost for schools and regional reservations etc.
- The target infill rate of 47% should be lower for outer sub-regions.
- Support for the new tier of 'Primary Centre' and Rockingham being designated as such.
- Growth projections for the south-west sub-region are considered very conservative.
- No clear direction on when land should be construed as suitable for rezoning.
- A 20 year horizon for the strategic plan is considered short sighted.
- Planning should take into account the need for major water, energy and sewer infrastructure to ensure it is planned well ahead of development and that suitable facility sites are identified.

**Specific Comment**
- The entire area east of the Freeway (within the City of Rockingham) should be the subject of further examination for urban development as it has similar attributes to other land identified for investigation in the Mandurah and Murray LGA's.
- Baldivis Special Rural (south of Sixty Eight Road) should be retained as 'Future Urban', however, the need to consider the conservation of significant remnant bushland, and the retention of a green link, should be noted on the plan.
- Baldivis East (between Baldivis Road and the Freeway) should be changed to 'Undeveloped Urban and Urban Deferred' in recognition of its recent zoning under the MRS.
- Land south of Sixty Eight Road and east of Baldivis Road is significantly constrained and its potential for urban development is questioned.
- Designation of Karnup (Amarillo Special Rural zone) as 'Future Urban' is supported.
- Development of a TOD at Karnup Station is supported.
- Development of Golden Bay Special Residential for urban purposes, in proximity to the Karnup Station, could have some merit but would need to be considered against the City's Policy position of protecting the landscape values of the precinct.
- Portion of the Stakehill Swamp Precinct should be included as 'Urban Investigation'.
- Land accumulation strategies are unlikely to completely resolve issues of land fragmentation, and it is likely to be difficult for Local Governments to deliver large active sporting reserves and community facility sites, which should be considered prior to land being rezoned under the MRS.
- The intention to undertake more detailed planning for traffic and transport is noted and supported. There is currently a lack of adequate transport planning in the region, particularly east of the Freeway which should be urgently addressed.

In August 2010, the WAPC adopted Directions 2031 and Beyond as the broad spatial plan for the Perth and Peel regions. The Activity Centres Policy was gazetted on the 31st August 2010.

The draft Sub-Regional Plan has been deferred and is expected to recommence in late 2010, with a view to being finalised by late 2011 / early 2012.

3. Details

The WAPC has now prepared the Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy (‘the Strategy’) to build on the broad objective of Directions 2031 and inform the Sub-Regional Structure Plan.

The Strategy has been released for public comment with responses required by the 29th November 2010. A full copy of the document is attached to the agenda.

The key sections of the Strategy, relevant to the City, are summarised as follows:

Section 1 - Executive Summary

Provides an introduction and context to the Strategy. Section 1.3 states that the Strategy is intended to "link State and local government strategic planning to guide the preparation and review of structure plans and local planning strategies by:

* providing information about the level of expected population growth in each local government area;
* identifying potential urban expansion areas and investigation areas for future urban development to meet the long-term residential needs;
* estimating the dwelling supply for each sub-region based on currently identified infill opportunities, existing urban and urban deferred zoned land, and potential urban expansion and investigation areas;
* outlining the wide spread of development opportunities throughout the outer metropolitan Perth and Peel sub-regions;
* investigating the development potential of planned and future urban growth areas including activity centres and transit oriented developments;
* supporting the planning and delivery of land for employment growth and actions to support economic development; and
* informing all levels of government decision-making on where and when to fund the most efficient roll out or upgrading of public infrastructure services."

The Executive Summary also explains the rationale applied by the WAPC in calculating dwelling yields from undeveloped urban or potential urban areas.

Section 2 - Directions 2031 Strategic Framework

Outlines the strategic framework of Directions 2031.

Section 3 - Policy Framework

Provides an overview of the planning framework including:

* State Planning Strategy
* State Planning Policies
* Liveable Neighbourhoods
* Local Planning Strategies
* Sub-Regional Structure Planning
* Planning Reform
* COAG Capital City Agenda

Section 4 - Connected City

Explains the intention of Directions 2031 to achieve a ‘connected’ City through a 50% improvement in both infill residential development and greenfield development yields. In this regard, Directions 2031 seeks to provide 47% of new dwellings through infill development, and achieve an average residential density of 15 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare.

The Strategy clarifies that 37% of new dwellings are expected to be provided through infill development within the central sub-region, with 10% through infill development in the outer metropolitan sub-regions.

Section 5 - Planning for a population of 3.5 million

Directions 2031 (based on WA Tomorrow 2005) forecasts growth of the Perth and Peel region from 1.65 million to 2.2 million, requiring around 328,000 dwellings and 353,000 jobs. 350,000 of the expected 555,000 new residents are expected to be located in the outer sub-regions.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) projections are actually higher than those adopted by the WAPC, varying between 2.40 - 2.88 million.

Recent population forecasts released by the Commonwealth Government forecasts Perth will reach a population of 3.5 million by 2056.

Section 6 - Managing urban expansion

Provides background information to the urban expansion management program, identifying its purpose to ensure a 25 year supply of undeveloped urban land by:

* identifying land ahead of the rezoning process;
* staging the rezoning of that land in response to future growth trends;
* ensuring that there is sufficient land available for development at all times, without the need for blanket rezonings;
* identifying land for rezoning to take place at the appropriate time in the most suitable locations; and
* completing the Urban Development Program, which coordinates the planning and release of serviced land in response to population growth trends and emerging development and planning opportunities/barriers.

The Strategy outlines the range of assumptions (based on three low, medium and high density scenarios) applied to establish how many new dwellings are required in order to accommodate a projected population of 3.5 million as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Business as usual</th>
<th>Connected City</th>
<th>High density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population increase to 2056 (3.5million)</td>
<td>1.85 million</td>
<td>1.85 million</td>
<td>1.85 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings required</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed infill development</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>341,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield development required</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>584,000</td>
<td>536,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density per gross urban zoned hectare</td>
<td>10du/ha</td>
<td>15du/ha</td>
<td>17du/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield land required</td>
<td>63,200</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current undeveloped zoned land</td>
<td>18,600ha</td>
<td>18,600ha</td>
<td>18,600ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional land required for 3.5million</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WAPC has adopted the ‘Connected City’ scenario for the Strategy.

In order to establish what areas may be appropriate for urban development, the WAPC has analysed and mapped opportunities and constraints (including environmental, social, cultural and economic). A portion of the Opportunities and Constraints Analysis Map relevant to the City of Rockingham is included as Attachment 2.
The Map identifies land that is already developed or zoned for development, land that is excluded from consideration, and the balance of land in terms of the degree to which it is constrained (least, moderately or highly). In terms of the 'excluded areas', the Strategy notes "severely environmentally constrained areas and other areas unsuitable for development were excluded from the mapping. These areas included Bush Forever sites, national and regional parks, Ramsar Convention listed wetlands, State forests, water protection areas, Aboriginal heritage sites, primary roads and railways, major port operations, portions of the Swan Valley, flood prone areas, areas with steep slopes, raw mineral resource extraction areas, waste water treatment plant buffer areas and major gas-pipeline corridors". It is noted that details of the opportunities and constraint analysis have not been provided for review.

In order to guide what areas should be considered for future urban development, the Strategy includes the following draft performance indicators:

1. The proposal demonstrates compliance with the WAPC's planning framework, including any relevant policies and endorsed strategies.
2. The proposed area represents a logical expansion of the urban area and does not result in land use conflict.
3. The land is capable of being provided with essential services and that the expansion of the servicing infrastructure is logical and economically efficient and has the agreement of the service providers with regard to the staging and financing of the infrastructure.
4. The development of the area will not have significant impacts on the environment and natural resources which cannot be appropriately managed.
5. The proposal is able to integrate and provide for regional needs; for example movement networks such as road, rail and public transport, and regional social infrastructure such as hospitals and tertiary institutions.
6. The proposed area satisfactorily demonstrates through an employment strategy where the resulting community's employment will be located and the degree of self sufficiency that could be achieved.

It is also stated that "it should not be assumed that urban expansion areas and investigation areas indicated in the draft urban expansion plan will be rezoned for urban or industrial development at any time".

The Strategy states that land supply is intended to be monitored through the Department's Urban Development Program, which is expected to be released next year and updated annually.

The Strategy itself, along with the Urban Expansion Plan (see below), is intended to be reviewed at least every five years.

Section 7 - Urban Expansion Plan

The Urban Expansion Plan (Attachment 3) is intended to identify priority sites to be considered for urban development and applies the following classifications:

1. **Urban undeveloped land**
   - Land currently zoned urban and not yet developed.

2. **Urban deferred undeveloped land**
   - Land currently zoned urban deferred and not yet developed.

3. **Areas in the process of region scheme rezoning**
   - Areas currently in the process of rezoning to urban and which have been granted WAPC approval to advertise for development in the short term.

4. **Urban expansion areas**
   - Areas of rural land identified as potential urban expansion areas for rezoning in the short term (within five years) subject to statutory rezoning processes.
5 Investigation areas

Rural land to be investigated for potential rezoning in the short to medium term (within ten years) subject to statutory rezoning processes.

The Urban Expansion Map identifies two Urban Expansion Areas in Rockingham, as follows:

* Karnup South-West: 49ha of land located to the east of the future Karnup train station; and
* Keralup: Stage 1 of the proposed Keralup development located immediately to the east of the Kwinana Freeway and west of the Serpentine River.

Three Urban Investigation Areas are also identified, as follows:

* Baldivis South: the predominantly 'Special Rural' land to the south of Sixty Eight Road and north of Stakehill Road.
* Karnup: the Amarillo 'Special Rural' area located between Stakehill Road and Paganoni Road.
* Keralup East: the balance of the proposed Keralup development east of the Serpentine River.

It is noted that 40% (4,200ha) of the total urban expansion and investigation areas in Perth and Peel have been allocated to the south-west sub-region, of which the majority is within Baldivis, Karnup and Keralup.

In terms of progressing these areas to an urban zoning, the Strategy states "it is expected that the rezoning process will generally be initiated by private sector proponents. In some cases, local or State Government involvement will be required to coordinate the structure plan process and establish infrastructure contribution schemes such as those required for the East Wanneroo development."

Section 11 - South-west sub-region

The Spatial Framework Map (Attachment 4) for the south-west sub-region (Rockingham, Kwinana and Cockburn) includes the Urban Expansion and Urban Investigation areas identified in the Urban Expansion Map, and identifies other key planning elements for the area as follows:

* Rockingham identified as a Strategic Metropolitan Centre;
* North-East Baldivis Priority Industrial Site;
* East Rockingham Waste Water Treatment Plant;
* Port Kennedy Waste Water Treatment Plant and Water Recycling Plant;
* Karnup Water Storage / Reservoir;
* Mundijong Road West Construction; and
* Kwinana Freeway Road Upgrading

The Strategy notes that the area west of the Freeway is a relatively mature urban area, and that the area to the east of Freeway has significant tracts of rural land that have the potential 'to absorb a lot of future urban growth'.

Other key points include:

* The identification of Rockingham Beach as a 'metropolitan attractor', which are considered to be "places that attract tourists and are highly valued by local and regional residents";
* Employment self-sufficiency in the sub-region is currently 60%, below the Directions 2031 target of 70%. Key strategies to increasing employment in the sub-region include increasing the supply of industrial land and finalising the Western Trade Coast economic development strategy.

The Strategy identifies the following actions for the sub-region:-

* Finalise South Metropolitan and Peel Transport Study to determine the preferred transport network to support future growth;
Finalise environmental, transport and economic development studies; and initiate and progress an amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme as key elements of the Keralup project; and

Finalise the Southern Metropolitan and Peel Sub-regional Structure Plan, informed by the Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-regional Strategy.

The Strategy also includes a detailed breakdown of dwelling supply estimates for the sub-region.

Section 13 - Governance, implementation and monitoring

Identifies the following nine strategies to meet land supply, housing and employment needs:

1. Plan for increased housing supply in response to changing populations needs.
2. Promote and increase housing diversity, adaptability, affordability and choice.
3. Ensure urban expansion occurs in a timely manner in the most suitable locations.
4. Promote higher densities in greenfield development.
5. Facilitate and retain employment land to support economic growth and a balanced distribution of employment across the metropolitan Perth and Peel regions.
6. Plan and develop for transit orientated developments mixed use and medium-rise higher density housing development.
7. Protect our natural and built environments and scarce resources; respond to social change and optimise the land use and transport conditions that create vibrant, accessible, healthy and adaptable communities.
8. Maximise essential urban infrastructure efficiency and equity, and develop a coordinated approach to infrastructure and land use planning and development.
9. Engage with the development industry, State government agencies, local government and the community to implement the Strategy.

Section 14 - The Strategy

Outlines actions to implement the above strategies, along with responsibility and timeframes for implementation. The timeframes for implementation are separated into:

- short term (1 to 2 years);
- medium term (3 to 5 years); and
- long term (6 or more years).

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Public consultation is undertaken by the WAPC.

b. Consultation with Government agencies
   Consultation with Government agencies is undertaken by the WAPC.

c. Strategic
   The matter falls within Functional Area 3 - Land Use & Environment under the Scope of Strategic Master Planning.

d. Policy
   N/A

e. Financial
   N/A

f. Legal and Statutory
   N/A
5. Comments

The draft Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy is intended to be a principal based document, identifying the key strategies needed to guide growth of the region into the future.

The general intent of the Strategy, in planning for a longer term population of 3.5 million and promoting a more dense urban form, is supported.

It is considered, however, that the draft Strategy is undermined as various regional studies which should have informed it, including regional transport, employment and industrial land strategies, are yet to be finalised. Over previous years it has become apparent that the desire of the WAPC to be seen as active in regional planning has been at the expense of normal, structured processes where the supporting work is done prior to the broader Strategy being released.

Although the WAPC should be commended for becoming more relevant in regional planning, the disjointed and unstructured approach often makes it difficult to fully understand and feed into the process.

With respect to the key aspects of the Strategy, the following comments are provided:

Population Projections

The Strategy currently adopts the WAPC's 'WA Tomorrow' population projections which were prepared in 2005, and notes that its projections are below even the low scenario projections of the ABS.

Given the strong economic growth the State is expected to experience, planning should consider the potential for greater than expected growth and it is considered that the ABS projections provide a more robust basis for planning into the future.

It is also noted that the ABS has forecast a population of 3.5 million for the Perth Metropolitan Area by 2056 and the adoption of this longer term forecasted population as a basis for strategic planning is supported.

The Strategy does not provide population projections by LGA, rather it is expressed on a sub-region level. Although the figures appear conservative, it is difficult to provide meaningful input as Rockingham is not specifically detailed; this will occur when the projections are refined through a review of WA Tomorrow (currently underway) and consideration of the detail contained in the future Sub-Regional Structure Plan.

Opportunities and Constraints Mapping

The analysis of relevant opportunities and constraints, in order to identify land that may be suitable for urbanisation, is an essential step in the preparation of the Strategy. Although the WAPC identified the factors that informed the opportunities and constraints, there was very little detail on how the factors were applied.

Given that this mapping drives significant elements of the Strategy outcomes, the details of the assessment should be provided to relevant local authorities for review and comment. This should occur prior to the Strategy being finalised.

It is also considered appropriate that detailed opportunity and constraints analysis be undertaken for infill development, in order to identify the preferred location for infill development and address potential constraints to the infill targets being delivered.

While it is difficult to comment on the mapping in the absence of more detailed information, there appears to be inconsistency in the assessment of some areas. For example, the Keralup land is generally comparable with other land east of the Freeway within Baldivis, however, the Baldivis land has largely been shown as an 'excluded area' giving the impression that development will not be contemplated.
Urban Expansion Plan

The areas identified as Urban Expansion or Urban Investigation within Rockingham are supported. The Strategy does not, however, adequately explain the basis for areas being identified for expansion or investigation.

Concern is raised that the Strategy essentially invites applications for rezoning in areas that are not identified for urban expansion or investigation in the Urban Expansion Plan, stating that areas not identified as such will still be considered if the case can be made. This is considered to be inconsistent with orderly and proper planning, and the Urban Expansion Plan should be updated as a prerequisite to rezoning being considered. This would warrant the Urban Expansion Plan being updated on a more regular basis, either as required or say every 2 years.

It is noted that the Strategy, despite undertaking an analysis of development needs to achieve a projected population of 3.5 million, does not identify sufficient land to accommodate such. Whilst the intent to ensure a 25 year supply is noted, the Strategy itself should look further ahead and seek to identify what areas could be developed to achieve the long term population of 3.5 million.

Within Rockingham, there are considered to be a number of areas worthy of consideration for urban development, including east of the Freeway in Baldivis and land within the Stakehill Swamp Precinct.

Dwelling Supply

The dwelling supply estimates for Rockingham outlined in the Strategy are generally acceptable, however, it is noted that a portion of the Baldivis precinct (BA6) has not been included in the dwelling yield estimates. This land should be included in the calculations as it is already zoned and likely to be developed in the short to medium term.

There is also confusion in terms of the classification of development of infill versus greenfield. In this regard, some areas such as Secret Harbour and Singleton are classified as infill, whereas the similar area of Golden Bay is classified as greenfield.

In terms of establishing the number of dwellings required to accommodate future growth, an occupancy rate of 2.0 persons per household is considered very conservative and well below Rockingham's current and projected occupancy rates. To ensure a robust plan for future growth, however, the adoption of a conservative figure, essentially overestimating the number of dwellings required, is considered appropriate.

It is also noted that the methodology for calculating the amount of greenfield development is predominantly based on the amount of demand met by infill development, and is therefore heavily reliant upon the accuracy of the infill assumptions. In this regard, whilst the infill assumptions for the City are considered appropriate (although the definition of 'infill' requires clarification), it is understood that the assumptions for some local government areas are ambitious and the likelihood of the infill targets being met is questioned.

Finally, it is noted that the dwelling yield estimates for the Rockingham City Centre reflect the anticipated development to 2031, rather than the ultimate dwelling yield for the project. In this regard, the City Centre is expected to provide up to 20,000 new dwellings when fully developed.

Sub-Regional Spatial Framework

As noted previously, the areas included as Urban Expansion or Urban Investigation are supported, however, it is considered that the eastern area of Baldivis and the Stakehill Swamp Precinct should be included as Urban Investigation. The existing Baldivis urban and urban deferred zones should also be acknowledged as a key urban growth area, similar to the Cockburn Coast and Port Coogee, as it is expected to accommodate substantial development for the sub-region over the next 20 years.

It is noted that the much of the land identified for investigation within Rockingham is considerably fragmented and strategies will need to be prepared in order to assemble land and facilitate urban development. As noted by the City previously, land accumulation strategies are unlikely to completely resolve issues of land fragmentation, and it is likely to be difficult for Local Governments
to deliver large active sporting reserves and community facility sites, which should be considered prior to land being rezoned under the MRS.

It is also noted that the approved Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre Plan expands the planning envelope for the City Centre to include land currently zoned Industrial (north of Dixon Road) and Urban (north of Patterson Road, west of Read Street and south of Council Avenue). The City has requested the WAPC to initiate an Amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme to reflect the extent of the planning envelope under the Centre Plan and it is recommended that the Spatial Framework Map be amended to reflect the proposed changes.

Finally, the intention to undertake more detailed planning for traffic and transport is noted and supported. There is currently a lack of adequate transport planning in the region, particularly east of the Freeway, which should be urgently addressed.

A number of mapping inaccuracies have also been identified which will be brought to the attention of the WAPC. Most notably, many areas of existing POS have been identified as ‘urban zoned undeveloped’. The Secret Harbour Golf Course has also been incorrectly given this status.

**Infrastructure**

The Strategy identifies the necessary infrastructure that will be required to support the growth.

In terms of delivering new development to accommodate population growth, servicing is currently the most significant issue within Rockingham, with sewer capacity currently constraining development in a number of areas of Baldivis. The proposed East Rockingham Wastewater Treatment Plant is listed as ‘planned for construction by 2015’.

With respect to the proposed Port Kennedy Waste Water Treatment Plant and Water Recycling Plant, the City has previously advised the Water Corporation of its view that the subject site is not appropriate for a treatment facility given the extent of existing and future incompatible land uses within its vicinity. It is also assumed that any plant will be associated with ocean outfall and that the Water Corporation would seek to install infrastructure directly west to the coast. The impact that this will have on the internationally recognised Port Kennedy Scientific Park (which is a key element of the wider Rockingham Lakes Regional Park) is likely to be considerable and strongly contested by the City and other stakeholders. It is therefore requested that the depicted Water Recycling Plant and Waste Water Treatment Plant be removed from the spatial framework map, and that strategic planning for regional wastewater be urgently reviewed.

The ‘Karnup Reservoir’ is also listed for construction after 2020. Although the City has not been approached with respect to this proposal, it is assumed that the facility will be required following the Tamworth Reservoir reaching capacity. The Water Corporation owns a vacant landholding in south Baldivis which was intended to accommodate the facility but has limitations by virtue of it being a Bush Forever site. The proposed Karnup facility is noted and the Water Corporation should be encouraged to liaise with City as early as possible in the planning process to ensure that implications of the facility are understood.

In terms of regional road planning, Mundijong Road is identified as ‘a project in progress or funded’. The description of the project suggests that its purpose is to provide a connection to the Kwinana Freeway. From the City’s point of view, an equally important objectives for Mundijong Road is to enable an efficient connection from the Freeway to the Rockingham City Centre; this point should be made to the WAPC and the emphasis changed accordingly.

Further, in terms of ‘Strategic Road Planning’, the Fremantle Rockingham Central Access Highway is mentioned. The manner in which this road intersects with Mundijong Road is also an important element of the broader City Centre transport network and particular attention will be given to this proposal.

The Spatial Framework map also shows a section of the Kwinana Freeway, south of Safety Bay Road, being upgraded, however, there is no commentary in support of this. Given that the road has only been open for about 12 months, the need for upgrade is questioned.

One aspect the Strategy has not considered is planning for social infrastructure, including both sporting and community facilities, as well as hospitals and tertiary education centres, necessary to
support population growth. These needs should be considered prior to the Sub-Regional Structure Plan being prepared.

The inefficient coordination of infrastructure has the greatest potential for the Strategy recommendations not to be realised. Other than containing a number of broad statements on expected deliver dates, the Strategy seems to be lacking commitments in this regard. The WAPC should ensure that certainty on infrastructure delivery is achieved such that all stakeholders can consider the findings of the Strategy with some confidence.

**Implementation Strategy**

The overall strategies and action plans outlined in the Strategy are generally considered appropriate, however, concern is raised with respect to the intention to require all development to achieve a density of 15 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare. In this regard, it is unlikely that all urban zoned land will be developed for urban purposes, due to relevant constraints, and higher than expected densities may be required to achieve the targeted dwelling yields. Such higher densities may not necessarily be commercially viable or supported by the market, particularly in the outer metropolitan areas, and a strict application of this requirement may delay or prevent development from occurring. It is essential that the State and local governments work collaboratively with the development industry towards delivering more dense urban development whilst ensuring that the supply of housing is not adversely affected.

The intention to prepare an Urban Development Program, in order to monitor the supply and delivery of urban development, is strongly supported. In 2009, the City prepared the Rockingham Urban Growth Programme through consultation with the owners and developers of urban and urban deferred zoned land in order to establish the likely timing of development within the City of Rockingham. The City’s Urban Growth Programme is currently being reviewed and updated and may assist in informing the WAPC’s Urban Development Program.

Finally, whilst the preparation of an Urban Expansion Plan is supported, it is considered that such a Plan should be reviewed and updated more regularly than on a five yearly basis. In this regard, as noted previously, the inclusion of land within an urban expansion area should be a prerequisite of rezoning and it may be appropriate to review the Plan on a more regular basis to ensure development is not unnecessarily delayed if it is considered that additional land has merit for urban development.

**Conclusion**

The Strategy is a key implementation mechanism for Directions 2031 and comes at an important time for the City as it embarks on its Local Planning Strategy. The overall intent of the document is sound and the pattern of development is generally in keeping with that known and supported by the Council. It is considered, however, that the Strategy does not go far enough in identifying certain growth opportunities in Rockingham as detailed above.

It is also difficult to reconcile some of the recommendations in the absence of ongoing or planned regional studies that would have informed its outcomes. The effective implementation of the Strategy and its more detailed partner, being the future Sub-Regional Structure Plan, requires the effective coordination of services and facilities which remains a major challenge for the WAPC.

In the light of the above, it is recommended that the above comments form the basis of the Council’s submission to the WAPC.

**6. Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**7. Officer Recommendation**

That Council ENDORSE the content of the Officer Report to form the basis of its submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission on the draft Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the content of the Officer Report to form the basis of its submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission on the draft Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner**

That Council **ENDORSE** the content of the Officer Report to form the basis of its submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission on the draft Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### Planning Services

**Statutory Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Street Naming Theme - Settlers Hills East Estate, Baldivis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/915-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Fugro Spatial Solutions Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Nicole D’Alessandro, Administration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>Legislative Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>Lots 11 Clyde Avenue, 9051 Safety Bay Road and 9059 Nair Drive, Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area:</th>
<th>Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maps/Diagrams:**

- Location Plan
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CONFIRMED AT A COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

MAYOR (B W SAMMELS)
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application seeking approval for a street naming theme of ‘Passenger Ships that Arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889’ for the ‘Settlers Hills East Estate’ located at Lots 11 Clyde Avenue, 9051 Safety Bay Road and 9059 Nairn Drive, Baldivis.

2. **Background**

In 1995 the Council supported a street naming theme based on 'Early Settlers' to complement the estate name of ‘Settlers Hills’ given its historic reference to the area.

Council is in receipt of a request from the developers of the Settlers Hills East Estate seeking approval for a proposed street naming theme associated with Passenger Ships that arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889.

3. **Details**

The developer has selected a street naming theme of ‘Passenger Ships that arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889’ for the subject subdivision and submitted a plan of the road layout and the street names allocated to such.

A sample of the proposed street names are as follows:-

- **Daylight Entrance** - *In September 1874, E H Laurence was appointed temporary immigration agent and authorised to charter a ship to convey 400 migrants. The Daylight left England in May bringing 160 passengers including EH Laurence, who organised with ship owners to take further groups on subsequent voyages. The captain of the Daylight was Captain Bush.*

- **Esmeralda Entrance** - *The Esmeralda was a passenger ship that departed London, England and arrived in Fremantle, WA on October 14 1854, with 208 passengers.*

- **Sunbeam Approach** - *The Sunbeam was a passenger ship that departed Algoa Bay and arrived in Busselton, WA on July 10 1883, with 21 passengers.*

- **Mikado Street** - *The Mikado was a passenger ship that departed London, England and arrived in Fremantle on February 28 1837, with 13 passengers.*

- **Sophia Link** - *The 537 ton teak and yellow metal Sophia was built in Calcutta, India in 1819. She is said to have sailed from London, Portsmouth and finally, on April 27 1850 from Plymouth. She arrived in Fremantle, WA on July 27 1850 with 250 passengers.*

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**

   Consultation with the Geographic Names Committee is required following the Council’s decision.

c. **Strategic**

   Nil

d. **Policy**

   Planning Procedure 1.4 – Street Names and their Themes.
e. **Financial**
   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   The responsibility for approving street names rests with the Geographic Names Committee.

5. **Comments**

   The original street naming theme of 'Early Settlers' was approved circa 1995. The supply of appropriate street names, which meet the Geographic Names criteria, has been exhausted. As the proposed street naming theme reflects a nautical heritage and complies with Council’s Planning Procedure 1.4, approval is recommended.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council **ENDORSE** the proposed street naming theme of 'Passenger Ships that arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889' for use within the Settlers Hills East Estate, Baldivis located at Lots 11 Clyde Avenue, 9051 Safety Bay Road and 9059 Nairn Drive, Baldivis.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council **ENDORSE** the proposed street naming theme of 'Passenger Ships that arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889' for use within the Settlers Hills East Estate, Baldivis located at Lots 11 Clyde Avenue, 9051 Safety Bay Road and 9059 Nairn Drive, Baldivis.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

   **Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner**

   That Council **ENDORSE** the proposed street naming theme of 'Passenger Ships that arrived in WA between 1829 and 1889' for use within the Settlers Hills East Estate, Baldivis located at Lots 11 Clyde Avenue, 9051 Safety Bay Road and 9059 Nairn Drive, Baldivis.

   Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.
Planning Services
Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-008/ 10 Residential Design Codes Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Western Australian Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr M Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>Monday, 15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>23rd February 2010 (PD20/2/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Advocate Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Purpose of Report

To consider lodging an expression of interest with WALGA, to participate in the review of State Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Design Codes ('R-Codes').

2. Background

The R-Codes provide a comprehensive basis for the control, through local government, of residential development throughout Western Australia.

The Western Australian Planning Commission ('WAPC') recently announced in addition to the review of the R-Codes, amendments to the R-Codes to introduce additional multiple dwelling provisions which were granted final approval on the 19th October 2010. The new R-Code Multiple Dwelling provisions will be gazetted on the 22nd November 2010.
The implementation of these new R-Code Multiple Dwelling provisions will be monitored by the Department of Planning over the next 2 years. During this time, a review of the entire R-Codes will be undertaken.

The new multiple dwelling provisions were considered by Council in February 2010 as part of a discussion paper on titled ‘Multi-Unit Housing Code’.

The new multiple dwelling provisions will apply in areas with a residential density coding greater than R30 and for multiple dwellings within mixed use development or activity centres.

The new Multiple Dwelling R-Codes include controls on building size, building height, street setbacks, side and rear boundary setbacks, open space, surveillance of the street, street walls and fences, building appearance, outdoor living areas, landscaping, on-site parking provision, design of parking spaces, vehicular access, traffic sight lines, site works, visual privacy, solar access for adjoining sites, dwelling size, outbuildings, external fixtures, stormwater, essential facilities and general site requirements (no minimum site area per dwelling requirement).

3. Details

The WAPC is about to commence a substantial review of the R-Codes and following a competitive tendering process has appointed GHD Consultants to assist in the review. It is proposed that the review will be undertaken over the next two years and formal consultation and advertising will be undertaken next year.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   N/A

b. Consultation with Government agencies
   The Department of Planning will be requiring GHD consultants to undertake preliminary discussions with stakeholders, to determine any issues or problems with the current provisions. These discussions will assist in the development of an issues paper that will be presented to a technical advisory group for further discussion on the R-Codes.

c. Strategic
   Functional Area 3 – Land Use & the Environment in Council’s Strategic Plan.

d. Policy
   The R-Codes are applied through the provisions of Town Planning Scheme No.2 (‘TPS2’) rather than as an adopted Council Policy. The development of land for any of the residential purposes dealt with by the R-Codes must conform to the provisions of the R-Codes in accordance with clause 4.1.2 of TPS2.

e. Financial
   N/A

f. Legal and Statutory
   As the R-Codes are read into Town Planning Scheme No.2 as a State Planning Policy, the review may not necessarily require change to existing scheme provisions, as any new provisions will automatically come into effect on the gazettal date.

5. Comments

The Department of Planning is seeking 6-8 local governments to be part of the initial discussions of the review of the R-Codes. The discussions were to be undertaken during the week of the 25th October 2010 and involved a one hour meeting, with follow-up phone calls and emails where required.
On the 28th September 2010, WALGA sought expressions of interest from local government to be part of this review. This process is favoured by the Department of Planning, as Local Governments can self nominate to be contacted, rather than the Department selecting the Councils to be involved.

Given the timeframe to lodge expressions of interest, the City has already contacted WALGA to be a part of the initial stage of the R-Codes review.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the Expression of Interest lodged by the Director, Planning and Development Services with WALGA to participate in the initial stage of the R-Codes review, being undertaken by the Department of Planning.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the Expression of Interest lodged by the Director, Planning and Development Services with WALGA to participate in the initial stage of the R-Codes review, being undertaken by the Department of Planning.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner

That Council ENDORSE the Expression of Interest lodged by the Director, Planning and Development Services with WALGA to participate in the initial stage of the R-Codes review, being undertaken by the Department of Planning.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
# Planning Services

## Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-009/10 Proposed Scheme Amendment - Holiday Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms D Shaw, Planning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr D Waller, Co-ordinator, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Ross, Manager, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>November 2005 (PD178/11/05), December 2007 (PD144/12/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Legislative Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purpose of Report

1. **Purpose of Report**

   To consider amending Town Planning Scheme No.2 ‘TPS2’, to include new ‘Holiday Home’ (large), and ‘Holiday Home’ (standard) uses in Table No.1 – Zoning Table, together with interpretations for each Use Class.

## Background

2. **Background**

   TPS2 does not currently provide for Holiday Accommodation within residential areas. The emergence of this type of tourist accommodation has meant that Holiday Homes have so far operated with minimal regulation. Planning Controls are proposed for TPS2 to regulate ‘Holiday Homes’ to provide a more certain legal environment and to avoid land use conflicts.

   Council’s earlier attempts to introduce Holiday Home controls, resulted in the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure requesting Council to initiate a separate Scheme Amendment, in the
light of the recommendations of the 'Holiday Homes Working Group', established to consider a similar Scheme Amendment in the Shires of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River.

Council was also requested by the Minister to refer the proposed Scheme Amendment to the Tourism WA for comment, prior to initiating the proposal. Tourism WA advised the City that it supported the inclusion of additional tourism uses and definitions to the City's Scheme.

### 3. Details

The Scheme Amendment is required to give the Council the ability to grant approval to Holiday Homes within various zones, including but not limited to, the ‘Residential’ zone, ‘Waterfront Village’ zone, and ‘Special Residential’ zone (including Warnbro Dunes) and ‘Special Rural’ zone. It is also necessary to adopt a Local Planning Policy that clearly sets out the conditions by which the Holiday Homes should operate and that would clearly state the management responsibilities of the landowner. Such Policy is listed as a separate item on this Agenda and should be read in conjunction with this report. (Refer SP-010-/10).

### 4. Implications to Consider

- **Consultation with the Community**
  Scheme Amendments are required to be dealt with in accordance with the Town Planning Regulations 1967 (as amended), which includes a requirement to advertise proposals for public comment over a period of 42 days, prior to Council considering final adoption.

- **Consultation with Government agencies**
  Scheme Amendments are required to be referred to the EPA to determine if an environmental assessment is required, prior to advertising.

- **Strategic**
  The proposal falls within Functional Area 3 - Land Use and the Environment under the scope of Development in the Council's Strategic Plan.

- **Policy**
  A draft Holiday Home Planning Policy has been prepared, to outline the planning requirements and conditions by which Holiday Homes should operate.

- **Financial**
  Nil

- **Legal and Statutory**
  Nil

### 5. Comments

Two new ‘Holiday Home’ definitions are proposed to be included in TPS2, being ‘Holiday Home’ (standard) and ‘Holiday Home’ (large) which reflect different types of operation from ‘low key activity’ to ‘larger operations’ respectfully. The permissibility of each new land use is a reflection of the scale of operation of the Holiday Home.

The interpretations for ‘Holiday Home’ (large) and ‘Holiday Home’ (standard) are as follows:-

"Holiday Home (standard): means a single house (excluding ancillary accommodation), grouped dwelling or multiple dwelling, which might also be used for short stay accommodation for no more than six people (but does not include a bed and breakfast accommodation unit)."

"Holiday Home (large): means premises conforming to the definition of holiday home (standard) with the exception that the premises provide short stay accommodation for more than six people but not more than 12 at any one time."
The definitions for 'Holiday Home' (standard) and Holiday Home (large) provide a clearer interpretation of the types of tourist accommodation from a Single House, Grouped Dwelling of Multiple Dwelling, but excluding Bed and Breakfast accommodation units and Ancillary Accommodation. Changes to the Zoning Table outlining the Land Use Category permissibility are detailed in the recommendation.

Council’s Rockingham Beach Waterfront Village Policy No. 3.2.5 supports urban-scaled residential and short stay visitor accommodation within the Waterfront Village. ‘Holiday Homes’ (standard) are proposed by this Scheme Amendment to be listed as a Land Use Category in TPS2 that is exempt from Planning Approval of the Council, for land within the Waterfront Village zone.

While it is acknowledged that permanent residents and short term visitors have competing objectives, this needs to be balanced against the Council’s objectives to foster tourism and facilitate tourist accommodation within the Waterfront Village. The Holiday Homes (large) land use requires Planning Approval within the Waterfront Village zone under the proposed Scheme Amendment. The Scheme Amendment also includes a Planning Approval requirement for ‘Holiday Homes (standard) and Holiday Homes (large) in other zones.

The symbols used in the cross-reference in the Table No.1 - Zoning Table have the following meanings:-

- ‘P’ means that the use is permitted.
- ‘D’ means that the use is not permitted unless the Council has exercised its discretion by granting planning approval.
- ‘A’ means the use is not permitted unless the Council has exercised its discretion by granting planning approval after advertising the proposal.
- ‘X’ means a use that is not permitted.

Accordingly, it is recommended that Council initiate the Scheme Amendment and subject to EPA level of assessment, proceed to advertise the Scheme Amendment together with draft Planning Policy 3.3.12 - Holiday Homes. It is also recommended that existing Holiday Home operators and Tourism WA be notified of the Scheme Amendment and invited to comment.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council, in pursuance of section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, INITIATE an Amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.2 as follows:-

RESOLUTION DECIDING TO AMEND A TOWN PLANNING SCHEME CITY OF ROCKINGHAM TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO.2 - AMENDMENT No. 100

(i) Amending the Scheme Text by inserting new use classes ‘Holiday Home (Large)’ and ‘Holiday Home (Standard)’ within Table No.1 - Zoning Table and where the permissibility of each land-use category is listed as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Holiday Home (large)</th>
<th>Holiday Home (standard)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) The following Interpretation of ‘Holiday Home’ is to be included in Schedule No.1 -

"Holiday Home (standard): means a single house (excluding ancillary accommodation), grouped dwelling or multiple dwelling, which might also be used for short stay accommodation for no more than six people (but does not include a bed and breakfast accommodation unit)."

"Holiday Home (large): means premises conforming to the definition of holiday home (standard) with the exception that the premises provide short stay accommodation for more than six people but not more than 12 at any one time."

(iii) Insert new clause 6.1.2 (n) Holiday Home (standard) where the proposed use is designated with the symbol "P" in the cross reference to the Waterfront Village zone in the Zoning Table, except where otherwise provided by the Scheme.

(iv) Amend Table 1 – Zoning Table by inserting the following note:

"*** Refer to subclause 6.1.2 (n)"

(v) Amend Schedule No.4 – all Special Rural zones clause 3 (c) to include the use class Holiday Home (standard) as a “D” use and Holiday Home (large) as an “A” use.

(vi) Amend Schedule No.5 – all Special Residential zones as follows:

Portions of Planning Unit 3 of the Rural Land Strategy – Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

Portions of Planning Unit 4 of the Rural Land Strategy – Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council, in pursuance of section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, INITIATE an Amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.2 as follows:-

RESOLUTION DECIDING TO AMEND A TOWN PLANNING SCHEME CITY OF ROCKINGHAM TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO.2 - AMENDMENT No. 100
(i) Amending the Scheme Text by inserting new use classes 'Holiday Home (Large)' and 'Holiday Home (Standard)' within Table No.1 - Zoning Table and where the permissibility of each land-use category is listed as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Holiday Home (large)</th>
<th>Holiday Home (standard)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Village</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldivis Town Centre</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Commercial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Kennedy Business Enterprise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Rural</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Residential</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Purposes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) The following Interpretation of 'Holiday Home' is to be included in Schedule No.1 - interpretations:-

"Holiday Home (standard): means a single house (excluding ancillary accommodation), grouped dwelling or multiple dwelling, which might also be used for short stay accommodation for no more than six people (but does not include a bed and breakfast accommodation unit)."

"Holiday Home (large): means premises conforming to the definition of holiday home (standard) with the exception that the premises provide short stay accommodation for more than six people but not more than 12 at any one time."

(iii) Insert new clause 6.1.2 (n) Holiday Home (standard) where the proposed use is designated with the symbol “P” in the cross reference to the Waterfront Village zone in the Zoning Table, except where otherwise provided by the Scheme.

(v) Amend Table 1 – Zoning Table by inserting the following note:

“*** Refer to subclause 6.1.2 (n)”
(v) Amend Schedule No.4 – all Special Rural zones clause 3 (c) to include the use class Holiday Home (standard) as a “D” use and Holiday Home (large) as an “A” use.

(vi) Amend Schedule No.5 – all Special Residential zones as follows:

Portions of Planning Unit 3 of the Rural Land Strategy - Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

Portions of Planning Unit 4 of the Rural Land Strategy - Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner

That Council, in pursuance of section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, *INITIATE* an Amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.2 as follows:-

**RESOLUTION DECIDING TO AMEND A TOWN PLANNING SCHEME CITY OF ROCKINGHAM TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO.2 - AMENDMENT NO. 100**

(i) Amending the Scheme Text by inserting new use classes ‘Holiday Home (Large)’ and ‘Holiday Home (Standard)’ within Table No.1 - Zoning Table and where the permissibility of each land-use category is listed as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Holiday Home (large)</th>
<th>Holiday Home (standard)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Village</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldivis Town Centre</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Commercial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Kennedy Business Enterprise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) The following Interpretation of ‘Holiday Home’ is to be included in Schedule No.1 - interpretations:-

“Holiday Home (standard): means a single house (excluding ancillary accommodation), grouped dwelling or multiple dwelling, which might also be used for short stay accommodation for no more than six people (but does not include a bed and breakfast accommodation unit).”

“Holiday Home (large): means premises conforming to the definition of holiday home (standard) with the exception that the premises provide short stay accommodation for more than six people but not more than 12 at any one time.”

(iii) Insert new clause 6.1.2 (n) Holiday Home (standard) where the proposed use is designated with the symbol “P” in the cross reference to the Waterfront Village zone in the Zoning Table, except where otherwise provided by the Scheme.

(vi) Amend Table 1 – Zoning Table by inserting the following note:

“*** Refer to subclause 6.1.2 (n)”

(v) Amend Schedule No.4 - all Special Rural zones clause 3 (c) to include the use class Holiday Home (standard) as a “D” use and Holiday Home (large) as an “A” use.

(vi) Amend Schedule No.5 – all Special Residential zones as follows:

Portions of Planning Unit 3 of the Rural Land Strategy – Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

Portions of Planning Unit 4 of the Rural Land Strategy – Provision 3 (b) is amended to insert Holiday Home (standard) and Holiday Home (large) as a “D” use.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
Planning Services
Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-010/10 Proposed Planning Policy No.3.3.21 - Holiday Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms D Shaw, Planning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr D Waller, Co-ordinator, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Ross, Manager, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee</td>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>November 2005 (PD178/11/05), December 2007 (PD144/12/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Legislative Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Draft Planning Policy No.3.3.21 - Holiday Homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Purpose of Report**

For Council to consider, for the purpose of advertising, a draft Planning Policy for Holiday Homes.

2. **Background**

Council's earlier attempts to introduce Holiday Home controls resulted in the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, requesting Council to initiate a separate Scheme Amendment. The Minister referred to the 'Holiday Homes Working Group', which was established to consider a similar Scheme Amendment in the Shires of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River. Council was also requested to refer a proposed Scheme Amendment to the Tourism WA for comment, prior to initiating the proposal.
Tourism WA has advised the City that it supported the inclusion of additional tourism uses and definitions to the City's Scheme. The preparation of a Local Planning Policy to provide guidance on the assessment of applications was also highly recommended.

In September 2009, Planning Bulletin 99 and the Holiday Homes Guidelines were released by the WAPC to guide Councils in the creation of Local Planning Policies to address Holiday Homes. Planning Bulletin 99 provides an interim position of the WAPC in relation to the regulation of Holiday Homes in WA. The Bulletin provided advice to the City in dealing with issues associated with Holiday Homes in the Local Government Framework.

3. Details

The purpose of the draft Planning Policy for Holiday Homes is to set out the objectives and policy provisions which the Council shall have due regard to in the assessment and determination of applications for planning approval for the establishment of Holiday Homes.

In light of the need for a Policy to guide the establishment of 'Holiday Homes' within the district, a draft Planning Policy for Holiday Homes has been prepared, and is attached in this Report. The Policy outlines requirements for the:-

- Objectives for Holiday Homes within the City of Rockingham;
- Design requirements for Holiday Homes, including carparking, scale of operation and health requirements;
- The application and consultation procedure for Holiday Homes; and
- Inserting a new definition of 'Holiday Homes' in Town Planning Scheme No.2.

The draft Policy has also been prepared to take into account the need for development guidelines to facilitate tourist accommodation within the district.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Under TPS2, if Council resolves to prepare a Planning Policy, the Council:

(a) is to publish a notice of the proposed Policy once a week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper circulating in the Scheme area, giving details of:-

(i) where the draft Policy may be inspected;
(ii) the subject and nature of the draft Policy; and
(iii) in what form and during what period (being not less than 21 days from the day the notice is published) submissions may be made.

(b) may publish notice of the proposed Policy in such other manner and carry out such other consultation as the Council considers appropriate.

b. Consultation with Government agencies

Consultation with Tourism WA is compulsory.

c. Strategic

The proposal falls within Functional Area 3 - Land Use & the Environment in Council’s Strategic Plan under the Scope of Land Use Planning.

d. Policy

If the Council proceeds to adopt the draft Policy, following consideration of any public submissions, it must have due regard to the requirements of the Policy together with the merits of proposals.
confirms at a council meeting held on tuesday 14 december 2010

5. Comments
The draft Policy prefers Holiday Homes in locations that present an advantage to the visitors to the City, such as in close proximity to the beach, lakes, retail and restaurant facilities or rural retreat locations. Suburban locations may not be considered appropriate. House rules for Holiday Homes are intended to protect the residential amenity of nearby properties. The City's Health Service and Building Service requirements are reflected in the Policy.

In recognition of the existence of Holiday Homes already operating within the district, transitional arrangements are proposed within the draft Policy. This will allow owner operators up to 12 months, after the Planning Policy has been adopted to apply for and obtain approval for the operation of existing Holiday Homes and implement the regulatory measures of this Policy.

The draft Policy together with the proposed Scheme Amendment will provide a legal planning framework to support existing Holiday Homes that are well operated and without complaint and the establishment of future Holiday Homes.

Accordingly, it is recommended that draft Planning Policy No.3.3.21 'Holiday Homes' be advertised for 42 days, together with the proposed Scheme Amendment. It is also recommended that existing holiday home operators and Tourism WA are notified of the draft Policy and invited to lodge submissions with the City.

6. Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation
That Council **ENDORSE** the publishing of a notice that it has prepared Policy No.3.3.21 - Holiday Homes for public inspection, pursuant to clause 8.9.4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, for a period of 42 days, in conjunction with the Scheme Amendment referred to in Item SP-009/10.

8. Committee Recommendation
That Council **ENDORSE** the publishing of a notice that it has prepared Policy No.3.3.21 - Holiday Homes for public inspection, pursuant to clause 8.9.4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, for a period of 42 days, in conjunction with the Scheme Amendment referred to in Item SP-009/10.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation
Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation
Not applicable.
11. Council Resolution

**Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner**
That Council **ENDORSE** the publishing of a notice that it has prepared Policy No.3.3.21 - Holiday Homes for public inspection, pursuant to clause 8.9.4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, for a period of 42 days, in conjunction with the Scheme Amendment referred to in Item SP-009/10.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
# Planning Services

## Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th><strong>SP-011/10</strong> Disposal of Council Land by Unconditional Private Treaty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>LUP/920-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proponent/s:</strong></td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Mrs S Peacock, Senior Planning Administration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td>Mr R M Jeans, Director, Planning &amp; Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee meeting:</strong></td>
<td>Monday, 15 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td>October 2002 (PD205/10/02), December 2002 (PD253/12/02), May 2009 (PD61/5/09), July 2009 (PD96/7/09), February 2010 (PD/23/2/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Executive Function</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 55 Trafalgar Gardens/Bounty Court, Port Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 55 Trafalgar Gardens/Bounty Court, Port Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area:</strong></td>
<td>580m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments:</strong></td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps/diagrams:</strong></td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

For Council to consider the disposal of Lot 55 Trafalgar Gardens/Bounty Court, Port Kennedy by ‘unconditional’ Private Treaty in accordance with Section 3.58 (3) and (4) of the Local Government Act, 1995.

2. **Background**

In October 2009 the Council resolved to appoint Impact Realty to market and sell Lot 55 (No.14) Trafalgar Gardens, Port Kennedy by Public Tender in accordance with Section 3.58(2)(b) of the Local Government Act, 1995.

In accordance with the above, the land was offered for sale by Public Tender in the local Sound Telegraph Newspaper on the 23rd December 2009 and the West Australian on the 19th December 2009. Following the conclusion of the advertising period on the 13th January 2010, no Tenders had been received.

In February 2010, the Council further considered the proposal and resolved to offer the property for sale by Private Treaty for a period of three months subject to the following conditions:

(i) The Purchaser must remove and dispose of (at their own cost) all existing improvements on the land such as, bollards and the existing concrete footpath which traverses the land within 3 months of the date of property settlement; and

(ii) The Purchaser must apply for a Building Licence to build a house within 6 months and commence house construction within 12 months of the date of property settlement.

2. Further, that any reasonable offers to purchase the land, in the opinion of the Director, Planning & Development Services, be presented to the Council for its consideration.

3. Appoint a Licensed Real Estate Agent to undertake the marketing and sale of Lot 55 Trafalgar Gardens, Port Kennedy, based on experience and price.

Given that the disposal of the property was now by Private Treaty, Landgate was requested to provide a market valuation on the property in accordance with Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act. In April 2010, Landgate considered that the land value was $205,000. The property was subsequently marketed at $215,000.

A ‘Contract of Sale’ for the property was prepared by a Licensed Real Estate Agent and the property was marketed for a period of three months ending on the 6th May 2010, with no offers being received.

A ‘Listing Extension Agreement’ was prepared extending the contract for a further three months with a reduction of the asking price consistent with the land valuation being $205,000. The contract expired on the 10th November 2010, with no offers being received.

3. **Details**

The property has now been offered for sale by either Tender or ‘conditional’ Private Treaty for a period of approximately ten months.

The selling agent has advised that a number of potential purchasers displayed some interest in purchasing the property, however, their interest was subsequently withdrawn after they were made aware of the ‘conditional’ Contract of Sale affecting the land.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

Nil.
b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   
   Nil.

c. **Strategic**
   
   Functional Area 3 – Land Use & The Environment in Council’s Strategic Plan.

d. **Policy**
   
   Nil.

e. **Financial**
   
   Nil.

f. **Legal and Statutory**


5. **Comments**

   Given the lack of interest in the property due to the ‘conditional’ Private Treaty, it is recommended that the Council remove the conditions associated with the Contract of Sale and pursue the method of sale by ‘unconditional’ Private Treaty.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Absolute Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council:
   
   
   2. **EXTEND** the Listing Agreement with the current Agent to market and sell Lot 55 (No.14) Trafalgar Gardens, Port Kennedy for a period of three months for not less than $205,000 by ‘unconditional’ Private Treaty.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council:
   
   
   2. **EXTEND** the Listing Agreement with the current Agent to market and sell Lot 55 (No.14) Trafalgar Gardens, Port Kennedy for a period of three months for not less than $205,000 by ‘unconditional’ Private Treaty.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

    Not applicable.
11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner

That Council:


2. **EXTEND** the Listing Agreement with the current Agent to market and sell Lot 55 (No.14) Trafalgar Gardens, Port Kennedy for a period of three months for not less than $205,000 by ‘unconditional’ Private Treaty.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### Planning Services
#### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-012/10  Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Ms Peta Koko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss D Shaw, Planning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr D Waller, Coordinator, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Ross, Manager, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Legislative Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site:                   | Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay  |
| Lot Area:               | 680m²                                      |
| Attachments:            | Submissions, petition, site and layout plan |
| Maps/Diagrams:         | Location Plan                              |

Note: Submission and petition also received from No.13 Cascade Close

Consulted

Submissioner

Subject Site
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application seeking planning approval for the operation of a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) at Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay.

2. **Background**

N/A

3. **Details**

An application has been received to establish a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) at Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay. The applicant is to be the sole operator of the business and will be performing muscle and connective tissue therapy.

The proposed hours of operation will be Monday, Wednesday and Fridays from 8:30am to 4:30pm, and Saturdays from 8:30am to 12noon. Clients will be attending on the premises on an appointment only basis, with 15 minute intervals between clients.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

In accordance with Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations & Home Businesses, the application was referred to adjacent and affected land owners for comment for a period of 14 days. At the end of the advertising period, two submissions were received. The submissions were received from the adjoining owner at No.33 Cascade Close and No.13 Cascade Close. The submission from No.13 Cascade Close also contained a petition, with signatures from fourteen residents that live on Cascade Close. A copy of this submission is attached.

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**

Nil.

c. **Strategic**

This proposal falls within Functional Area 3 - Land Use & The Environment in the Council’s Strategic Plan under the scope of Land Use Planning and Land Use Control.

d. **Policy**

Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations & Home Businesses.

e. **Financial**

Nil.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Nil.

5. **Comments**

The proposed Home Occupation complies with the requirements of Planning Policy No. 3.3.10 - Home Occupations and Home Businesses (the Policy).

The main concerns raised in the submission relate to the possible increase in traffic in the street and a lack of carparking available on the property, should the Home Occupation be approved. It is considered that by imposing conditions limiting the maximum number of clients and a requirement to provide a 15 minute interval between clients, the increase in traffic volume in the street and resultant impact on amenity of neighbours would be minimal.
It is acknowledged that the subject site shares a driveway with a neighbouring property and that the vehicles parking in the driveway of the subject site could impact the access of vehicles entering or leaving the adjacent property.

Given the number of appointments proposed being a maximum of five (5) and the business operating hours being limited to three and half days, it is considered the impacts in this regard would be negligible.

It is recommended that the application for a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) be approved, subject to conditions.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority.

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **GRANT** planning approval for a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) on Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay subject to:

(i) Standard Conditions: D1, D75 (Home Occupation), D77 (5), D78

(ii) All car parking in relation to the business must be wholly contained within the property.

(iii) The Home Occupation operating between the hours of 8:30am to 4:30pm, Monday, Wednesday and Fridays, and from 8:30am to 12 noon on Saturdays.

(iv) Footnotes
    
    Standard Footnote: F10 (D75)

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council **GRANT** planning approval for a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) on Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay subject to:

(i) Standard Conditions: D1, D75 (Home Occupation), D77 (5), D78

(ii) All car parking in relation to the business must be wholly contained within the property.

(iii) The Home Occupation operating between the hours of 8:30am to 4:30pm, Monday, Wednesday and Fridays, and from 8:30am to 12 noon on Saturdays.

(iv) Footnotes
    
    Standard Footnote: F10 (D75)

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

**Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner**

That Council **GRANT** planning approval for a Home Occupation (Bowen Therapy) on Lot 450 (No.35) Cascade Close, Safety Bay subject to:

(i) Standard Conditions: D1, D75 (Home Occupation), D77 (5), D78
(ii) All car parking in relation to the business must be wholly contained within the property.

(iii) The Home Occupation operating between the hours of 8:30am to 4:30pm, Monday, Wednesday and Fridays, and from 8:30am to 12 noon on Saturdays.

(iv) **Footnotes**

   Standard Footnote: F10 (D75)

   Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### Planning Services

#### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-013/10 Proposed Closure of Unnamed Road Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/4959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Development Planning Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss D Shaw, Planning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr D Waller, Co-ordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Ross, Manager, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Legislative Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Unnamed road reserve adjacent to Lot 1000 (No.409) Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td><img src="unnamed-road-map.png" alt="Map of Unnamed Road to be closed" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unnamed Road to be closed**
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application to close an unnamed road reserve adjacent to Lot 1000 (No.409) Baldivis Road, Baldivis, following closure of the advertising period.

2. **Background**

In June 2010, the City received an application from Development Planning Strategies, seeking the closure of an unnamed road reserve to enable to co-ordinated development of land, as the road reserve is located within an area covered by the proposed East Baldivis Structure Plan.

In July 2010, Council resolved to advertise the proposed closure of the unnamed portion of road reserve. This included consultation with various government agencies.

3. **Details**

The north-south portion of the unnamed road dissects Lot 1000, and is situated between Lots 105 and Lot 541 Baldivis Road. Lot 105 and Lot 541 are owned by Australand. Lot 1000 has an option to be purchased by Bonvest, Australand’s Joint Venture partner. Lot 562 and Lot 129, which adjoin the northern side of the east west portion of the road, are owned by Peet Ltd.

4. **Implications to Consider**

   a. **Consultation with the Community**

   A Public Notice was placed in a local newspaper advertising the proposed closure. No public submissions were received.

   b. **Consultation with Government agencies**

   The proposed road closure was advertised for 35 days in accordance with the Land Administration Act 1997. Advertising closed on the 2nd September 2010 with submissions received from Main Roads, Water Corporation, Western Power, Department of Planning and the City’s Engineering Services. No objections were raised. No submission was received from Telstra.

   Main Roads WA advised that it has no objections to the proposal, providing that Council complies with the requirements of Section 3.50 of the Local Government Act 1995. Main Roads WA also noted that the proposed road closure may affect minor signing and pavement marking and has requested that Council investigate the need to modify the existing and/or install additional minor signing and pavement marking to complement the proposal. Section 3.50 of the Local Government Act 1995 has been satisfied through the advertising process undertaken. The City’s site visit did not reveal any impacts of the proposal on road signing or pavement marking and given the road is unconstructed there are no implications.

   Western Power has no objection to the proposal and notes its infrastructure is within and traversing the above road reserve. Western Power advised that any of its requirements would be imposed upon the subdivision/amalgamation of the land.

   The Water Corporation and the Department of Planning both raised no objection to the road reserve closure.

   c. **Strategic**

   The proposal falls within Functional Area 3 - Land Use & the Environment in Council’s Strategic Plan under the scope of Land Use Planning.
d. Policy
Nil

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
The responsibility for determining applications for the closure of road reserves rests with the Minister for Lands, on advice from Landgate.

5. Comments
The City’s Engineering Services advised of its support for the proposed closure of this section of road reserve but did note that Lot 541 Baldivis Road, Baldivis would no longer have frontage to a road reserve should the road reserve be closed. Development Planning Strategies has advised that Australand Holdings Ltd is prepared to amalgamate Lot 541 with Lot 105 Baldivis Road, which are both in its ownership.

It is recommended that the Council request the Minister for Lands to proceed with the proposed road closure accordingly, subject to the amalgamation of lots 105 and 541.

6. Voting Requirements
Simple Majority.

7. Officer Recommendation
That Council REQUEST the approval of the Minister for Lands, to proceed with the road closure of an unnamed road reserve, adjacent to Lot 1000 (No.409) Baldivis Road, Baldivis, pursuant to Section 58 of the Land Administration Act 1997, subject to Australand Holdings Ltd amalgamating Lots 541 and 105 Baldivis Road.

8. Committee Recommendation
That Council REQUEST the approval of the Minister for Lands, to proceed with the road closure of an unnamed road reserve, adjacent to Lot 1000 (No.409) Baldivis Road, Baldivis, pursuant to Section 58 of the Land Administration Act 1997, subject to Australand Holdings Ltd amalgamating Lots 541 and 105 Baldivis Road.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation
Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation
Not applicable.
11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Warner

That Council REQUEST the approval of the Minister for Lands, to proceed with the road closure of an unnamed road reserve, adjacent to Lot 1000 (No.409) Baldivis Road, Baldivis, pursuant to Section 58 of the Land Administration Act 1997, subject to Australand Holdings Ltd amalgamating Lots 541 and 105 Baldivis Road.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
## Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee

### Corporate and Engineering Services

**Corporate Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-003/10 Application for Rating Exemption - 32 Tesla Road, Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RTV/1-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms A Gumina, Senior Rates Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>32 Tesla Road, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

To seek Council’s Approval to grant a rating exemption to South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.

### 2. Background

Correspondence has been received from South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc. seeking rating exemption on property they own that is being used to run an number of early intervention programs for young people who have offended or are at risk of offending.
3. **Details**

The following documents have been received from South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc:
1. Constitution of South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.
2. Notice of Charitable Status

4. **Implications to consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   - Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   - Nil

c. **Strategic**
   - Nil

d. **Policy**
   - Nil

e. **Financial**
   - The total rates levied for the 2010/11 financial year are $6,482.30, and will need to be written off if council approves the rating exemption.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   - Under Section 6.26 (2) (g) of the Local Government Act 1995, land used exclusively for charitable purposes is not rateable land.

5. **Comments**

A legal opinion was obtained as to whether the South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc. would be entitled to a rate exemption on their property pursuant to Section 6.26 (2)(g) of the Local Government Act. It was considered based on the information supplied by South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc that it satisfies the requirements of Section 6.26 (2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995 in that the property is being used exclusively for charitable purposes.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority.

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council:
1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption of the following property owned by South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc:
   - 32 Tesla Road, Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)
   - as it is non rateable pursuant to Section 6.26 (2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2010.

2. **WRITE OFF** rates totalling $6,482.30 for the 2010/11 financial year as follows:
   - $6,482.30 on 32 Tesla Road Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption of the following property owned by *South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc*:
   32 Tesla Road, Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)
   as it is non rateable pursuant to Section 6.26 (2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2010.

2. **WRITE OFF** rates totalling $6,482.30 for the 2010/11 financial year as follows:
   - $6,482.30 on 32 Tesla Road Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption of the following property owned by *South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc*:
   32 Tesla Road, Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)
   as it is non rateable pursuant to Section 6.26 (2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2010.

2. **WRITE OFF** rates totalling $6,482.30 for the 2010/11 financial year as follows:
   - $6,482.30 on 32 Tesla Road Rockingham (Assessment No 349812)

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
Corporate and Engineering Services  
Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-004/10 Monthly Financial Management Report for September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no:</td>
<td>FLM/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms Vanisha Govender, Financial Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Monthly Financial Management Report for September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Purpose of Report**

To receive the monthly Financial Management Report for September 2010.

2. **Background**

Nil.

3. **Details**

The monthly Financial Management Report includes the following:

1. Statement of Financial Activity by Program
2. Statement of Net Current Assets
3. Other schedules and charts for management information purposes.
4. **Implications to consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   N/A

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   N/A

c. **Strategic**
   Nil

d. **Policy**
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   Major variances (above $250,000) between budget estimates and actual results for the month to which the statement relates are shown in the supporting documentation.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

5. **Comments**

The majority of the variances reported for the month are as a result of timing differences between the monthly budgets and actual figures however the annual budget to actual is on track. Major changes to the budget have been addressed in the Quarterly Budget Review.

Revenue from Tip Entry Fees is significantly under budget and this has been addressed in the Quarterly Budget Review.

The audit of the Annual Financial Statements has not been finalised and as such depreciation has not been allocated this financial year.

6. **Voting requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer recommendation**


8. **Committee Recommendation**


   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin


Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
## Corporate and Engineering Services

### Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-005/10</th>
<th>List of Payments for October 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no:</td>
<td>FLM/157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Wayne Smith, Coordinator Financial Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributors:</td>
<td>Miss Narelle Fisher, Senior Accounts Payable Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council's role in this matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot area:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maps/diagrams:</th>
<th>List of Payments for October 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Purpose of Report

1. **Purpose of Report**

   To present a list of payments made under Delegated Authority for confirmation of Council.

### Background

2. **Background**

   Nil

### Details

3. **Details**

   Nil
4. Implications to consider
   a. Consultation with the Community
      N/A
   b. Consultation with Government agencies
      N/A
   c. Strategic
      Nil
   d. Policy
      Nil
   e. Financial
      Nil
   f. Legal and Statutory
      Regulation 13 (1) & (3) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires a list of payments made under Delegated Authority to be prepared each month and presented to the Council at the next ordinary meeting of Council.

5. Comments
   Nil

6. Voting requirements
   Simple Majority.

7. Officer recommendation
   That Council RECEIVE the attached List of Payments for October 2010 totalling $9,327,666.16 paid under Delegated Authority, in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

8. Committee Recommendation
   That Council RECEIVE the attached List of Payments for October 2010 totalling $9,327,666.16 paid under Delegated Authority, in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.
   Committee Voting - 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation
   Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation
    Not applicable.
11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin
That Council RECEIVE the attached List of Payments for October 2010 totalling $9,327,666.16 paid under Delegated Authority, in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

Carried - 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

Reference No & Subject: CS-006/10 October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review

File no: FLM/17-04
Proponent/s: City of Rockingham
Author: Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services
Other contributors: Ms Pamela Donnelly, Accounting Services Officer
Date of Committee meeting: 16 November 2010
Previously before Council: 
Disclosure of interest: 
Nature of Council’s role in this matter: Executive Function

Site: 
Lot area: 
Attachments: October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review
Maps/diagrams: 

1. Purpose of Report

To present the October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review for Council’s consideration and to seek Council’s authorisation of the budget amendments arising from the review.

2. Background

The City of Rockingham undertakes quarterly budget reviews to monitor its financial performance against the annual budget and to review projections to the end of the financial year. Any variations to the annual budget arising from the review process are presented for Council’s consideration and authorisation.
3. Details

The October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review includes details of transactions during the July - September period and adjustments required to the annual budget. The document includes the following information,

1. Summary of Budget Position
2. Detailed statement of Operating Income & Expenditure by Department
3. Detailed statement of Non Operating Income & Expenditure.
4. Detailed statement at Work Order level.

4. Implications to consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   N/A
b. Consultation with Government agencies
   N/A
c. Strategic
   Nil
d. Policy
   Nil
e. Financial
   The net result of the Quarterly Budget Review is an anticipated surplus of $91,573.

f. Legal and Statutory

   Clause 33A of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires local governments to undertake a budget review between 1 January and 31 March in each financial year. Within 30 days of the review being completed it is to be presented to Council. Council is to consider the review submitted and is to determine (by absolute majority) whether or not to adopt the review, any parts of the review or any recommendations made in the review. Within 30 days after a council has made a determination, a copy of the review and determination is to be provided to the Department of Local Government.

   As the City of Rockingham undertakes quarterly budget reviews this review is additional to the statutory requirement and as such will not be sent to the Department.

5. Comments

The major changes resulting from the Quarterly Budget Review are summarised below:

- Opening Position – The Adopted Budget included an estimated opening position of $9,526,387 however, following the preparation of the Annual Financial Report for last financial year, this figure has been revised up to $12,621,629. Although the audit of the Annual Financial Statements is not yet complete, major changes to the opening position are not expected.

- Operating Revenue – There is an increase in operating revenue of $894,183 which is despite a reduction of $2,085,000 in anticipated income from Tip Entry Fees. The additional revenue is primarily from additional grant funds being recognised including $650,000 under the Emergency Services Levy and $570,000 for roads. Other revenue includes $468,000...
from the Autumn Centre and $553,000 contributions from developers for Anstey Park, not included in the Adopted Budget.

- Operating Expenditure – The overall increase in operating expenditure is $1,131,819 which includes $130,000 expenditure for Corporate Training and $631,585 for contributions under the Anstey Park Scheme not included in the Adopted Budget. A number of transfers of budget allocations have occurred to simplify the financial reporting systems including in the areas of road maintenance and Community Grants.

- Non Operating Revenue - The increase in Non Operating Revenue is $1,397,106 which is largely due to transfers from Reserves for road works including $1,000,000 for the Mundijong Road Extension.

- Non Operating Expenditure – The overall increase in Non Operating Expenditure is $3,554,034 which includes $460,000 for asset purchases under the Emergency Services Levy, $1,750,000 for transfers to Reserves, and $1,000,000 for the Mundijong Road Extension.

The overall result is an anticipated surplus of $91,573 however there are a number of minor variances throughout the statements that will be addressed during the next quarterly review process.

6. Voting requirements

Absolute Majority.

7. Officer recommendation

That Council **ADOPT** the October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review and **AMEND** the budget accordingly.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review
   - allocate $42,900 for the Harmony Parade, Singleton footpath
   - allocate $40,700 for the Wenn Road, Singleton footpath
   - allocate $15,400 for the Georgetown Drive (between Read Street and existing), Safety Bay footpath.

2. **AMEND** the budget accordingly.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

The Committee added to the Office Recommendation in order to bring forward the provision of footpath infrastructure by utilising the anticipated surplus.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
11. **Council Resolution**

*Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin*

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the October 2010 Quarterly Budget Review
   - allocate $42,900 for the Harmony Parade, Singleton footpath
   - allocate $40,700 for the Wenn Road, Singleton footpath
   - allocate $15,400 for the Georgetown Drive (between Read Street and existing), Safety Bay footpath.

2. **AMEND** the budget accordingly.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
1. **Purpose of Report**

This report seeks adoption of the 2011/12 to 2020/21 City Business Plan, covering a 10 year period. The details of the Plan are provided in the attached separate document to this report.

2. **Background**

A City Business Plan is prepared annually and is updated according to latest predictions. This is the second document of this type prepared.

3. **Details**

The City of Rockingham Business Plan places emphasis on new projects and asset preservation. Key Projects are as follows:
- Baldivis "Folly Road" District Sporting Complex totalling $21 million commencing in 2013/14
- Secret Harbour Surf Life Saving Club Redevelopment totalling $4 million commencing in 2012/13
- Construction of a new Depot in Southern Rockingham totalling $6 million commencing in 2014/15
- Acquisition of land in Baldivis totalling $5 million over 4 years commencing in 2014/15 to provide adequate public open space.
- Redevelopment of the Rockingham Aquatic Centre totalling $11 million in 2018/19
- Construction of Mundijong Rd totalling $12 million commencing in 2011/12
- Building Maintenance (asset rejuvenation) of $31.5 million over 10 years
- Roads and Parks capital improvement program of $81.5 million over 10 years
- Construction of further buildings to support required staff in 2017/18 totalling $24 million.
- City Centre Infrastructure works totalling $10 million commencing in 2014/15
- Construction of Secret Harbour Library in 2016/17 totalling $3 million
- Construction of the Baldivis Library and Community Centre totalling $11.65 million commencing in 2011/12.

The Plan includes information and projections current as at November 2010.

A summary type format is utilised with all projects being included on a simplified single sheet so that Councillors can see all the projects together.

Council is requested to adopt the plan, which will indicate the various projects to then be taken into account for the 2011/12 operational budget year and provide direction on future years activities.

4. **Implications to consider**

   a. **Consultation with the Community**
      Nil
   b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
      Nil
   c. **Strategic**
      The City Business Plan provides financial context to the Strategic Goals of the City of Rockingham
   d. **Policy**
      Nil
   e. **Financial**
      The City Business Plan indicates the financial position of the Council for the next 10 years and is one of the most important planning documents that Council needs to consider. It provides a broad framework for major activities to be undertaken.

      As much as possible all the financial implications are shown on a single sheet, for simplicity purposes and for ease of reading. It should be noted that the City remains in a strong financial position.

      This plan includes major facilities that need to either be maintained or constructed. Specifically annual allocations have been made towards building rejuvenation totalling some $31.5 million over the duration of the plan. Further it provides a direction towards separation of Landfill revenues from other municipal revenues.
Little provision has been made to ensure acceptable levels of reserves for the Millar Rd Landfill facility to ensure no undue hardship occurs should the facility require closure. Unfortunately, given the current circumstance, little surplus revenue is available.

Debt management remains a significant challenge and it is recommended that where ever possible a debt servicing ratio not exceed 8% (debt serving ratio is the % of operating revenue that is allocated towards maintaining debt principal and interest payments). For the purposes of the plan landfill revenues have been excluded in this calculation. The plan provides for $45.5 million to be raised in loans over a 10 year period. For the majority of the plan this leaves debt servicing below the 8% figure.

Rates increases have been included at a rate yield of 9% for 5 years and 7% there after. In essence the average rate payer can expect an annual rate increase of between 7% and 9% to achieve a rate yield of 9%. Given the constantly shifting parameters of rating valuations an exact rate in the dollar change cannot be provided at this time.

Recent changes in state planning policies have allowed for local governments to collect revenue from “new” land parcels created within the City boundaries. Work has commenced within the City to utilise this method to raise revenue to assist in the construction of new Community Facilities. Given that the Developer Contributions Scheme is still a “work in progress” assumptions have been made to estimate revenue yield from this system. The revenues predicted are substantial and require monitoring when implemented. Should the Developer Contribution Scheme not be implemented as predicted this will substantially affect the timing of major community infrastructure projects including the Baldivis Library and Baldivis District Sporting Complex.

The proposed Developer Contributions Scheme is generating income that will pay debt. This falls outside the City Debt Servicing Ratio calculations and should the scheme not meet targets, the loans need to be funded via other revenue sources.

f. Legal and Statutory
Nil

5. Comments

As Councillors are aware, there were numerous projects that needed to be considered and every effort has been made to include as many of those as appears financially possible. Where excluded it was done on the grounds related to strategic need, provisions already provided for by others or simple inability to fund with current revenue trends.

Council needs to understand the role that the Developer Contributions Scheme has in funding future projects. In essence, without the Scheme being adopted and implemented, major infrastructure (particularly in Baldivis) will be delayed until other revenue sources can be found. Whilst confident that what is proposed is achievable some timing parts of the scheme fall outside City of Rockingham control.

While the Council is faced with some financial challenges it is still in a strong financial position. Emphasis needs to be made on the need to replace assets and building facilities which are crucial to the running of the organisation and create a situation where Council is able to reduce or maintain an appropriate debt position whilst still bolstering its cash reserves.

It should be noted that the figures are indicative only and many options have been considered, alternatives tried, as well as detailed analysis made of various items. The Plan includes information and projections current as at November, 2010.

A summary type format is utilised with all projects being included on a simplified single sheet so that Councillors can see all the projects together.

With strong strategic and financial management, Council has the ability to achieve significant outcomes for the City. Although funds for the next few years are tight, with correct allocations and
strong financial projections the latter half of the plan represents financial prosperity for the City of Rockingham.

6. Voting requirements

Simple Majority.

7. Officer recommendation

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the City of Rockingham - City Business Plan 2011/12 – 2020/21, inclusive of any amendments passed at this meeting.
2. **ENDORSE** a minimum 9% increase in rate yield for the financial years 2011/12 to 2015/16.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the City of Rockingham - City Business Plan 2011/12 – 2020/21, inclusive of any amendments passed at this meeting.
2. **ENDORSE** a minimum 9% increase in rate yield for the financial years 2011/12 to 2015/16.
3. **REVIEW** the minimum increase in rate yield at the April 2011 Council Meeting in conjunction with the adoption of the 2011/12 to 2020/21 City Business Plan.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

The Committee added to the Officer Recommendation in order to allow further consideration of the rate yield during the review of the City Business Plan in April 2011.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Stewart

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the City of Rockingham - City Business Plan 2011/12 – 2020/21, inclusive of any amendments passed at this meeting, subject to land rate increases not exceeding 7%
2. **REVIEW** the City Business plan in April 2011.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Council amended the Committee Recommendation to ensure that land rate increases did not exceed 7%.
1. **Purpose of Report**

The Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation has requested that the City of Rockingham amend Part 5 - **Dog Prohibited Areas** of the **Dog Amendment Local Law 2010**. These amendments have been made and are presented to Council for approval.

2. **Background**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 24 August 2010, Council ratified the City of Rockingham **Dog Amendment Local Law 2010**. This amendment local law was gazetted on Friday 10 September 2010 and a copy of the gazetted amendment local law and associated documentation was then sent to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation.
On 13 October 2010, the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation wrote to the City requesting changes to the amended clause 5.1 - **Dog Prohibited Areas** of the *Dog Amendment Local Law 2010*. Specifically, the City was informed that it could not use the phrase “as indicated by a sign or signs” to define areas where dogs are prohibited. Areas where dogs are permitted needed to be specified, with reserves and parks actually listed.

### 3. Details

After discussions with Officers from the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation, minor changes have been made and **Schedule 4 - Dog Exercise Areas**, which lists all areas where dogs are permitted, has been added to the Local Law. In addition the wording in clauses 5.1 and 5.2 has been amended.

As the sitting sessions of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation and the Council of the City of Rockingham do not run concurrently, the City will provide the Joint Standing Committee with draft copies of its agendas and minutes to show the Council's timeline for approving these amendments.

### 4. Implications to consider

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Not required

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   
   Substantial consultation with Officers from the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation has taken place.

c. **Strategic**
   
   In accordance with Organisational Performance – Corporate Governance

d. **Policy**
   
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   
   An allocation of $10,000 for new and local law amendments has been included in the 2010/11 Budget (account 210018.1457).

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   

### 5. Comments

A Schedule showing the marked amendments to Section 5.1 and Section 5.2 of the City of Rockingham Local Law 2000 is attached to the back of this Report.

### 6. Voting requirements

Absolute majority

### 7. Officer recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** and **ADOPT** the amendments to the City of Rockingham Dog Amendment Local Law 2010 as follows:
Under the powers conferred by the Local Government Act 1995 and the Dog Act 1976 and under all other powers, the Council of the City of Rockingham resolved on 23 November 2010 to make the following local law.

1. Citation
This local law may be cited as the City of Rockingham Dogs Amendment Local Law 2010.

2. Commencement
This local law comes into operation 14 days after the date of publication in the Government Gazette.

3. Principal local law
In this local law, the City of Rockingham Dogs Local Law 2000 published in the Government Gazette on 4 December 2000 is referred to as the principal local law. The principle local law is amended.

4. Clause 5.1 amended
In subclause (1), delete paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) and insert -

(c) a food business as defined by section 10 of the Food Health Act 2008 (WA) including “dining and drinking areas” as stated in Standard 3.2.2, Clause 24 of the National Foods Standards Code;

(d) a public swimming pool;

(e) any public beach except those listed in Schedule 4 - Dog Exercise Areas; and

(f) any public reserve except those listed in Schedule 4 - Dog Exercise Areas.

5. Clause 5.2 amended
In subclause (1), delete paragraph and insert -

1. Subject to clause 5.1 and subclause (2) of this clause, for the purposes of sections 31 and 32 of the Act, Schedule 4 - Dog Exercise Areas lists all dog exercise areas - beaches, reserves and freehold land either owned or under the care, control and management of the local government as indicated by sign or signs.

6. Schedule 4 amended
Insert -

Schedule 4

DOG EXERCISE AREAS

(Clauses 5.1 and 5.2)

ROCKINGHAM

Andromeda Wind Park
Anniversary Park Volume 1 and 2
Antilla Place Reserve
Aries Court
Ashford Avenue Reserve
Bayview Reserve
Benjamin Way Reserve
Bungaree Oval
Careeba Park
Casserley/Seabrooke
Catalpa
Christison Way Reserve
Derwent Park
Diamantina Reserve
Dixon Road Conservation Area/Patterson Road
Dixon Road Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Dowling Street Reserve
Falcon Reserve
Governor Reserve
Haselmere Circus Reserve
Hercules Street Windbreak
Houston Reserve
Lewington Reserve
Lynx Way Reserve
Naval Memorial Park Volume 1 and 2
Rockingham Oval Volume 1 and 2
Rosewood
Seabrooke Reserve
Sepia Court Reserve
Stan Twight Reserve Volume 1, 2 and 3
Sycamore Park
The Esplanade - Fisher to Hymus
Warramunga Reserve

COOLOONGUP
Alf Powell Reserve
Breaden Drive Reserve
Deanne A Reserve
Deanna B Reserve
Elanora Drive
Glencoe Reserve
Grange Reserve
Hourglass Reserve
Madison Place Reserve
Paul Garnett Oval
St Michaels Reserve
Solquest Park

SAFETY BAY
Bequia Reserve
Catalina Reserve
Costa Rica Reserve
Janet Park
Forrester Road Reserve
Georgetown Drive Reserve
Gumnut Reserve
Malibu A, Malibu B
Malibu C, Malibu D
Mayfield Crescent
Nettleton Way Reserve
Panama Place Reserve

CONFIRMED AT A COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

MAYOR (B W SAMMELS)
Royal Road Reserve
Safety Bay Foreshore – Berry to June
Safety Bay Foreshore – Carlisle to Berry
Safety Bay Foreshore – June to Malibu
Wallsend Street Reserve
Wilson Park
HILLMAN
Calume Street Buffer Zone
Ennis/Dixon Road Reserve
Gabyon Park

SECRET HARBOUR
Secret Harbour Foreshore
Secret Harbour Oval

SHOALWATER
Apex Reserve
Shoalwater Oval

WARNBRO
Balaka Reserve
Bristol Reserve
Cadbury Street Reserve
Cannes Place Reserve
Dress Circle
Indigo Reserve
La Seyne Reserve
Galway Gardens Reserve
Orleans Drive Reserve
Swallowtail Reserve Drainage
Tarwarri Park
The Bay Foreshore Warnbro
Torbay Mews Reserve
Torcross Reserve
Turner Street Reserve
Warnbro Beach Road to Francis
Warnbro Parklands
Warnbro Recreation Centre/Oval – Volume 1 and 2
Welch Way Reserve

GOLDEN BAY
George Foster Reserve
Golden Bay Foreshore
Sawley Close Nature Reserve
Tangadee Reserve

SINGLETON
Beacon Reserve
Bight Reefs Reserve
Singleton Reserve
Whitehead Reserve
8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** and **ADOPT** the amendments to the City of Rockingham Dog Amendment Local Law 2010 as follows:

   **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995**
   **DOG ACT 1976**
CITY OF ROCKINGHAM

Dogs Amendment Local Law 2010

Under the powers conferred by the Local Government Act 1995 and the Dog Act 1976 and under all other powers, the Council of the City of Rockingham resolved on 23 November 2010 to make the following local law.

1. Citation
This local law may be cited as the City of Rockingham Dogs Amendment Local Law 2010.

2. Commencement
This local law comes into operation 14 days after the date of publication in the Government Gazette.

3. Principal local law
In this local law, the City of Rockingham Dogs Local Law 2000 published in the Government Gazette on 4 December 2000 is referred to as the principal local law. The principle local law is amended.

4. Clause 5.1 amended
In subclause (1), delete paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) and insert -

(c) a food business as defined by section 10 of the Food Health Act 2008 (WA) including “dining and drinking areas” as stated in Standard 3.2.2, Clause 24 of the National Foods Standards Code;

(d) a public swimming pool;

(e) any public beach except those listed in Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas; and

(f) any public reserve except those listed in Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas.

5. Clause 5.2 amended
In subclause (1), delete paragraph and insert -

1. Subject to clause 5.1 and subclause (2) of this clause, for the purposes of sections 31 and 32 of the Act, Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas lists all dog exercise areas - beaches, reserves and freehold land either owned or under the care, control and management of the local government as indicated by sign or signs.

6. Schedule 4 amended
Insert -

Schedule 4

DOG EXERCISE AREAS

(Clauses 5.1 and 5.2)

ROCKINGHAM

Andromeda Wind Park
Anniversary Park Volume 1 and 2
Antilla Place Reserve
Aries Court
Ashford Avenue Reserve
Bayview Reserve
Benjamin Way Reserve
Bungaree Oval
Careeba Park
Casserley/Seabrooke
Catalpa
Christison Way Reserve
Derwent Park
Diamantina Reserve
Dixon Road Conservation Area/Patterson Road
Dixon Road Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Dowling Street Reserve
Falcon Reserve
Governor Reserve
Haselmere Circus Reserve
Hercules Street Windbreak
Houston Reserve
Lewington Reserve
Lynx Way Reserve
Naval Memorial Park Volume 1 and 2
Rockingham Oval Volume 1 and 2
Rosewood
Seabrooke Reserve
Sepia Court Reserve
Stan Twight Reserve Volume 1, 2 and 3
Sycamore Park
The Esplanade – Fisher to Hymus
Warramunga Reserve

COOLOONGUP
Alf Powell Reserve
Breaden Drive Reserve
Deanne A Reserve
Deanna B Reserve
Elanora Drive
Glencoe Reserve
Grange Reserve
Hourglass Reserve
Madison Place Reserve
Paul Garnett Oval
St Michaels Reserve
Solquest Park

SAFETY BAY
Bequia Reserve
Catalina Reserve
Costa Rica Reserve
Janet Park
Forrester Road Reserve
Georgetown Drive Reserve
Gumnut Reserve
Malibu A, Malibu B
Malibu C, Malibu D
Mayfield Crescent
Nettleton Way Reserve
Panama Place Reserve
Royal Road Reserve
Safety Bay Foreshore – Berry to June
Safety Bay Foreshore – Carlisle to Berry
Safety Bay Foreshore – June to Malibu
Wallsend Street Reserve
Wilson Park

HILLMAN
Calume Street Buffer Zone
Ennis/Dixon Road Reserve
Gabyon Park

SECRET HARBOUR
Secret Harbour Foreshore
Secret Harbour Oval

SHOALWATER
Apex Reserve
Shoalwater Oval

WARNBRO
Balaka Reserve
Bristol Reserve
Cadbury Street Reserve
Cannes Place Reserve
Dress Circle
Indigo Reserve
La Seyne Reserve
Galway Gardens Reserve
Orleans Drive Reserve
Swallowtail Reserve Drainage
Tarwarri Park
The Bay Foreshore Warnbro
Torbay Mews Reserve
Torcross Reserve
Turner Street Reserve
Warnbro Beach Road to Francis
Warnbro Parklands
Warnbro Recreation Centre/Oval - Volume 1 and 2
Welch Way Reserve

GOLDEN BAY
George Foster Reserve
Golden Bay Foreshore
Sawley Close Nature Reserve
Tangadee Reserve

SINGLETON
Beacon Reserve
Bight Reefs Reserve
Singleton Reserve
Whitehead Reserve
BALDIVIS
Baldivis Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Trusty Park

PERON
Peron Park
Point Peron Foreshore

WAIKIKI
Blair Court Reserve
Fairview Reserve
Java Park
Lakemba Reserve
Gidgi Way Reserve
Gnangara Oval'
Hinds Court Reserve
Mornington Reserve
Rand Avenue Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Santa Monica Reserve
Seahaven Reserve
Shelton Street
Waikiki Foreshore - Malibu to Warnbro Beach Road

PORT KENNEDY
Majestic Close Reserve
St Raphael Reserve
Veterans Memorial Park - Endeavour Drive

BEACH EXERCISE AREAS
1. The public beach bounded on the east by Rockingham Road, on the north by the northern boundary of the district, and on the west by a prolongation of Weld Street.
2. The public beach bounded on the east by Hymus Street and extending generally in a westerly direction and then in a southerly direction and bounded on the south by Boundary Road.
3. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of McLarty Road, on the east by Arcadia Drive and on the south by the northern boundary of Mersey Point carpark.
4. The public beach bounded on the west from the eastern side of the Bent Street boat ramp, on the north by Safety Bay Road and on the east from the western side of the Donald Drive boat ramp.
5. The public beach bounded on the north by, and 40 metres to the north, of a prolongation of Shelton Street, on the east by Blakey and Fendham Streets and on the south by a prolongation of St Malo Close.
6. The public beach bounded on the north by the northern-most part of Capella Pass carpark beach access and extending generally in a southerly direction for a distance of 1km.
7. The public beach bounded on the north by the boundary of Port Kennedy and Secret Harbour and in a southerly direction to the public beach access of Siracusa Court carpark.
8. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of Crystaluna Drive and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 500 metres.
9. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of Bight Reefs Road and extending in a southerly direction to the southern boundary of the district.
Dated: 23 November 2010.
The Common Seal of the City of Rockingham was affixed by authority of a resolution of the Council in the presence of-

BARRY SAMMELS, Mayor

ANDREW HAMMOND, Chief Executive Officer

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

The Committee added to the Officer Recommendation to include the dog beach exercise areas in the Local Law.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin

That Council:

1. APPROVE and ADOPT the amendments to the City of Rockingham Dog Amendment Local Law 2010 as follows:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995

DOG ACT 1976

CITY OF ROCKINGHAM

Dogs Amendment Local Law 2010

Under the powers conferred by the Local Government Act 1995 and the Dog Act 1976 and under all other powers, the Council of the City of Rockingham resolved on 23 November 2010 to make the following local law.

1. Citation

This local law may be cited as the City of Rockingham Dogs Amendment Local Law 2010.

2. Commencement

This local law comes into operation 14 days after the date of publication in the Government Gazette.

3. Principal local law

In this local law, the City of Rockingham Dogs Local Law 2000 published in the Government Gazette on 4 December 2000 is referred to as the principal local law. The principle local law is amended.

4. Clause 5.1 amended

In subclause (1), delete paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) and insert -
(c) a food business as defined by section 10 of the Food Health Act 2008 (WA) including “dining and drinking areas” as stated in Standard 3.2.2, Clause 24 of the National Foods Standards Code;

(d) a public swimming pool;

(e) any public beach except those listed in Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas; and

(f) any public reserve except those listed in Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas.

5. Clause 5.2 amended

In subclause (1), delete paragraph and insert -

1. Subject to clause 5.1 and subclause (2) of this clause, for the purposes of sections 31 and 32 of the Act, Schedule 4 – Dog Exercise Areas lists all dog exercise areas – beaches, reserves and freehold land either owned or under the care, control and management of the local government as indicated by sign or signs.

6. Schedule 4 amended

Insert –

Schedule 4

DOG EXERCISE AREAS

(Clauses 5.1 and 5.2)

ROCKINGHAM
Andromeda Wind Park
Anniversary Park Volume 1 and 2
Antilla Place Reserve
Aries Court
Ashford Avenue Reserve
Bayview Reserve
Benjamin Way Reserve
Bungaree Oval
Careeba Park
Casserley/Seabrooke
Catalpa
Christison Way Reserve
Derwent Park
Diamantina Reserve
Dixon Road Conservation Area/Patterson Road
Dixon Road Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Dowling Street Reserve
Falcon Reserve
Governor Reserve
Haselmere Circus Reserve
Hercules Street Windbreak
Houston Reserve
Lewington Reserve
Lynx Way Reserve
Naval Memorial Park Volume 1 and 2
Rockingham Oval Volume 1 and 2
Rosewood
Seabrooke Reserve
Sepia Court Reserve
Stan Twight Reserve Volume 1, 2 and 3
Sycamore Park
The Esplanade – Fisher to Hymus
Warramunga Reserve

COOLOONGUP
Alf Powell Reserve
Breaden Drive Reserve
Deanne A Reserve
Deanna B Reserve
Elanora Drive
Glencoe Reserve
Grange Reserve
Hourglass Reserve
Madison Place Reserve
Paul Garnett Oval
St Michaels Reserve
Solquest Park

SAFETY BAY
Bequia Reserve
Catalina Reserve
Costa Rica Reserve
Janet Park
Forrester Road Reserve
Georgetown Drive Reserve
Gumnut Reserve
Malibu A, Malibu B
Malibu C, Malibu D
Mayfield Crescent
Nettleton Way Reserve
Panama Place Reserve
Royal Road Reserve
Safety Bay Foreshore – Berry to June
Safety Bay Foreshore – Carlisle to Berry
Safety Bay Foreshore – June to Malibu
Wallsend Street Reserve
Wilson Park

HILLMAN
Calume Street Buffer Zone
Ennis/Dixon Road Reserve
Gabyon Park

SECRET HARBOUR
Secret Harbour Foreshore
Secret Harbour Oval

SHOALWATER
Apex Reserve
Shoalwater Oval

WARNBRO
Balaka Reserve
Bristol Reserve
Cadbury Street Reserve
Cannes Place Reserve
Dress Circle
Indigo Reserve
La Seyne Reserve
Galway Gardens Reserve
Orleans Drive Reserve
Swallowtail Reserve Drainage
Tarwarri Park
The Bay Foreshore Warnbro
Torbay Mews Reserve
Torcross Reserve
Turner Street Reserve
Warnbro Beach Road to Francis
Warnbro Parklands
Warnbro Recreation Centre/Oval – Volume 1 and 2
Welch Way Reserve

GOLDEN BAY
George Foster Reserve
Golden Bay Foreshore
Sawley Close Nature Reserve
Tangadee Reserve

SINGLETON
Beacon Reserve
Bight Reefs Reserve
Singleton Reserve
Whitehead Reserve

BALDIVIS
Baldivis Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Trusty Park

PERON
Peron Park
Point Peron Foreshore

WAIKIKI
Blair Court Reserve
Fairview Reserve
Java Park
Lakemba Reserve
Gidgi Way Reserve
Gnangara Oval'
Hinds Court Reserve
Mornington Reserve
Rand Avenue Reserve Volume 1 and 2
Santa Monica Reserve
BEACH EXERCISE AREAS
10. The public beach bounded on the east by Rockingham Road, on the north by the northern boundary of the district, and on the west by a prolongation of Weld Street.
11. The public beach bounded on the east by Hymus Street and extending generally in a westerly direction and then in a southerly direction and bounded on the south by Boundary Road.
12. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of McLarty Road, on the east by Arcadia Drive and on the south by the northern boundary of Mersey Point carpark.
13. The public beach bounded on the west from the eastern side of the Bent Street boat ramp, on the north by Safety Bay Road and on the east from the western side of the Donald Drive boat ramp.
14. The public beach bounded on the north by, and 40 metres to the north, of a prolongation of Shelton Street, on the east by Blakey and Fendham Streets and on the south by a prolongation of St Malo Close.
15. The public beach bounded on the north by the northern-most part of Capella Pass carpark beach access and extending generally in a southerly direction for a distance of 1km.
16. The public beach bounded on the north by the boundary of Port Kennedy and Secret Harbour and in a southerly direction to the public beach access of Siracusa Court carpark.
17. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of Crystaluna Drive and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 500 metres.
18. The public beach bounded on the north by a prolongation of Bight Reefs Road and extending in a southerly direction to the southern boundary of the district.

Dated: 23 November 2010.
The Common Seal of the City of Rockingham was affixed by authority of a resolution of the Council in the presence of-

BARRY SAMMELS, Mayor

ANDREW HAMMOND, Chief Executive Officer

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
CONFIRMED AT A COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

MAYOR (B W SAMMELS)

Corporate & Engineering Services
Occasional & Advisory Committee Minutes
Economic Development Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>ED 003/10 Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee (REDAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no:</td>
<td>ECD/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>26 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>1 Councillor, 6 Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>Executive Support – Chief Executive Office Division - Economic Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes of the REDAC Committee Meeting held on 26 October 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

That Council receive the minutes of the REDAC Committee meeting held on 26 2010 for information.

2. **Recommendations to Standing Committee**

2.1 **Recommendation 1: Strategic Metropolitan Centres**

**Advisory Committee recommendation:**

That Council INVITE Mr Gary Prattley, Chairman of WA Planning Commission, to give a presentation to the REDAC Committee on the State Government priorities for Strategic Metropolitan Centres.
Implications to consider

a. Strategic
   Nil

b. Policy
   Nil

c. Financial
   Nil

d. Legal and Statutory
   Nil

e. Voting requirements
   Simple Majority

Officer comments & recommendation if different to Committee recommendation
Nil

2.2 Recommendation 2: REDAC Committee Membership

Advisory Committee recommendation:
That Council **APPROVE** the appointment of Captain Brett Dowsing’s replacement to the REDAC Committee.

Implications to consider

a. Strategic
   Nil

b. Policy
   Nil

c. Financial
   Nil

d. Legal and Statutory
   Nil

e. Voting requirements
   Simple Majority

Officer comments & recommendation if different to Committee recommendation
Nil

3. Committee Recommendation

That Council
1. **RECEIVE** the minutes of the REDAC Committee meeting held on 26 2010 for information.
2. **INVITE** Mr Gary Prattley, Chairman of WA Planning Commission, to give a presentation to the REDAC Committee on the State Government priorities for Strategic Metropolitan Centres.
3. **APPROVE** the appointment of Captain Brett Dowsing’s replacement to the REDAC Committee.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**

   **Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin**

   That Council

   1. **RECEIVE** the minutes of the REDAC Committee meeting held on 26 2010 for information.
   2. **INVITE** Mr Gary Prattley, Chairman of WA Planning Commission, to give a presentation to the REDAC Committee on the State Government priorities for Strategic Metropolitan Centres.
   3. **APPROVE** the appointment of Captain Brett Dowsing’s replacement to the REDAC Committee.

   Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

   Not applicable.
1. **Purpose of Report**

This report provides information to Council regarding the feasibility of conducting an economic impact study regarding permanent retail trading on Sundays and Public Holidays.

2. **Background**

At its ordinary Meeting held on the 26 October 2010, Council resolved that a decision on its policy position on permanent Sunday and Public Holiday trading for the district of Rockingham be deferred and that costs be obtained to undertake an Economic Impact Study.

The City of Geraldton-Greenough undertook a similar exercise in 2009 and information has been obtained from this Council to assist with this report.
Rockingham Trading

The District of Rockingham is classified as a Holiday Resort which restricts Sunday trading, public holiday trading and week night trading to school holiday periods only.

The State Government has the ability to create ‘Special Trading Precincts’ which would allow retailers in those precincts to operate all year from:

- 8am - 9pm Weekdays
- 8am - 5pm Saturdays
- 11am - 5pm Sunday
- 8am - 5pm Public Holidays
  (other than Christmas Day, New Years Day (for the first year only), Anzac Day and Good Friday).

Currently areas within the local governments of Perth, Fremantle and Joondalup are classified as Special Trader Precinct. Areas within Midland and Armadale will be classified as Special Trader Precincts from 1 November 2010.

In summary, the difference between “Holiday Resort” status and “Special Trader Precinct” status is that under the “Special Trader Precinct” status permanent Sunday trading can occur all year rather than just during school holidays.

As of the 1 November 2010, due to changes in legislation, Rockingham retailers were be entitled to trade on all week nights until 9pm. Restrictions on Sunday and Public Holiday trading will continue in accordance with Holiday Resort classification.

3. Details

Pracsys Consultants was engaged by the City of Geraldton-Greenough to undertake an Economic Development Impact Assessment on retail trading impacts.

Three impacts were tested for the purpose of the Assessment, as follows:
- Shifts in shopping patterns and therefore demand for retail services
- Estimation of changes in turnover as a result of changes in shopping patterns
- Distribution of retail supply within the City

The methodology designed by the consultant included quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact that deregulation of trading hours would have.

A six stage methodology design was created to deliver the analysis, being:
1. Background information gathering
2. Profiling retail supply and distribution and employment provision
3. Modelling retail demand
4. Scenario modelling changes in retail services consumption periods
5. Estimate employment and expenditure impacts
6. Draft and final reports

The Impact Assessment concluded that deregulation of retail trading hours is a contentious issue and one that is difficult to resolve solely on the basis of an assessment of economic impacts.

The cost to the City of Geraldton-Greenough was in the vicinity of $35,000 plus GST
4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
The City has undertaken extensive consultation with the community, which was detailed in the Report presented to Council at its October meeting (refer ED-001/10 for full details).
   
   To gauge community perception on permanent Sunday trading, the City advertised for feedback over a 42-day consultation period.
   
   Data was gathered in three ways:
   
   - Tear-off section from the full page advertisement that appeared in the two local newspapers (Sound Telegraph on 18 August and 15 September 2010, and Weekend Courier on 20 August and 17 September 2010),
   
   - Email response (via the link on the City’s website and email address listed in the advertisement),
   
   - Online survey product.
   
   Respondents were requested to provide a yes/no response with a reason for their selection.
   
   The Corporate and Engineering Services Committee also received a deputation from the owner of the Port Kennedy IGA store, who tabled a petition seeking no changes to current Sunday trading arrangements.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Verbal discussion has occurred with various State Government officers to confirm information.

c. **Strategic**
   
   In accordance with Council Strategic Plan – Economic Development Strategy 2 – Increase the City’s competitiveness in attracting investment, business growth, tourism, education and employment.

d. **Policy**
   
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   
   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   
   The decision to grant permanent Sunday trading to the District of Rockingham rests with the Minister for Commerce in accordance with the Retail Trading Act (1987). The City of Rockingham has no statutory role in this matter but may request for precinct status changes. Should the City of Rockingham decide to support extended trading hours on Sundays and Public Holidays beyond those provided under its Resort Holiday classification, the Minister is likely to ask for evidence of consultation to demonstrate community support for the proposed changes.

5. **Comments**

The State Government’s new legislation allowing midweek extended trading for all retail outlets in the metropolitan region, including Rockingham, took effect from the 1 November 2010.

There has been considerable media commentary on the issue, with strong argument from those for and against the legislation.
Given that the State Government is currently reviewing its Policy position on Sunday trading hours, it is recommended that Council defer consideration of its position on this matter until the Policy and legislative changes being contemplated by the State are clearly understood.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority.

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. SEEK further information from the Minister for Commerce, the Honourable Bill Marmion, MLA, on the State Government’s agenda on extended trading hours on Sundays and request advice on any proposed changes to legislation on the matter.

2. DEFER consideration on a policy position for the City of Rockingham until such information from the State Government has been received and assessed.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. SEEK further information from the Minister for Commerce, the Honourable Bill Marmion, MLA, on the State Government’s agenda on extended trading hours on Sundays and request advice on any proposed changes to legislation on the matter.

2. DEFER consideration on a policy position for the City of Rockingham until such information from the State Government has been received and assessed.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable.

11. Council Resolution

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin

That Council:

1. SEEK further information from the Minister for Commerce, the Honourable Bill Marmion, MLA, on the State Government’s agenda on extended trading hours on Sundays and request advice on any proposed changes to legislation on the matter.

2. DEFER consideration on a policy position for the City of Rockingham until such information from the State Government has been received and assessed.

Carried – 10/0

12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
Corporate & Engineering Services  
Occasional & Advisory Committee Minutes  
Economic Development Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>ED 005/10 Global Friendship Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no:</td>
<td>ECD/1-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mat Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributors:</td>
<td>21 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>To coordinate Council’s global friendship relationships and related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>3 Councillors, 6 Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>Executive Support – Chief Executive Office Division - Economic Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td>Minutes of the Global Friendship Committee Meeting held on 21 October 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Receipt of Minutes
That Council receive the minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 21 October 2010 for information.

2. Recommendations to Standing Committee
There are no recommendations arising from the Global Friendship Committee Meeting.

3. Committee Recommendation
That Council **RECEIVE** the minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 21 October 2010 for information.

Committee Voting - 4/0
4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hamblin**

That Council *receive* the minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 21 October 2010 for information.

Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
## Reference No & Subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ED 006/10 Adoption of Logo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No:</th>
<th>ECD/73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponent/s:</th>
<th>City of Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Contributors:</th>
<th>Mr Bob Jeans, Acting Chief Executive Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Committee Meeting:</th>
<th>16 November 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously before Council:</th>
<th>CES130/7/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure of Interest:</th>
<th>Executive Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Council's Role in this Matter:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments:</th>
<th>Copy of Logo 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maps/Diagrams:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

For Council to adopt the City of Rockingham logo as circulated to Councillors on 29 October 2010.

### 2. Background

As a result of Council’s endorsement of the Brand Development Program in July 2010, the existing City of Rockingham logo has been modernised and refreshed.

### 3. Details

Three options were presented to Councillors on 29 October 2010. Voting revealed Logo 1 as the favourite.
4. **Implications to Consider**
   
a. **Consultation with the Community**
   Nil
   
b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   Nil
   
c. **Strategic**
   In line with the Economic Development Implementation Plan, Key Focus Area 2.1: Develop a comprehensive marketing strategy to review the Brand and the perceptions/mind-set position of the City of Rockingham, includes review of brand logo.
   
d. **Policy**
   Nil
   
e. **Financial**
   Appropriate funding for the development and launch of the logo has been allocated for in the 2010/2011 Budget. No funds have been allocated for changes to City stationary, facilities, street signs, building or entry statement signage.
   
f. **Legal and Statutory**
   Nil
   
5. **Comments**
   
A subsequent internal staff survey indicated Logo 1 (of the three possible versions) as the preferred option as well. Subject to adoption by Council, it is proposed to launch the new logo at a function on 1 December 2010 at Penguin Island.

The Brand Audit, currently being prepared by City Officers, will address the staged implementation of the refreshed logo across City infrastructure.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority.

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPT** Logo 1 as the City of Rockingham logo, as circulated to all Councillors on 29 October 2010.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPT** Logo 1 as the City of Rockingham logo, as circulated to all Councillors on 29 October 2010.

   Committee Voting – 3/1  (Cr P Ellis voted against)

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
**Motion**

**Moved Cr Smith, seconded Cr Ellis**

That Council *NOT SUPPORT* the adoption Logo 1 as the City of Rockingham logo.

Councillors having voted for the motion:  
Cr R Smith  
Cr J Stewart  
Cr A Prince  
Cr P Ellis  
Cr L Liley  

Councillors having voted against the motion:  
Cr B Sammels (2)  
Cr B Warner  
Cr D Hamblin  
Cr L Dodd  
Cr L Dunkling  

Lost - 5/6

**Note:** Due to an equality of votes at the Council meeting, the Mayor exercised his right to cast a second vote to reach a decision in this matter (Section 5.12(3) of the Local Government Act).

**11. Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Dodd, seconded Cr Hamblin**

That Council *ADOPT* Logo 1 as the City of Rockingham logo, as circulated to all Councillors on 29 October 2010.

Councillors having voted for the motion:  
Cr B Sammels (2)  
Cr B Warner  
Cr D Hamblin  
Cr L Dodd  
Cr L Dunkling  

Councillors having voted against the motion:  
Cr R Smith  
Cr J Stewart  
Cr A Prince  
Cr P Ellis  
Cr L Liley  

Carried - 6/5

**Note:** Due to an equality of votes at the Council meeting, the Mayor exercised his right to cast a second vote to reach a decision in this matter (Section 5.12(3) of the Local Government Act).

**12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
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Reference No & Subject: EP-011/10 Rockingham Committee RoadWise Advisory

File No: RDS/15-04
Author: Ms C Frean, Engineering Technical Officer - Transport
Other Contributors: Mr S Lambie, Traffic Services Coordinator
Date of Committee Meeting: 16 November 2010
Terms of Reference: To provide input and advice into road safety matters with the outcome of having a safe and efficient transport network in the City of Rockingham.
Composition: 2 Councillors, 6 Community members
Executive Support: Engineering & Parks Services Division – Traffic Services Team

Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function
Attachments:
Maps/Diagrams: Minutes dated 4 October 2010

1. Receipt of Minutes
That Council receive the Minutes of the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on Monday 4 October 2010.

2. Recommendations to Standing Committee
Nil

3. Committee Recommendation
That Council RECEIVE the Minutes of the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on Monday 4 October 2010.

Committee Voting - 4/0
4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**

 Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith

That Council *RECEIVE* the Minutes of the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on Monday 4 October 2010.

Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
## Purpose of Report

To seek Council's approval of the renaming of Mayfield Reserve, Safety Bay to *Noel France Reserve* in recognition of past Shire Chairman, Mr Noel France.

## Background

Council received a request from the sons of Mr Noel France to have a section of the Warnbro Sound foreshore renamed in their father's honour. However, in line with the City's policy Mayfield Reserve was considered more suitable.

Council at its 26 October 2010 meeting resolved to:

1. **APPROVE** in principle the renaming of Mayfield Reserve *Noel France Reserve* adjacent to Mayfield Reserve, Safety Bay.
2. **Advertise** the approved name for public comment in accordance with Council’s Policy - Naming of Reserves.

3. **Review** submissions received at the closure of the advertised period and present results to a future meeting of Council.

### 3. Details

Mr France’s family have supported the following wording for the brass plaque to be mounted within the reserve:

"**Mr Noel Harold France CD**

Born North Perth 8 August 1923  Died Nedlands 13 July 2009

Noel was the youngest son of Harry and Mabel France. When he was three years old the family moved to Northam where his father established a watch making and jewellery business. Upon leaving Northam High School he worked for the State Water Supply and following the outbreak of WWII joined the Army as a Machine Gunner but did not serve overseas.

In 1946 he and his brother Colin (who was later to become a prominent local race horse trainer), moved to Rockingham and set up the district’s first taxi service. Soon after, they established the McLarty Road Store in Shoalwater. During this period, Noel met and married Yvonne Bell, whose family were early pioneers of the Rockingham District. They were married for 58 years and had two sons, Lindsay and Roy. Following the sale of the McLarty Road Store, Noel was involved in a number of other local businesses including crayfishing, a greengrocery shop and commercial painting. in 1965 he joined the Landalls Housing Construction Group which built many homes in the Waikiki and Rockingham Parks precincts.

Noel was a keen sportsman and skilled amateur fisherman. He was also a prominent member of the Rockingham Golf Club from 1949 and later the Safety Bay Bowling Club until his passing. He was a passionate advocate for the progress of the Rockingham-Safety Bay community and was actively involved in the advancement of the community from the Shire to City status and the civil development of the area.

He served as a Councillor for the Safety Bay Ward for a total of 21 years (1953 - 1970 and 1982 - 1985) and was Chairman of the Rockingham Shire for 2 years (April 1955 to May 1957). In addition to this service to local government, he was also involved in other community services organisations. These included being an active member of the Rockingham Branch of Lions International from the earliest days of its formation and a foundation member of the Ages Person’s Trust.

In later years he was a mainstay of the Rockingham Probus Club, of which he was president for 2 years (1999 - 2000). In 1999 he received an Australia Day Citizenship Award in recognition of these contributions to the Rockingham - Safety Bay community.

He was particularly proud of the development of the Warnbro Sound foreshore. This area now attracts people from all over the metropolitan area for their recreation, which includes relaxing in the shade of the Norfolk Pines that line the Sound and for whose planting he was largely responsible."

### 4. Implications to Consider

**a. Consultation with the Community**

A public consultation period was conducted concluding on 29 October 2010 at which time no submissions had been received.

**b. Consultation with Government Agencies**

In accordance with the Department of Land Administration Act and Policy. The Geographic Naming Committee
c. **Strategic**

In accordance with Council’s Strategic Plan:

Functional Area 2, Strategy 3.3 - Review and continue to implement the Culture Policy and Plan, and Strategy 3.6 - Review and develop Council’s services and facilities for families and children.

d. **Policy**

In accordance with Council’s Policy - Naming of Reserves.

e. **Financial**

Funds totalling approximately $2,000 for the installation of signage, plaque and naming ceremony will be met from accounts as follows:

Naming Ceremony: 210018.1235 - Council Official Openings and Launches
Signage: 410165.0001 – Buildings and fixed equipment, Recreation Reserves.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

In accordance with the Department of Land Administration Act and Policy.

The Geographic Naming Committee will need to be notified of the reserve name change.

5. **Comments**

A naming Ceremony is requested by the family to be held in early January due to family members returning from overseas, with the most suitable date being Thursday 13 January 2011.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPT** the name of ‘Noel France Reserve’ in lieu of Mayfield Reserve adjacent to Mayfield Road, Safety Bay.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPT** the name of ‘Noel France Reserve’ in lieu of Mayfield Reserve adjacent to Mayfield Road, Safety Bay.

Committee Voting - 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith

That Council **ADOPT** the name of ‘Noel France Reserve’ in lieu of Mayfield Reserve adjacent to Mayfield Road, Safety Bay.

Carried – 10/0
12. The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation

Not applicable.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-013/10 Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>COM/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Matthew Donaldson, Coastal Engineering Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>To advise Council on Marine Infrastructure matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>2 Councillors, 8 Community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Government representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Parks Services Division: Manager Capital Projects &amp; Coastal Engineering Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes dated 30 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

That Council receive the minutes of the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee meeting held on 30 September 2010.

2. **Recommendations to Standing Committee**

Nil

3. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council RECEIVED the minutes of the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee meeting held on 30 September 2010.

Committee Voting – 4/0
4. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

5. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

6. **Council Resolution**

*Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith*

That Council **RECEIVE** the minutes of the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee meeting held on 30 September 2010.

Carried – 10/0

7. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
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**Reference No & Subject:**
- **File No:** WSM/40
- **Proponent/s:** AGL Energy Services Pty Limited
- **Author:** Mr Adam Vaughan-Williams, Engineering Support Officer
- **Other Contributors:**
  - Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services
  - Mr Graham Rose, Manager Waste & Landfill Services
- **Date of Committee meeting:** 16 November 2010
- **Previously before Council:**
- **Disclosure of Interest:**
- **Nature of Council’s role in this Matter:** Executive Function
- **Site:** Lot 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis
- **Lot Area:** 986,681 square metres
- **Attachments:**
- **Maps/diagrams:**

### 1. Purpose of Report

Seeking Council’s support of AGL Energy Services Pty Limited’s proposal to expand the existing Millar Road landfill site methane gas extraction system, from approximately 2MW, with the installation of an additional 1MW of generation (and an option for a further increase by 1MW).

### 2. Background

In August 2002 the City of Rockingham entered into an Access Licence Agreement with AGL Energy Services Pty Limited (AGL) to allow AGL to extract methane gas from the Millar Road Landfill site for the purpose of electrical power generation.
This agreement has worked successfully for both parties since its inception and has many benefits to the City including generating both electrical power and income and also by eliminating methane gas and odours that emanate from the waste contained at the site.

### 3. Details

The City has received a proposal from AGL Energy Services Pty Limited as follows:

“AGL Energy Services Pty Limited ("AGL") and the City of Rockingham ("the Council") entered into a Landfill Gas Extraction and Power Generation Development Agreement which was dated 30 August 2002 ("the agreement"). Under the terms of the Agreement, AGL installed a landfill gas extraction system at the Council's landfill site at Cockburn Sound ("the Site"). The Council permits AGL to take all the landfill gas it can extract from the site and granted a lease to AGL over part of the Site for the location of a flare and a power generation plant.

Under the terms of the Agreement, the Council receives a royalty of the revenue received by AGL for the sale of power generated and from the sale of 'renewable energy certificates' as that term is defined in the 'Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000'.

AGL currently has approximately 125 gas wells installed into the existing landfill site extracting sufficient gas (approximately 1,000 m/ hr to run two existing generators at maximum capacity of 2MW, as well as an additional 400 m³ flared.

AGL has become aware that there is an odour problem at the Site because more landfill gas is being produced than AGL can capture and burn. Consequently, AGL would like to propose to the Council that, at the cost of AGL, the existing extraction system be expanded and an additional power generation plant will be installed. AGL is currently investigating the options of installing approximately 25 additional wells into cells 10 & 11 of the existing landfill to increase gas collection as well as installation of a 1WM of generation (with an option of a further increasing by 1WM). Applications are presently with Western Power to increase the capacity of the existing network connection from 2MW to 5MW to allow for the increased generation capacity.

Although AGL cannot guarantee that the odour emissions will completely eliminated as a number of factors may make this technically difficult or economically unviable, AGL does anticipate that this will be the case and at the very least the odour will be reduced. The increase to power generation plant will result in an increased amount of power being returned to the grid and an increase in the royalties received by Council.”

### 4. Implications to consider

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Not applicable.

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   
   Not applicable.

c. **Strategic**
   
   In accordance with Council’s Strategic Plan Functional Area 3 - Land Use and the Environment) - Strategy 8 - Introduce a comprehensive range of initiatives to manage the natural environment - Action Plan 8.3 - Implementation of the community and corporate greenhouse gas reduction strategies and Action Plan 8.9 - Continue to implement the Waste Management Strategy.

d. **Policy**
   
   Not applicable.

e. **Financial**
   
   An anticipated increased income of approximately $50,000 per MW per annum in general ledger account no 310049.3258 - Sanitation and Waste Services - Royalties Income.
5. **Comments**

The City of Rockingham and the environment benefit considerably from the removal of greenhouse gas and the generation of clean power by means of the methane extraction at Millar Road Landfill by AGL.

In the past three years, direct income of royalties to the City from the power generation is as follows with the 2010/11 estimated figure also included:

- 2007/08 $25,082
- 2008/09 $29,043
- 2009/10 $91,108
- 2010/11 $114,000 (estimated)

6. **Voting requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer recommendation**

That Council **SUPPORT** AGL Energy Services Pty Limited's proposal to expand the existing landfill site methane gas extraction system, from approximately 2MW, with the installation of an additional 1MW of generation (with an option of a further increase by 1MW).

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **SUPPORT** AGL Energy Services Pty Limited's proposal to expand the existing landfill site methane gas extraction system, from approximately 2MW, with the installation of an additional 1MW of generation (with an option of a further increase by 1MW).

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith**

That Council **SUPPORT** AGL Energy Services Pty Limited's proposal to expand the existing landfill site methane gas extraction system, from approximately 2MW, with the installation of an additional 1MW of generation (with an option of a further increase by 1MW).

Carried – 10/0
12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
## Corporate and Engineering Services

### Engineering Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-015/10 Rockingham Waterfront Village, Transfer of Lot 303 Empress Corner (car park) to the City of Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/5383-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>City of Rockingham Landcorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Adam Vaughan-Williams, Engineering Support Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee meeting:</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s role in this matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area:</td>
<td>3,041 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

To seek Council’s approval for the transfer of Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham from the West Australian Land Authority to the City of Rockingham.

### 2. Background

In October 2004, the City of Rockingham entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Landcorp to progress the Rockingham Village project with the intention of revitalising the traditional town centre of Rockingham.

The Waterfront Village Project was initiated by the City of Rockingham in the late 1990’s and following an extensive public consultation process, Council endorsed a structure plan to guide and
facilitate the redevelopment of under-utilised Crown land generally between Kent Street and Patterson Road, Rockingham.

This project was undertaken in a number of stages, with the final stage being the construction of a car park on public open space (POS) adjacent to Flinders Hall, which has been designed to allow for future expansion to 250 cars.

### 3. Details

Landcorp have completed the construction of an 80 bay car park on Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham in accordance with the Waterfront Village Project. This car park is capable of further development into a tri-level 250 car park in the future if required and meets the requirements of the development plan.

In accordance with the Waterfront Village Project Memorandum of Agreement, the City will:

> 'accept responsibility for the Village Green and Village Square and ongoing maintenance upon practical completion and an agreed maintenance period.'

Practical completion is about to occur with the construction of this car park being the final stage of the Waterfront Village project and the transfer of Lot 303 Empress Corner is a part of that requirement.

The land is being transferred to the City in fee simple.

### 4. Implications to consider

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Not applicable.

b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
   
   Project in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Rockingham and Landcorp.
   
   Transfer of Land to be Authorised by the Western Australian Land Authority.

c. **Strategic**
   
   In accordance with the City of Rockingham's Strategic Plan 2006-2011, Functional Area 3, Strategy 7.2 - Implement the recommendations of the Waterfront Village Plan and Policy for the Rockingham beachfront.

d. **Policy**
   
   Not applicable.

e. **Financial**
   
   Ongoing maintenance will be incorporated into the Road Maintenance budget and $1,000 is allocated for the 2010/11 period.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   
   
   
   Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.55 - Acquisition of Land.

### 5. Comments

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding, Landcorp is required to undertake an agreed maintenance period of 12 months for civil works and 24 months for landscaping from practical completion.
6. **Voting requirements**

Simple Majority.

7. **Officer recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the transfer, in fee simple, of Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham to the City of Rockingham in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Rockingham and Landcorp under the Waterfront Village Project.

2. **AUTHORISE** the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal the Transfer of Land for Lot 303, Empress Corner Rockingham to the City of Rockingham.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the transfer, in fee simple, of Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham to the City of Rockingham in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Rockingham and Landcorp under the Waterfront Village Project.

2. **AUTHORISE** the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal the Transfer of Land for Lot 303, Empress Corner Rockingham to the City of Rockingham.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.

11. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the transfer, in fee simple, of Lot 303 Empress Corner, Rockingham to the City of Rockingham in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Rockingham and Landcorp under the Waterfront Village Project.

2. **AUTHORISE** the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal the Transfer of Land for Lot 303, Empress Corner Rockingham to the City of Rockingham.

Carried – 10/0

12. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
14. Report of Mayor

Mayor’s Report

Reference No & Subject: MR-002/10 Meetings & Functions Attended
File No: GOV/3
Proponent/s: City of Rockingham
Author: Cr Barry Sammels, Mayor
Other Contributors: Cr Barry Sammels, Mayor
Previously before Council: 
Disclosure of Interest: 
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function

1. Purpose of Report

To advise on the meetings and functions attended by the Mayor during the period 27 October 2010 to 23 November 2010.

2. Background

Nil

3. Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting/ Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27 October 2010    | Rockingham Education Development Group  
Sitting of Water Valedictory Presentation |
| 28 October 2010    | Judging National Best Beaches Awards                                              |
| 1 November 2010    | Seachange Taskforce Executive Teleconference  
Meeting with Maranatha College            |
| 4 November 2010    | Opening of Seniors Expo  
Safety Bay Senior High School Graduation  
Meeting with Murdoch University          |
| 8 November 2010    | Meeting with Environmental Planning Consultants  
Opening new branch of the National Bank |
<p>| 10 November 2010   | Bendigo Bank School Scholarship Presentations                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting/ Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2010</td>
<td>Opening Secret Harbour Golf Club Links new Clubhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remembrance Day Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Safe Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2010</td>
<td>Opening of Warnbro High School Education Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 2010</td>
<td>Rockingham Volunteer Sea Rescue Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2010</td>
<td>Lunch with Mayor Datuk Iliyas Ibrahim of Kota Kinabalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging the Gap Executive meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
<td>Rockingham Rotary Club meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate &amp; Engineering Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November 2010</td>
<td>Presentation of Award at Montessori School Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BHP Billiton Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 2010</td>
<td>Pedal for Prostate Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Friendship Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 November 2010</td>
<td>Satterley Group Christmas Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham Senior High School Education Support Centre Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November 2010</td>
<td>Visit by City of Swan – Tour of Lark Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murdoch University Art Exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2010</td>
<td>Rockingham Spring Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November 2010</td>
<td>Rockingham Rotary Pride of Workmanship Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November 2010</td>
<td>Switch Off Lights Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Implications to Consider**

   a. **Consultation with the Community**
      
      Nil.

   b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
      
      Nil.

   c. **Strategic**
      
      Nil.

   d. **Policy**
      
      Nil.

   e. **Financial**
      
      Nil.

   f. **Legal and Statutory**
      
      Nil.

5. **Comments**

Nil

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *RECEIVE* the Mayor’s Report for the period 27 October 2010 to 23 November 2010.

8. **Council Resolution**

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Smith

That Council *RECEIVE* the Mayor's Report for the period 27 October 2010 to 23 November 2010.

Carried – 10/0

9. **The Council’s Reason for Varying the Committee’s Recommendation**

Not applicable.
### 15. Reports of Councillors
Nil.

### 16. Reports of Officers
Nil.

### 17. Addendum Agenda
Nil.

### 18. Motions of which Previous Notice has been given
Nil.

### 19. Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting
Nil.

### 20. Questions by Members of which Due Notice has been given
Nil.

### 21. Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Council
Nil.

### 22. Date and Time of Next Meeting
The next Ordinary Council Meeting for the City of Rockingham will be held on **Tuesday, 14 December 2010** at 6:00pm in the Council Chambers, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham.

### 23. Closure
There being no further business, the Chairman thanked those persons present for attending the Council Meeting, and declared the meeting closed at 6:35pm.

### 24. Attachments
CS-004/10  Monthly Financial Management Report for September 2010