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# City of Rockingham
## Corporate & Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting
### 4:00pm Tuesday 16 August 2011

## MINUTES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Declaration of Opening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairman declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting open at 4:08pm and welcomed all present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Record of Attendance/ Apologies/ Approved Leave of Absence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Barry Sammels Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Lorraine Dunkling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Paul Ellis (from 4:14pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Ann Prince Deputising for Cr Deb Hamblin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td><strong>Executive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson A/Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Pearson Director Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Gary Rogers Manager Capital Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Allan Moles Manager Accounting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Graham Rose Manager Waste &amp; Landfill Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie Coordinator Traffic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Spearing Projects Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Jelette Edwards A/Manager Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Sue Langley Secretary Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Public:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press:</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td><strong>Apologies:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td><strong>Approved Leave of Absence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice**

   Nil

4. **Public Question Time**

   4.1 Mr Kim Gorey, Perth Waste, Mosman Park - Assessment Process of T11/12-28 - Collection, Transport & Processing of Co-mingled Materials

   The Mayor invited Mr Gorey to present his question to the Corporate & Engineering Services Standing Committee. Mr Gorey asked the following question:

   1. How has Perth Waste been assessed in the Recycling Collection and Processing Tender when none of the referees were contacted?

   Mr Thompson, A/Chief Executive Officer advised that Council had followed the City's tender process when assessing this tender which involved a four member selection panel that met on three occasions. An evaluation of each submission was done against the selection criteria and all submissions received were of a high quality with considerable information and therefore contact with the referees was not considered necessary.

4:14pm Cr Paul Ellis attended the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting.

4:14pm Cr Ann Prince left the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting.

Mr Thompson also advised that the Alternative Cleanaway tender received the highest percentage in the assessment criteria but concurred that two companies (ie: Cleanaway and Perth Waste) are both capable of undertaking the work.

5. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting**

   Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Ellis:

   That Council **CONFIRM** the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting held on 19 July 2011, as a true and accurate record.

   Committee Voting - 3/0

6. **Matters Arising from the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting Minutes**

   Nil

7. **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 next Council meeting.
8. **Declarations of Members and Officers Interests**

Nil

4:19pm Cr Ann Prince returned to the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting.

9. **Petitions/ Deputations/ Presentations/ Submissions**

9.1 **Deputations**

4:20pm Mr Andre Zaugg - 116 Currie Street, Warnbro attended the meeting to provide the Committee with a briefing relating to Item EP-053/11 - Currie Street and Gamble Street, Warnbro - Traffic Calming Community Consultation.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Andrew Zaugg and invited him to make his presentation to the Committee.

Mr Zaugg raised various concerns regarding the location of a third roundabout in Currie Street, these included:

- the study was undertaken in 2006, five years old and believed there would be further relevant details to consider since that time
- safety issues would be concern with the driveway entering onto the proposed roundabout
- as noted in the Officer's report the roundabout is not designed to stop hoon behaviour and therefore suggests further anti-social behaviour
- plants and road signs have been stolen from the previous two roundabouts installed in Currie Street
- the current location of the roundabouts are 600m apart - this is too far apart and it would be more effective if 125m apart
- would be beneficial to have 50km street signs along Currie Street
- negative impact on property and occupants - first roundabout was installed 5-6 months ago and the second 2-3 months ago and landscaping has not yet been completed
- concern for residents whose driveways enter onto the roundabouts for reversing trailers, caravans etc.

The Chairman thanked Mr Zaugg for his presentation.

10. **Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed**

Nil
## Bulletin Items

### Corporate & Executive Services Information Bulletin - August 2011

**Corporate Services**
1. Corporate Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Minutes and Agenda Software
   - 3.2 Customer Request Management System
   - 3.3 Mobile Computing (AIM) Licensing Fees
   - 3.4 Disaster Recovery Solution
4. Information Items

**Executive Services**
1. Executive Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Review of City of Rockingham Local Laws
   - 3.2 Review of all Council Policies
   - 3.3 Review of Delegated Authority to Chief Executive Officer
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Minor Donations – Delegation of Authority to the Chief Executive Officer
   - 4.2 Fire Attendance by COR Appliances & Crews
   - 4.3 Emergency Management and Recovery

**Human Resources**
1. Human Resources Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Employee Health & Wellbeing Programme
   - 3.3 Advanced Diploma of Management
   - 3.4 Leadership & Management Programme
4. Information Items

**Economic Development**
1. Economic Development Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Printing and Graphic Design Services
   - 3.2 Leadership Forum
   - 3.3 Communication Guide
   - 3.4 Social Media Strategy
   - 3.5 Global Friendship Activity Database
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 The Amazing Race Australia
   - 4.2 Media Tracking for July 2011

**Strategy Coordination**
1. Strategy Coordination Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Development and implementation of a Community Plan

4. Information Items
   4.1 Establishing linkages between the Community Plan, the Specific Purpose Plans and the Team Plans
   4.2 2011 Customer Satisfaction Survey
   4.3 Co-ordinating the development of a 10 year infrastructure plan
   4.4 Co-ordinating the development and implementation of a Development Contribution Scheme
   4.5 Operational Team Plans
   4.6 New Ideas Incentive Scheme
   4.7 City Scoreboard
   4.8 Climate Change Response Plan
   4.10 Other Initiatives Managed by the Strategy Co-ordination Group

Committee Recommendation:
That Councillors acknowledge having read the Corporate and Executive Services Information Bulletin – August 2011 and the contents be accepted.
Committee Voting – 4/0

Engineering & Parks Services Information Bulletin - August 2011

Engineering Services
1. Engineering Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Delegated Authority for approval of Engineering Drawings - Subdivisions
   4.2 Delegated Authority for acceptance of As-Constructed Engineering Drawings - Subdivisions
   4.3 Delegated Authority to approve the release of Cash Bonds for private subdivisional works
   4.4 Delegated Authority for approval of requests for installation of street lighting
   4.5 Delegated Authority for approval of requests for installation of Directional Signs
   4.6 Delegated Authority for approval of Memorial Seating
   4.7 Delegated Authority for Thoroughfare Closures
   4.8 Delegated Authority for the payment of Crossover Subsidies
   4.9 Mundijong Road Extension (Auslink Funded)
   4.10 Footpath Construction and Replacement Program 2011/12
   4.11 Local area Traffic Management and Road Safety Design Projects 2011/12
   4.12 Handover of Subdivisional Roads
   4.13 Incoming Correspondence

Engineering Operations
1. Engineering Operations Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Road Construction Program Roads to Recovery 2011/12
4.2 Road Construction Program Main Roads Direct Grant 2011/12
4.3 Road Construction Program Main Roads Grant 2011/12
4.4 Road Construction Program Federal Black Spot 2011/12
4.5 Road Construction Program State Black Spot 2011/12
4.6 Road Construction Program Municipal Works 2011/12
4.7 Road Resurfacing Municipal Works 2011/12
4.8 Road Maintenance Program 2011/12
4.9 Passenger Vehicle Fleet Program 2011/12
4.10 Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2011/2012
4.11 Heavy Plant Program 2011/2012

Parks Development
1. Parks Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Warnbro Foreshore Car Park Shoring
4. Information Items
   4.1 Surf Drive POS development
   4.2 Dress Circle Reserve Pond Removal
   4.3 Presentations/Submissions
   4.4 Delegated Development Approvals

Asset Management
1. Asset Management Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Road reserve and footpath survey
4. Information Items
   4.1 Asset Management Improvement Strategy
   4.2 Asset Management Systems
   4.3 Lease Management

Building Maintenance
1. Building Maintenance Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Building condition survey
4. Information Items
   4.1 Building Maintenance

Capital Projects
1. Capital Projects Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Coastal Management Consultants (Sand Drift/Erosion Problems)
   3.2 Coastal Infrastructure Facilities Consultant (Jetties/Boat Ramp Planning)
   3.3 Lighting Consultants (Technical Planning/Designs, Underground Power Program)
   3.4 Major Project Property Development Planning (Design Modifications/Tender Planning/Structural Testing)
   3.5 Hymus Street Erosion Strategy
4. **Information Items**
   4.1 Delegated Written Notification of Successful Tender
   4.2 Delegated Release of Retention/Bank Guarantee’s
   4.3 Palm Beach Underground Power Project
   4.4 Proposed Shoalwater North Underground Power Project
   4.5 2011 Public Area Lighting & Arterial Lighting
   4.6 Lark Hill Wind Turbine
   4.7 Waste Education Centre at Millar Road Landfill Facility
   4.8 Bent Street Boat Ramp Access
   4.9 Palm Beach Jetty
   4.10 Point Peron Boat Launching Facility
   4.11 Waikiki Foreshore Protection Works - RLGIP
   4.12 McLarty Hall Timber Flooring
   4.13 Museum Roof Replacement
   4.14 Bert England Lodge Air-conditioning
   4.15 Bert England Lodge Kitchen Renovations
   4.16 Laurie Stanford Reserve Toilet
   4.17 Rhonda Scarrott Skatepark, Golden Bay
   4.18 Read Street & Rae Road, Rockingham - Traffic Light Signal Upgrade
   4.19 Read Street & Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham - Traffic Light Signal Upgrade

**Waste & Landfill Services**
1. Waste & Landfill Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Waste kerbside collection
   4.2 240 litre bin service
   4.3 Waste kerbside collection
   4.4 Destroyed and Stolen Refuse Bins (Domestic Only)
   4.5 Waste kerbside collection
   4.6 Education / promotion
   4.7 Power station
   4.8 T11/12-28 Collection, transport and processing of co-mingled recyclable material
   4.9 T11/12-34 Supply and delivery of one new crawler loader with optional service agreement and optional trade of the City’s existing crawler loader OR outright purchase of the City's existing crawler loader

**Committee Recommendation:**
That Councillors acknowledge having read the Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin - August 2011 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

12. **Agenda items**
Corporate and Engineering Services

Reference No & Subject:
- CS-025/11 Application for Rating Exemption - 35 Council Avenue, Rockingham
- File No: RTV/1-03
- Proponent/s: Generations International Ltd
- Author: Ms A Gumina, Senior Rates Officer
- Other Contributors: Ms A Gumina, Senior Rates Officer
- Date of Committee Meeting: August 16 2011
- Previously before Council: August 16 2011
- Disclosure of Interest: 
- Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function
- Site: 35 Council Avenue, Rockingham
- Lot Area: 
- Attachments: 
- Maps/Diagrams: 

1. Purpose of Report

To seek Council’s approval to grant a rating exemption to Generations International Ltd.

2. Background

Correspondence has been received from Generations International Ltd (Generations Church) seeking a rating exemption on a property they are leasing. The property is used as a public place of worship and the Church is available to any member of the public.
3. **Details**

The following documents have been received from Generations International Ltd.

1. Copy of Registration of Generations International Ltd
2. Constitution for Generations International Ltd
3. Copy of lease agreement

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Nil

c. **Strategic**

   **Community Plan**
   
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15**: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**
   
   Nil

e. **Financial**

   The total rates levied for the 2011/12 financial year are $4881.67. If the exemption is granted, $4881.67 will need to be written off.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   Under Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, land used or held exclusively by a religious body as a place of worship is not rateable land.

5. **Comments**

A legal opinion previously obtained for a similar organisation would suggest that Generations International Ltd would be entitled to a rate exemption on the property they lease pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 35 Council Avenue, Rockingham (Assessment No 128795) leased by Generations International Ltd, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.

2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $4881.67 on Assessment No 128795 for the 2011/12 financial year.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 35 Council Avenue, Rockingham (Assessment No 128795) leased by Generations International Ltd, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.

2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $4881.67 on Assessment No 128795 for the 2011/12 financial year.

   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
## Purpose of Report

To seek Council’s approval to grant a rating exemption to Bizlink Incorporated.

## Background

Correspondence has been received from Bizlink Incorporated seeking a rating exemption on a property they own that is being used to provide employment services to people with disabilities. Bizlink assist people with disabilities to find work and then support those people during their employment. Bizlink is fully funded by the Federal Government.
3. Details

The following documents have been received from Bizlink Incorporated.

1. Certificate of Incorporation
2. Notice of endorsement for Charity Concessions

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Nil

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Nil

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
   
   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   The total rates levied for the 2011/12 financial year are $2335.76. If the exemption is granted, $2335.76 will need to be written off.

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 previously obtained for a similar organisation would suggest that Bizlink Incorporated would be entitled to a rate exemption on the property they own pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995. It was considered based on the information supplied by Bizlink Incorporated that it satisfies the requirements of Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995 in that the property is being held exclusively for charitable purposes.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 11 Benjamin Way, Rockingham (Assessment No 120099) owned by Bizlink Incorporated, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.

2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $2335.76 on Assessment No 120099 for the 2011/12 financial year.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 11 Benjamin Way, Rockingham (Assessment No 120099) owned by Bizlink Incorporated, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.

2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $2335.76 on Assessment No 120099 for the 2011/12 financial year.

   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
1. **Purpose of Report**

To seek Council's approval to grant a rating exemption to Sound City Church.

2. **Background**

Correspondence has been received from Sound City Church seeking a rating exemption on a property they own. They currently have a rate exemption on the property next door at 5 McCamey Avenue, Rockingham. The property at Unit 1/7 McCamey Avenue is used for a Children's Ministry and Children's Church Services.
3. **Details**

The following documents have been received from Sound City Church.

1. Copy of Charitable Tax Concessions
2. Certificate of Incorporation

4. **Implications to Consider**

   a. Consultation with the Community
      Nil
   
   b. Consultation with Government Agencies
      Nil
   
   c. Strategic
      Community Plan
      This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

      **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

   d. Policy
      Nil
   
   e. Financial
      The total rates levied for the 2011/12 financial year are $1158.12. If the exemption is granted, $1158.12 will need to be written off.

   f. Legal and Statutory
      Under Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, land used or held exclusively by a religious body as a place of worship is not rateable land.

5. **Comments**

As this land is used exclusively by Sound City Church as a place of worship, they are entitled to a rate exemption on the property they own pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council:
   
   1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 1/7 McCamey Avenue, Rockingham (Assessment No 344919) owned by Sound City Church, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.
   
   2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $1158.12 on Assessment No 344919 for the 2011/12 financial year.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the rating exemption on 1/7 McCamey Avenue, Rockingham (Assessment No 344919) owned by Sound City Church, as it is non rateable land pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1995, effective from 1 July 2011.

2. **APPROVE** the writing off of rates totalling $1158.12 on Assessment No 344919 for the 2011/12 financial year.

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
### Purpose of Report


### Background

Nil

### 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
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

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 financial position at the end of June 2011 is subject to final accruals and any adjustments required following the audit.

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
## Reference No & Subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-029/11</th>
<th>List of Payments for July 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no:</td>
<td>FLM/157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms Vanisha Govender, Financial Accountant</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 meeting:</td>
<td>16 August 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before 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>Executive Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Lot area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of Payments for July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps/diagrams:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

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

### 2. Background

Nil

### 3. Details

Nil
4. Implications to consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   N/A

b. Consultation with Government agencies
   N/A

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
   
   Aspiration 15: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

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 ACCEPT the attached List of Payments for July 2011 totalling $8,639,183.96 paid under Delegated Authority, in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the attached List of Payments for July 2011 totalling $8,639,183.96 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
1. **Purpose of Report**

To adopt the materiality level for variances required to be reported in the 2011/12 Statements of Financial Activity.

2. **Background**

The City is required to prepare a Statement of Financial Activity for each month which includes, in part, details of the budget and actual revenue/expenditure to the end of the relevant month and ‘material’ variances between the budget and actual.

Each year Council is required to adopt the level considered ‘material’ for the purposes of reporting these variances.

The adopted material variance level for 2010/11 was $250,000.
3. **Details**

The Australian Accounting Standards state that “materiality means, in relation to information, that information which if omitted, misstated or not disclosed has the potential to adversely affect decisions about the allocation of scarce resources made by users of the financial report or the discharge of accountability by the management or governing body of the entity”.

Essentially the smaller the entity the lower the materiality level, as it is the relative impact that is important. Variances of $10,000 may be considered material to an individual but when considered in the context of the City, which is an entity with a total expenditure of over $150 million, this limit would not be considered material.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   Nil

c. **Strategic**

   **Community Plan**

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15**: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**

   Nil

e. **Financial**

   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   Regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires that each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with the AAS, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

5. **Comments**

The material variance level adopted for 2010/11 was $250,000 and this value is still considered appropriate for the 2011/12 financial year.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council **ADOPT** $250,000 as the value to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances for the 2011/2012 financial year.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPT** $250,000 as the value to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances for the 2011/2012 financial year.

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
1. Purpose of Report

Council consideration of changing the dates of Committee and Council meetings for October 2011 due to the holding of Local Government Elections

2. Background

Committee and Council meetings for the month of October 2011 have previously been advertised as follows:
- Community Development Committee – 10 October 2011
- Planning Services Committee – 17 October 2011
3. **Details**

Due to the local government elections being held on 15 October 2011, and with the possibility of some new Councillors at the Council meeting scheduled to be held on 25 October 2011, it is proposed that all Committee meetings and the Special Council meeting and Standing Committee meetings be held on the following dates:

- Special Council - 17 October 2011
- Community Development Committee - 18 October 2011
- Planning Services Committee - 19 October 2011
- Corporate & Engineering Services Committee - 20 October 2011
- Council - 25 October 2011

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

Advertisements will be placed on both the Sound Telegraph, Weekend Courier, Council Notice Board, Libraries and the Council Website advising of the change of date for the Committee meetings and the holding of the Special Council Meeting.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

Nil

c. **Strategic**

*Community Plan*

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative, legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**

Nil

e. **Financial**

The cost to place advertisements in the local papers amounts to approximately $500, and appropriate allocation has been made in the 2011/12 budget.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

In accordance with regulation 12(2) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*, a local government is to give local public notice of any change to the date, time or place of a committee or council meeting.

5. **Comments**

It is proposed that the following Committee and Council meeting dates for October 2011 be as follows:-

**Special Council Meeting** - **Monday, 17 October 2011** - to swear in newly elected members and appoint representatives to committees and various working parties, liaison groups etc.

**Community Development Committee** - **Tuesday, 18 October 2011** (in lieu of Monday, 10 October 2011).
Planning Services Committee - Wednesday, 19 October 2011 (in lieu of Monday, 17 October 2011)

Corporate & Engineering Services Committee - Thursday, 20 October 2011 (in lieu of Tuesday, 18 October 2011).

Council Meeting - Tuesday, 25 October 2011 - no change.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **AMEND** the Committee and Council meeting dates for October 2011 to the following times and dates:
   - Community Development Committee - 4:00pm, Tuesday 18 October 2011
   - Planning Services Committee - 4:00pm, Wednesday 19 October 2011
   - Corporate & Engineering Services - 4:00pm, Thursday 20 October 2011
   - Council - 6:00pm, Monday 25 October 2011

2. **CONDUCT** the Special Council Meeting to swear in newly elected members and appoint representatives to committees and various working parties and liaison groups at 6:00pm, Monday 17 October 2011.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **AMEND** the Committee and Council meeting dates for October 2011 to the following times and dates:
   - Community Development Committee - 4:00pm, Tuesday 18 October 2011
   - Planning Services Committee - 4:00pm, Wednesday 19 October 2011
   - Corporate & Engineering Services - 4:00pm, Thursday 20 October 2011
   - Council - 6:00pm, Monday 25 October 2011

2. **CONDUCT** the Special Council Meeting to swear in newly elected members and appoint representatives to committees and various working parties and liaison groups at 6:00pm, Monday 17 October 2011.

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
### Economic Development

#### Corporate and Engineering Services Advisory & Occasional Committee Minutes Economic Development Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>ED-010/11 Global Friendship Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>ECD/1-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mrs Ana Stulich, Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Ms Desiree Turner, Project Officer Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>To coordinate Council’s Global Friendship relationships and related issues by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting awareness of the social and economic importance of the Global Friendships program to the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning and arranging visits to and from global affiliates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measuring the performance and effectiveness of individual Global Friendships in terms of community and economic development benefit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Global Friendship proposals; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing the performance and effectiveness of each Global Friendship every four years to assess the degree of activity, value to Council and associated benefits for the City of Rockingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>3 Councillors, 6 Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Support - Economic Development Team</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>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 21 July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Receipt of Minutes**

That Council receive the minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 21 July 2011 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 July 2011 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
Corporate and Engineering Services
Advisory & Occasional Committee Minutes
Engineering & Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-049/11</th>
<th>Rockingham Committee</th>
<th>RoadWise Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RDS/15-05</td>
<td>Ms Catherine Frean, Engineering Technical Officer - Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie, Traffic Services Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>16 August 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>1 Councillor, 6 Community Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>Executive Support: Engineering and Parks Services Division – Traffic Services Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting held on 4 July 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

That Council receive the minutes of the RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on 4 July 2011 for information.

2. **Recommendations to Standing Committee**

There are no recommendations to the standing committee.
### Committee Recommendation

That Council **RECEIVE** the minutes of the RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on 4 July 2011 for information.

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
Corporate and Engineering Services
Advisory & Occasional Committee Minutes
Engineering & Parks Services

Reference No & Subject: EP-050/11 Disability Access Reference Group
File No: CSV/761
Author: Ms Catherine Frean, Engineering Technical Officer - Transport
Other Contributors: Ms Tenille Wightman, Community Development Officer
Date of Committee Meeting: 16 August 2011
Terms of Reference: To collate Council's Disability Services Plan for the improvement of accessibility to Council facilities and services for people with disabilities of all kinds.
Composition: 2 Councillors, 13 Community Representatives
Executive Support from Engineering & Parks Services, Traffic Services Team

Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function
Attachments: Minutes of meeting held on 11 May 2011
Maps/Diagrams:

1. Receipt of Minutes
That Council receive the minutes of the Disability Access Reference Group meeting held on Wednesday 11 May 2011.

2. Recommendations to Standing Committee
There are no recommendations to the Standing Committee.

3. Committee Recommendation
That Council RECEPT the minutes of the Disability Access Reference Group meeting held on Wednesday 11 May 2011.
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
### Purpose of Report

For Council to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to award the tender T11/12-22 - Consultant - Period Tender for Professional Local Government Engineering, Architectural, Planning, Environmental and Project Management Services

### Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 7 June 2011 Tender T11/12-22 Consultant - Period Tender for Professional Local Government Engineering, Architectural, Planning, Environmental and Project Management Services closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday 22 June 2011 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
The companies were requested to provide submissions for the following services:

- Project Management Services
- Civil Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Structural Engineering
- Transport Engineering
- Drafting & Drawing Services
- Irrigation Design
- Contract Administration
- Surveying
- Town Planning
- Architectural, Including Architectural and Interior Architectural Design Services
- Environmental Assessment and Management Services
- Urban Design
- Heritage Consultants
- Energy Auditor
- Anthropologist/Archaeologist Indigenous Consultants
- Retail Economic Planning/Retail Sustainability Assessments
- Hydrology

### 3. Details

The purpose of calling tender T11/12-22 is to provide a panel of professional consultancies covering all of Councils Professional Land Use & Infrastructure, Planning, Development and Management Services. Submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360 Environmental</td>
<td>James Christou Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Australia</td>
<td>Land Insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Clare Consulting</td>
<td>Mackay Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Projects</td>
<td>Max Margetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard Consulting Solutions</td>
<td>McDowall Affleck Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollig Design Group</td>
<td>MP Rogers &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick Architects</td>
<td>Natural Area Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Design Group</td>
<td>Opus International Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardno</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Antil Planning &amp; Urban Design Consultant</td>
<td>Paterson Group Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID Consultants</td>
<td>Perth CAD Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates Civil Consulting</td>
<td>Porter Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coterra Environment</td>
<td>Rob Anson Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPG Australia</td>
<td>Sage Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoscape Australia</td>
<td>Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Services Consulting</td>
<td>Slavin Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endemic Pty Ltd</td>
<td>SLR Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentiel Environmental</td>
<td>Solmec Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fratelle Group</td>
<td>Syrinx Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Projects</td>
<td>Thinc Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD</td>
<td>Umwelt Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Rowe &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Urban Modelling Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holton Connor Architects</td>
<td>Westplan Design &amp; Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroplan Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2011

PRESIDING MEMBER
4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
Not applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
Not applicable

c. Strategic
Community Plan
This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:

Aspiration 6: Civic Buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.

d. Policy
In accordance with Council's Purchasing Policy to deliver a best practice approach and procedures for internal purchasing for the City, and to ensure that integrity over the whole of the purchasing process is maintained and that the calling of tenders is a transparent process demonstrating fairness and equity.

e. Financial
The 2011/12 budget allocation for consultancy fees is divided into the various work orders approved for projects in the current budget.

f. Legal and Statutory
In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless sub-regulation (2) states otherwise.

In accordance with the Local Government Act 1995, Sections 5.42-5.43 Delegation of Powers and Duties, Section 5.43 (b) grants Council the power to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer for acceptance of a Tender.

5. Comments
The large numbers of submissions and the need for broad deliberation has meant a protracted assessment process and as the timing of acceptance is critical to the provision of services for current projects it is recommended that Council delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to accept tenders as best meeting the requirements of the tender.

6. Voting Requirements
Absolute Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *DELEGATE* authority to the Chief Executive Officer to award Tender T11/12-22 - Consultant - Period Tender for Professional Local Government Engineering, Architectural, Planning, Environmental and Project Management Services.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *DELEGATE* authority to the Chief Executive Officer to award Tender T11/12-22 - Consultant - Period Tender for Professional Local Government Engineering, Architectural, Planning, Environmental and Project Management Services.

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
1. **Purpose of Report**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T11/12-24 Period cleaning of gutters at various buildings within the City of Rockingham, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

2. **Background**

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday 4 June 2011 and the Weekend Courier on Friday 3 June 2011 for tender T11/12-24 Period cleaning of gutters at various buildings within the City of Rockingham. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday 22 June 2011 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
3. **Details**

Tenders were received from the following companies:

**Company**

- Newscape Contractors
- Nauticlean
- Dunbar Services (WA) Pty Ltd
- Kleenit Rockingham
- Chockers Gutter Cleaning
- KenKleen Rockingham

A panel comprising of the City’s Manager Asset Services, Building Maintenance Coordinator and Contracts Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

The Assessment Panel was advised in writing that KenKleen had withdrawn their submission and their submission was therefore not considered.

Evaluation of tenders, in accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Newscape</th>
<th>Nauticlean</th>
<th>Dunbar</th>
<th>Kleenit</th>
<th>Chockers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tender has an option to be extended for a maximum of up to 36 additional calendar months, in periods not greater than 12 calendar months.

4. **Implications to Consider**

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

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   - Not applicable

c. **Strategic**
   - **Community Plan**
     - This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
Aspiration 4: A healthy community engaging in positive and rewarding lifestyles with access to a range of passive and active recreational and personal development opportunities

Aspiration 6: Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design constructed and maintained using best practice principles

Aspiration 13: A community that is welcoming and desirable in the eyes of residents and non-residents alike

d. Policy
In accordance with Council’s Purchasing Policy to deliver a best practice approach and procedures for internal purchasing for the City, and to ensure that integrity over the whole of the purchasing process is maintained and that the calling of tenders is a transparent process demonstrating fairness and equity.

e. Financial
Expenditure for the cleaning of gutters at various City buildings for 2010/2011 was $52,530. An amount of $60,000 has been allocated in the 2011/2012 building maintenance operating budgets for this service.

f. Legal and Statutory
In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless sub-regulation (2) states otherwise.

5. Comments
Assessment of the submissions in accordance with the tender selection criteria, the submission received from Dunbar Services (WA) Pty Ltd was deemed to represent best value to the City.

6. Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the Tender submitted by; Dunbar Services (WA) Pty Ltd, Unit 6, 290 Victoria Road, Malaga for Tender T11/12-24 Period cleaning of gutters at various buildings within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period of the date of award to 30 June 2012.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the Tender submitted by; Dunbar Services (WA) Pty Ltd, Unit 6, 290 Victoria Road, Malaga for Tender T11/12-24 Period cleaning of gutters at various buildings within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period of the date of award to 30 June 2012.

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
# Corporate and Engineering Services

## Engineering & Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th><strong>EP-053/11</strong> Currie Street and Gamble Street, Warnbro – Traffic Calming Community Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CUR1-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Ian Daniels – Manager Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie – Coordinator Traffic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Intersection Currie Street &amp; Gamble Street, Warnbro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Locality Plan and Proposed Roundabout Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map of the intersection Currie Street & Gamble Street, Warnbro]
1. **Purpose of Report**

To provide council with details on the response to the public consultation for the proposal to construct a roundabout at the intersection of Currie Street and Gamble Street, Warnbro and request support for the recommended action.

2. **Background**

In 2006, the City was receiving regular complaints from residents, with regard to speeding vehicles along Currie Street in Warnbro. As a result of the regular complaints, the city’s Traffic Services undertook an investigation into the traffic operating conditions, which involved electronic traffic counts at various points along Currie Street in 2006, 2007 and 2009.
The results of the investigation showed that traffic volumes on Currie Street were generally below 4000 vehicles per day which is well under the recommended maximum of 6000 vehicles for a local distributor road. The operating speed of Currie Street, derived from the 85th percentile of all speeds recorded during the investigation, was however significantly higher that acceptable for a 50km/h speed zone, with a figure of 62.3km/h recorded at the intersection of Currie Street and Gamble Street and readings as high as 67km/h at other locations.

After an analysis of the collected data, Traffic Services deemed that the warrants for traffic calming were met and therefore recommended that traffic calming measures be designed at certain locations along Currie Street, with funding to be considered in future budgets.

3. Details

Currie Street is classified as a ‘Local Distributor Road’ under the Perth Metropolitan Road Hierarchy. The speed limit is the urban default 50km/h and is a Transperth bus route. The major portion of Currie Street is a 2.46km section that links Hokin Street to the north and Grand Ocean Boulevard to the south. Currie Street runs parallel with Warnbro Sound Avenue, located to the east and Fendam Street to the west.

As a result of the earlier traffic investigations, a proposal to introduce treatments into Currie Street that broke the nearly 2.5km long road section into 4 shorter sections was considered an appropriate treatment to improve general speed limit compliance by re-focusing the drivers attention back onto the road at regular intervals.

The proposal was to install 3 roundabouts, staged over 2 years, at roughly evenly spaced intervals.

Stage 1
Stage 1 was the construction of 2 roundabouts on Currie Street in the 2010/2011 construction program. The first built was located at the intersection of Currie Street and Okehampton Road at the northern end while the second was located at the intersection of Currie Street and Holcombe Road to the south. Total budget allocation for these works was $350,501 with a total expenditure of $300,000.

Stage 2
Stage 2 involves the construction of the final roundabout at the intersection of Currie Street and Gamble Street. This final roundabout would complete the traffic calming scheme along Currie Street, resulting in 4 road sections of around 600m in length compared to the original 2.46km of unimpeded carriageway.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In preparation for construction to begin, Public Notification pursuant to Section 3.51 of the Local Government Act 1995 was undertaken by local public notice and individual written correspondence with directly affected property owners. A public meeting was also organised at the location of the works on Thursday 28th July 2011. A notification period of 7 days ended on the 3rd August 2011 and one submission was received.

The submission was received from the landowner of 116 Currie Street which is located on the east side of Currie Street directly opposite the intersection. A short summary of the issues highlighted in the submission are listed below:

(i) Safety - Safe access/egress from the existing driveway will be compromised and the edge of the new carriageway will be significantly closer to the front of the house (in particular the main bedroom) which is currently protected by 2 large verge trees.

(ii) Anti-Social Behaviour - The 2 new roundabouts that have been constructed along Currie Street have not had a positive impact on ‘hoons’. In fact they have created a problem where hoons are targeting these roundabouts on weekend nights.
(iii) Location – The spacing between the roundabouts along Currie Street is too great to effectively slow down traffic. The large amount of road surface opposite Gamble Street may cause a drainage issue. Main Roads WA advises that they do not recommend driveways to be within 25 metres of roundabouts. Austroads documents indicate that the locations of the roundabouts along Currie Street will be ineffective. A better location for the roundabout would be the intersection of Currie Street and Kingsbridge Road.

(iv) Design – Significant modifications to the driveway are required to make the access/egress legal and safe. The curvature of the central island is too great to slow down vehicles.

(v) Negative Impact on Property and Occupants – Concerned that there will be increased traffic noise, less protection from light, sound and wind with the removal of the large verge trees. Loss of value due to the reduction in verge width. Landscaping and beautification on other roundabouts along Currie Street not finished leaving a barren dirt area in front of properties. Access for cars with trailers will be hampered.

(vi) Consultation/Study – A modern study should be undertaken on an effective traffic calming strategy for the area. Alternatives such as centre blister islands more evenly spread along the road should be considered.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
The design of the proposed roundabout has been approved for regulatory signs and line marking by Main Roads WA.

c. Strategic Community Plan
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

Aspiration 2: A safe community where residents feel secure, relaxed and comfortable within their home, work and social environments.

d. Policy
Nil

e. Financial
The project is included in the 2011/12 budget at a total cost of $180,000. The project estimate along with the recommended alterations highlighted in this report all fall within this budgetary amount.

f. Legal and Statutory
Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.51 requires notification of works where the action of said works are deemed to have an adverse affect on property owned by others.

5. Comments
During the onsite public meeting all of the issues highlighted earlier in this report were discussed and several alterations to the design and access to the property were recommended. These included the removal of the proposed concrete path on the eastern side of the roundabout; reducing the width of the carriageway; providing a wider access to the driveway; installing a turnaround area at the front of the house; filling in the verge area and providing landscaping and semi established trees in the front garden area. These recommendations will still allow for an appropriately designed roundabout that will reduce vehicle speeds in the area along with addressing many of the concerns. These recommendations were received favourably by the landowners of 116...
Currie Street however the submission shows that their preference is still to have a treatment at a different location.

A summary of the comments that refer to the main points of contention are listed below:

(i) Safety - Safe access/egress from the existing driveway will be compromised and the edge of the new carriageway will be significantly closer to the front of the house (in particular the main bedroom) which is currently protected by 2 large verge trees.

Comment – All alteration works recommended at the site meeting will rectify these issues.

(ii) Anti-Social Behaviour - The 2 new roundabouts that have been constructed along Currie Street have not had a positive impact on 'hoons'. In fact they have created a problem where hoons are targeting these roundabouts on weekend nights.

Comment – Traffic Calming is not designed to stop 'hoon' behaviour and, in some cases, has proven to act as a challenge to these types of drivers. The only way of stopping these drivers is to have them caught and their vehicles impounded under the anti-hoon legislation. This is the reason why this legislation has come about. The very fact of putting an obstacle in front of a 'hoon'; whether it be vertical (speed hump, plateau) or horizontal (chicane, blister island, roundabout) sometimes results in anti-social behaviour but this is usually short lived and they move on. Traffic Calming in this type of environment is usually installed to slow down the everyday driver that has allowed their speed to creep up over the posted speed limit, usually without their knowledge.

(iii) Location - The spacing between the roundabouts along Currie Street is too great to effectively slow down traffic. Austroads documents indicate that the locations of the roundabouts along Currie Street will be ineffective.

Comment - Further investigations were always going to take place after the installation of this last roundabout to assess the effectiveness of the devices and to also assess whether extra treatments would be required. Austroads documentation is used as a guide and local knowledge and data is always used to compliment these guidelines.

A better location for the roundabout would be the intersection of Currie Street and Kingsbridge Road.

Comment – The road alignment of Currie Street at this location is curved which would force the design of the roundabout central island further along Kingsbridge Road to enable the correct horizontal deflection to slow vehicles sufficiently. By doing this the sight distances are compromised at the holding lines which creates an unsafe design. Also, the islands that have been installed at this intersection have stopped the issue of vehicles cutting the corner which has made it safer and there is no data that suggests severe crashes have occurred since the installation of these islands. Also, installing a roundabout at this location would not address the spacing concerns stated above.

The large amount of road surface opposite Gamble Street may cause a drainage issue.

Comment - The drainage for the road surface has been taken into account in the design. Further to this the filling of the verge and landscaping will protect the front of the property in extreme weather events.

Main Roads WA advises that they do not recommend driveways to be within 25 metres of roundabouts.

Comment - Higher speed roundabouts on higher classified roads (usually managed by Main Road WA) have very different criteria to those that are located within the urban environment. In those instances driveways within the roundabout would not be allowed however, in the urban environment, driveways are a common occurrence. In fact the access into a driveway within a roundabout at this type of location could be safer than the existing because of the slower speeds encountered and the fact that all motorists must give way to vehicles that are in the roundabout.
(iv) Design - Significant modifications to the driveway are required to make the access/egress legal and safe. The curvature of the central island is too great to slow down vehicles.

Comment - The access issue has been addressed earlier in this report. The roundabout has been appropriately designed using a horizontal deflection that is designed for a 40km/h speed environment. This is a standard speed criteria for designs such as these. There is also a request in the submission to move the central island further west however this will result in a reduced deflection and a higher speed roundabout which is not the required outcome.

(v) Negative Impact on Property and Occupants - Concerned that there will be increased traffic noise, less protection from light, sound and wind with the removal of the large verge trees.

Comment - Initially it must be understood that trees do not reduce the effects of noise. With the recommended installation of semi mature trees in the front garden of the property the other issues will be taken care of.

Loss of value due to the reduction in verge width.

Comment - There is no evidence that this is fact and in some cases traffic calming devices can actually have the opposite effect.

Landscaping and beautification on other roundabouts along Currie Street not finished leaving a barren dirt area in front of properties.

Comment - The landscaping at the other roundabouts has been partially completed however there have been issues with landscaping being stolen. It is still programmed to finalise the landscaping at these sites.

Access for cars with trailers will be hampered.

Comment - With the modifications to the driveway access and the installation of a turnaround area at the front of the house these concerns have been taken care of.

(vi) Consultation/Study - A modern study should be undertaken on an effective traffic calming strategy for the area. Alternatives such as centre blister islands more evenly spread along the road should be considered.

Comment - The study that was undertaken in 2006 is still considered to be valid and a further study is not warranted as traffic calming treatments and standards have not altered in the past 5 years.

The roundabout treatment at the intersection of Currie and Gamble Streets is still considered to be the most appropriate traffic calming treatment to slow vehicles in this area and with the modifications highlighted above the majority of concerns expressed in the submission will be appeased.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council SUPPORT the installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Currie Street and Gamble Street, Warnbro with minor modifications to reduce the overall impact on, and allow safe access into 116 Currie Street Warnbro.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. *DEFER* this matter to the next Corporate and Engineering Services meeting.
2. *CONTACT* the Commissioner of Police requesting a response from previous correspondence sent by the Council in respect to the transfer of the Traffic Branch from Rockingham to Kwinana.
3. *ARRANGE* an on-site meeting for Councillors to inspect the proposed roundabout.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

The Committee changed the Officer’s recommendation to allow for all Councillors to have the opportunity to view the proposed roundabout site and for contact to be made to the Commissioner of Police to obtain a response on traffic concerns within the City of Rockingham.

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

Not applicable
## Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the submissions received for Tender T11/12-28 Collection, transport and processing of co-mingled material and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the Tender.

## Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday 25 June 2011, for Tender T11/12-28 Collection, transport and processing of co-mingled material. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday 27 July 2011 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
### 3. Details

The purpose of this tender is for the collection and transporting of co-mingled recyclable materials from all residential premises and selected collections from multi-dwelling, business and light industrial premises. The Contractor is also to process the co-mingled recyclable materials.

Tenders were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Engineering Maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising of the Manager Waste and Landfill Operations, Director of Engineering & Parks Services and Waste Collection Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

The tender submission and alternative tender submission provided by Perth Engineering Maintenance were deemed non-conforming by the assessment panel as the submissions did not provide pricing for the collection and transport of co-mingled materials, which was a requirement in the tender specification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Perth Waste</th>
<th>Cleanaway</th>
<th>Avon Waste</th>
<th>Cleanaway Alternative Tender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderers Resources &amp; Delivery/Availability to</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply &amp; Sustain Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cleanaway provided an alternative tender in two parts:

- Part 1 - included a profit sharing arrangement where the City would receive a share of any profits (50%) Cleanaway can recover for commodities, where the increase is greater than the CPI (Cleanaway would absorb any losses).
- Part 2 - The alternative tender also included a reduced price for the collection and transport of the co-mingled recyclable materials. The tender specification requested a price per lift of any recycling bin which is collected on the recycling day. The alternative tender provided a
reduced price where the anticipated participation rate (85%) is multiplied by all rateable properties to give an estimate number of bins put out on the verge.

The Assessment Panel considered that this alternative submission provided an advantage to the City and chose to assess this alternative Tender in addition to Cleanaway's conforming tender.

Avon Waste provided two alternative tenders:

Alternative Tender 1 - Removed the requirement to provide bin replacements and bin repairs for the tender. The replacement and repair of bins would therefore become the responsibility of the City. The assessment panel considered this alternative submission and decided not to assess this submission as this was not in the best interest of the City.

Alternative Tender 2 - The alternative tender also included a reduced price for the collection and transport of the co-mingled recyclable materials. The tender specification requested a price per lift of any recycling bin which is collected on the recycling day. The alternative tender provided a reduced price where all residences that are charged for a recycling service are invoiced, should the recycling bin be collected or not. The alternative submission also removed the requirement to provide bin replacements and bin repairs for the tender. The replacement and repair of bins would therefore become the responsibility of the City. The assessment panel considered this alternative submission and decided not to assess this submission as this was not in the best interest of the City.

The annual estimated costs for the assessed submissions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perth Waste</td>
<td>$1,021,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Waste</td>
<td>$1,162,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanaway Alternative Tender</td>
<td>$1,111,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanaway</td>
<td>$1,201,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latest lift figures of bins collected in the City is 75,318 per month and 1003 tonnes of co-mingled recyclable materials for processing.

The contract will be for a period of 5 years calculated from the date of commencement of the first collections with an optional extension of a further 5 years in 12 month extensions or as one 5 year extension.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 12:** Carbon footprint reduction and waste minimisation programs centred upon public awareness and the use of new technologies.
d. **Policy**

In accordance with Council’s Purchasing Policy to deliver a best practise approach and procedures for internal purchasing for the City, and to ensure that integrity over the whole of the purchasing process is maintained and that the calling of tenders is a transparent process demonstrating fairness and equity.

e. **Financial**

The 2011/2012 Budget Allocation for the collection and transport of co-mingled materials is $1,400,000 in GL 210154.1488 - Non-Putrescible Waste Collection and $1,300,000 for the processing of co-mingled materials in GL210154.1523.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless sub regulation (2) states otherwise.

---

5. **Comments**

The alternative submission from Cleanaway allows for a share of profits (50%) from any increase in commodity prices where the increase is greater than the CPI. If there is no increase or a decrease in the commodity prices then the City will receive no income or charged any additional costs. An estimate of the profit share alternative is $90,000 per annum. As this price is calculated on the future price of commodities, no guarantee is given by Cleanaway that $90,000 will be received as this calculation was completed on indicative figures. This assumption has been included in the Assessment Matrix above for their Alternative Tender.

The alternative submission from Cleanaway also included a reduced price where the anticipated participation rate (85%) is multiplied by all rateable properties to give an estimate number of bins put out on the verge. This option is considered a benefit to the City as it allows for accurate budgeting of pricing and should the recycling rate for residences increases then the price paid is not affected.

All tenderers demonstrated the capacity and ability to perform the tender requirements, as well as sufficient experience and ability to provide the service.

A brief summary of each company’s submission is as follows:

**Cleanaway**

Cleanaway is the City’s current contractor for the Collection, Transport of Co-mingled Recyclable materials and have provided an excellent service over the last 10 years. During this time Cleanaway has consistently completed the required collections on time and with minimal problems. Cleanaway has also been processing the City's co-mingled recyclable materials since the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council's (SMRC) Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) was damaged in the fire in June 2009. Cleanaway also services a number of metropolitan Councils, including Mandurah, Armadale, Jondalup and Gosnells.

Cleanaway will transport their recyclables to their MRF in Mandurah.

Cleanaway have proposed to construct a new Education Centre which will assist in providing tours to school children to demonstrate the recycling process and plan on a $4.5million upgrade to their Mandurah MRF.
Perth Waste

Perth Waste currently services a number of metropolitan Councils, including Kwinana, Serpentine-Jarrahdale, Fremantle, Mosman Park, Bunbury, Busselton and Capel.

Perth Waste will transport their recyclables to their Transfer Station in Bibra Lake and then onto their MRF near Bunbury.

Perth Waste are assessing the viability of constructing a Perth Based MRF or Transfer Station in the Rockingham Region.

Avon Waste

Avon Waste will transport their recyclables to the Perth Engineering & Maintenance MRF in North Coogee.

Avon Waste currently services a number of Country Councils including York, Yilgarn, Merredin and Dandaragan.

Avon Waste has proposed that they would establish a depot facility to provide for the administration, customer service, workshop and fleet support.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria and evaluation of the tender assessment matrix, the alternative submission received from Cleanaway is considered to represent the best value to the City and is therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

Due to the competitive nature of this tender it is anticipated that the City will make substantial savings on the forecasted budget by accepting the Cleanaway tender submission.

The tender rate for processing of co-mingled recyclables has reduced considerably due to market conditions. The City was paying $85 per tonne for processing at the SMRC MRF, subsequent to the damage at the SMRC. The processing of recycling was then transferred to Mandurah at the Cleanaway MRF, at a rate of $60 per tonne. These figures have significantly reduced further in the current tender.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the alternative tender including profit sharing and price costing alternative submitted by Transpacific Cleanaway, 171 Camboon Road, Malaga for Tender T11/12-28 Collection, transport and processing of co-mingled materials in accordance with the tender documentation.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted by Perth Waste, 30 Palmerston Street, Mosman Park for Tender T11/12-28 Collection, transport and processing of co-mingled materials in accordance with the tender documentation.

Committee Voting – 3/2

Councillors having voted for the motion: Cr Sammels (2)

Cr Prince

Councillors having voted against the motion: Cr Dunkling

Cr Ellis

NOTE: Due to an equality of votes at the Corporate & Engineering Standing Committee meeting, the Chairman exercised his right to cast a second vote to reach a decision in this matter (Section 5.21(3) of the Local Government Act 1995).
9. **The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

The Committee changed the Officer's recommendation because of the closeness of the percentage in the weighted scores and there being a significant annual price difference of up to $180,000 per annum.

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

Not applicable
13. **Reports of Councillors**

Nil

14. **Addendum Agenda**

Nil

15. **Motions of which Previous Notice has been given**

**Corporate and Engineering Services**

**Executive Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>ES-026/11 Change of Mode of Mayoral Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>GOV/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Paul Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Hammond, Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 August 2011</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>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Purpose of Report**

To provide Officer comment and advice on Cr Ellis’ Notice of Motion.
2. **Background**

At the Ordinary Council meeting of 26 July 2011, Councillor Ellis submitted the following motion for consideration at the August meeting.

“That the format for electing the Mayor of the City of Rockingham be changed under the authority of Section 2.11(2) of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) to that of being elected by electors of the district.”

Cr Ellis’ reasons for the motion are as follows:

“Australia has three tiers of Government – Federal, State and Local. In the first two cases, the electors are aware of who they are voting into the main position. Under Local they are not aware of who will be elected Mayor. This very important decision is given to a handful of people.

Under the current system, the position of Mayor is elected by a Special Majority vote requiring only six people, yet the population of Rockingham is in excess of 100,000. There are many occasions where the Mayor is required to utilise his casting vote on matters. The Mayor should be answerable to the people and not just a handful of people, albeit Councillors.

3. **Details**

Local Governments have two methods in which the Mayor can be elected to office.

**Elector Mayor**

Is elected by way of an election every four years in line with the normal Local Government election process conducted biennially in October. The office of elector Mayor sits over and above Councillors representing wards or the district as a whole. If the City of Rockingham was to have an elector Mayor, then the number of elected members would increase to 11. An elector Mayor is not a Councillor. Their title is “Mayor Surname” not “Councillor Surname”. The term for an elector Mayor is four years.

**Councillor Mayor**

Is elected by the Council at the first available meeting after the biennial elections. A Councillor Mayor forms part of the elected group and therefore represents a ward or the district as a whole. A Councillor Mayor is part of the existing complement of Councillors, in the City of Rockingham’s situation 10. A Councillor Mayor is a Councillor. Their title can therefore be either “Councillor Surname” or “Mayor Surname”. The term for a Councillor Mayor is two years.

Since its establishment as a City in 1988, Rockingham has had a Councillor Mayor.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   Nil

c. **Strategic**

   Community Plan

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15:** Governance – Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.
d. **Policy**

Nil

e. **Financial**

Costs related to an Elector Mayor would be twofold:

- Costs relating to an extra elected member would amount to approximately $12,000 per annum.

- Costs relating to conducting a Mayoral Election as part of the normal Local Government Election process every four years would be approximately $50,000 over and above current costs. This estimate is based upon neighbouring Council expenditure which sees the Mayoral Election increasing normal election costs by approximately 35% - 40%.

The approximate annualised cost to Council therefore would be approximately $25,000 per annum for an Elector Mayor.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Section 2.11(2) of the Local Government Act (the Act) provides that Councils may change the filling of office of Mayor from “Councillor” to “Elector” by way of a “special majority” vote.

Section 1.10 of the Act provides that a Council with less than 11 members, of which the City of Rockingham is one, must use the decision on an absolute majority to exercise a special majority vote. Therefore, for a motion to be successful, it would require six votes.

Section 2.11(3) provides that any decision to change the mode of Mayoral Election would have no effect if made within 80 days of an election where the incumbent Mayor’s term of office ends.

The Act is not clear on whether the 80 day exclusion period extends to future (ie 2013) elections so legal advice was sought from McLeods Barristers & Solicitors as to the validity of the motion.

The advice is as follows:

“Under section 2.13(3), a decision made under section 2.11(2) would have ‘no effect if it is made during’ that 80 days period. It follows, in my view, that if the Proposed Motion were to be passed by a special majority at an August Councillor meeting, it would have ‘no effect’.

For these purposes, it is immaterial whether the Proposed Motion purported to apply in respect of, and from, the 2011 elections, the 2013 elections or any other elections. Any exercise of the power under section 2.11(2) (to change the method of filling the office of Mayor used by the City) would have no effect if made during the 80-day pre-election period referred to in section 2.13(3) of the Local Government Act.

It follows that the Council cannot lawfully exercise the power under section 2.11(2) and, therefore, cannot change the City’s current method of filling the office of Mayor (ie by election by the Council) until after this year’s ordinary (Council) elections, following which the City’s Mayor is to elected by Council.

It would be open for the Council, at any Council meeting after the October 2011 ordinary elections (but before the 80-day pre-election period applying to the 2013 ordinary elections) to pass a resolution in the terms of the Proposed Motion.”

5. **Comments**

It is not the role of staff to advise on the relative merits or otherwise of the “Councillor Mayor” versus the “Elector Mayor”.

The purpose of this report has been to provide the implications of such a change in an administrative and financial context and also to seek expert advice on the validity of the process that would serve to bring about the change.

The ramifications of conducting a Mayoral Election based upon an invalid statutory process, could see the results of an election annulled and the City open to serious legal, reputational and financial risk.

The advice from the City’s Solicitors clearly provides that any decision made within the 80 day period preceding an election would have no effect, irrespective of what year that decision referred to. Such decisions need to be made after the election day and before the commencement of the 80 day exclusion period.

Should Council approve this motion, then it will have no effect and the decision cannot be implemented under law.

6. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council not give this matter consideration.

7. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority – should Council not wish to proceed.

Absolute Majority – should Council wish to consider and vote upon the motion.

8. **Motion from Cr Ellis**

That the format for electing the Mayor of the City of Rockingham be changed under the authority of Section 2.11(2) LGA to that of being elected by electors of the district.

9. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **NOT GIVE** this matter consideration.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable


### Corporate and Engineering Services

**Executive Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>ES-027/11 Recording of Council and Standing Committee Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CPM/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Paul Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Ned Fimmano, Manager Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 August 2011</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></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

Council consideration of having all Council Meetings, Special Council Meetings and Standing Committee Meetings recorded and for the recordings to be put on the City of Rockingham website.

### 2. Background

At the Ordinary Council meeting held on the 26 July 2011, Cr Paul Ellis submitted the following Notice of Motion for consideration at the August meeting:

“That all Council Meetings, Special Council Meeting and Standing Committees be audibly recorded and these recordings made available to any interested parties on the Council Web Site”.

---

**CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**PRESIDING MEMBER**
Cr Ellis has provided the following reasons for his motion:

“Not all the people of Rockingham area in a position to attend these meetings. However, decisions made at these meetings can seriously affect the lives of these people. As we are representatives of the people of Rockingham they have a right to know exactly what has been said at the meetings on their behalf. Minutes are kept of these meetings, however the notes are not verbatim and often something that has been said can be taken and recorded out of context.

In addition to this there are occasions where something that has been said at a meeting is disputed at a later date. In a recent incident a Councillor has disputed a comment made by the Mayor. As there is no actual recording of this comment this matter is now being referred to the Local Government Authority for satisfaction. This can be at a cost to the people of Rockingham. Should these meetings be recorded this matter could be resolved by reviewing the tape”.

3. **Details**

A quote has been obtained from ELS Systems Design & Integration (ELA) who installed the current Microphone System that is in the Council Chambers. ELA have provided the following information and costs:

1. **To upgrade existing DCN system in the Council Chambers for recording**
   
   $2,998.00 + GST

   To replace the existing CCU 800 Series with a CCU-CURD 900 Series with a recording facility.

   System retains current operations and only requires SD memory card.

2. **To upgrade ground floor boardroom for recording audio**
   
   $4,255.00 + GST

   To install new sound recording system with integration into existing system for playback.

   4 x Desk boundary microphones

   1 x Professional SD Card recording and playback system

   1 x 8 Channel mixer for microphone balancing

   Additional Microphones will be at a cost of $80 each

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Nil

c. **Strategic**
   
   Community Plan

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15**: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative, legally and ethically compliant

d. **Policy**

   Council does not have a policy regarding the recording of Council or Standing Committee Meetings.
e. **Financial**

The cost to install a recording system in both the Council Chambers and Council Boardroom amounts to $7253 + GST and additional Microphones if required will be at a cost of $80 each.

From enquiries made there will be negligible costs to include the recordings on Council’s website.

The appropriate budget allocation will need to be made during the September quarterly budget review if approved by Council.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

There is no legislative provision requiring or dealing with the sound recording of an ordinary or committee meeting of a local government, however, if a meeting is recorded, then the State Records Act or Regulations under the Act requires the following:

1. Tape recordings of Council meetings – Verbatim transcripts (tapes may only be erased following verbatim transcripts) – 5 years after date of last action.

2. Tape recordings of Council Meetings – tapes not transcribed in full (local governments must ensure that a full and accurate record of the meeting is maintained and that the record is always accessible for the required period. Tapes should be refreshed to ensure their audibility) – 30 years after date of last action.

Council does not have a policy regarding the recording of Council or Standing Committee meetings, however, clause 8.5 of the Standing Orders Local Law 2001 states as follows:

1. No person is to use any electronic, visual or vocal recording device or instrument to record the proceedings of the Council or a Committee without the written permission of the Council.

2. Subclause (1) does not apply if the record is taken by or at the direction of the CEO with the permission of the Council or Committee.

5. **Comments**

Should Council wish to pursue the recording of Council and Standing Committee meetings a number of issues will need to be considered:

1. The Boardroom will need to have electronic recording equipment professionally installed with sufficient microphones to ensure that the sound quality is at the best level achievable. A hand held or portable recording device would not produce the sound quality required for official record purposes.

2. A sound recording person will be required at each meeting to specifically monitor the equipment to ensure that the equipment is recording properly throughout the entire meeting.

3. An area will need to be set aside in the Administration Building where the public can come in and listen to the recordings and an officer allocated to assist the public in the event that persons wishing to listen to the recordings do not have an internet service.

4. A decision will need to be made on the number of copies of the recordings that are to be made and if the recordings will be available for sale to the public presumably on CD ROM.

5. A secure place will need to be set aside for the recordings and kept for a minimum period of 30 years in accordance with the requirements of the State Records Act 2000. (It is assumed that the minutes will not be verbatim in which case if they are verbatim the recordings may be erased after 5 years). The recordings will require cataloguing for easy access.
There appears to be no call from the public for this service and Council may be involving itself in a prospective expensive time wasting exercise where there has not been any demonstrated benefit for its adoption. Until such time as the public require such a service it would appear unwarranted.

6. Officer Recommendation

That Council not support the recording of Council meetings, Special Council meetings or Standing Committee meetings.

7. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

8. Motion from Cr Ellis

That all Council Meetings, Special Council Meeting and Standing Committees be audibly recorded and these recordings made available to any interested parties on the Council Website.

9. Committee Recommendation

That Council NOT SUPPORT the recording of Council meetings, Special Council meetings or Standing Committee meetings.

Committee Voting - 3/1

(Cr P Ellis voted against)

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notices of motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matters Behind Closed Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and Time of Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday 20 September 2011 in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There being no further business, the Chairman thanked those persons present for attending the Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at 5:20pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>