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1. Declaration of Opening
The Chairperson declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at 4:06pm, welcomed all present, and recited the Acknowledgement of Country.

2. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

2.1 Councillors
Cr Barry Sammels Chairperson
Cr Lorraine Dunkling
Cr Allan Hill
Cr Ron Pease
Cr Deb Hamblin (to 4:12pm) Observer
Cr Chris Elliott Observer
Cr Richard Smith Observer
Cr Joy Stewart (from 4:08pm) Observer

2.2 Executive
Mr John Pearson Director Corporate Services
Mr John Woodhouse Director Legal Services and General Counsel
Mr Gary Rogers (to 4:38pm) Manager Procurement and Projects
Mr Kelton Hincks (to 4:38pm) Manager Asset Services
Mr James Henson Manager Parks Development
Mr Cadell Buss Manager Economic Development
Ms Karin Strachan (to 4:38pm) Manager Strategy Coordination
Mr Allan Moles Manager Financial Services
Mr Peter Varris Manager Governance and Councillor Support

2.3 Members of the Gallery: 1

2.4 Apologies: Nil

2.5 Approved Leave of Absence: Nil

3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice
Nil

4. Public Question Time
4:07pm The Chairperson invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions. There were none.
5. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

   **Moved Cr Hill, seconded Cr Dunkling:**
   
   That Council **CONFIRM** the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 16 April 2013, as a true and accurate record.
   
   Committee Voting – 4/0

6. **Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes**

   Nil

7. **Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion**

   4:07pm  The Chairperson 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**

   4:08pm  The Chairperson asked if there were any interests to declare.
   
   There were none.

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

   Nil

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

    Nil

4:08pm  Cr Stewart joined the meeting.

**Moved Cr Pease, seconded Cr Hill:**

That for the convenience of the meeting Item EP-016/13 - Notice of Motion – Rockingham Bike Plan be brought forward for consideration.

Carried – 4/0
**11. Motions of which Previous Notice has been given**

**Engineering and Parks Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-016/13 Notice of Motion – Rockingham Bike Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>Q12/13-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Deb Hamblin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>21 May 2013</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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

To provide officer comment and advice on Cr Deb Hamblin’s Notice of Motion.

**Background**

Councillor Hamblin submitted the following motion for consideration at the April Ordinary Council Meeting:

“That Council SUPPORT the inclusion of appropriate infrastructure in the Rockingham Bike Plan to facilitate cyclist access to and from the Kwinana Freeway through to the Rockingham City Centre.”

**Details**

The City developed its first Bike Plan back in the year 2000.

Following an extensive audit of all major cycling routes and bike parking facilities, the Bike Plan was reviewed and updated in 2007. The review focussed on improving existing routes and subsequently minor works were undertaken to improve the network.
Currently a further review is being undertaken by the City in conjunction with Sinclair Knight Merz of its Bike Plan with a strategic focus.

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   - Community workshop was held on 18 April 2013.
   - Updates on Council website.
   - Questionnaire Survey undertaken online.
   - Social Media through the City’s Facebook page.
   - Undertaking of the Bike Plan review was advertised in both local papers.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   - Department of Transport including Main Roads WA.
   - Public Transport Authority.

c. **Strategic**
   - **Community Plan**
     - This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:
     - **Aspiration 8:** Transport Systems that facilitate better use of public transport and promote non-car alternatives.

d. **Policy**
   - Nil

e. **Financial**
   - $60,000.00 expenditure allocated in the 2012/2013 budget Acc. No. 210377.1412.
   - $30,000.00 income received as a grant from Department of Transport.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   - Nil

**Comments**

The City’s Bike Plan is being reviewed on a six year basis. Whilst the last review focussed on removing breaks in the network, the current review because of the extensive growth in the City and the integration of two major transport infrastructure links (railway and freeway) has a Strategic Focus.

This provides the ideal opportunity to strategically look at multiple west-east connections from the city centre and railway stations through to the Kwinana Freeway.

The missing links were highlighted during the State Election Campaign particularly the connection along Safety Bay Road to Baldivis.

It is envisaged that the Bike Plan will be outlined to Council at an upcoming Council Information Workshop likely around July 2013.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council SUPPORT the inclusion of appropriate infrastructure in the Rockingham Bike Plan to facilitate cyclist access to and from the Kwinana Freeway through to the Rockingham City Centre.
Notice of Motion from Cr Deb Hamblin

That Council SUPPORT the inclusion of appropriate infrastructure in the Rockingham Bike Plan to facilitate cyclist access to and from the Kwinana Freeway through to the Rockingham City Centre.

Committee Recommendation

That Council SUPPORT the inclusion of appropriate infrastructure in the Rockingham Bike Plan to facilitate cyclist access to and from the Kwinana Freeway through to the Rockingham City Centre.

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

4:12pm  Cr Hamblin left the meeting.
### 12. Bulletin Items

**Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – May 2013**

**Corporate Services**
1. Corporate Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Mobile Computing (AIM) Licensing Fees
   - 3.2 Minutes and Agenda Software
   - 3.3 Online Records Management Training
   - 3.4 Retention and Disposal Project
   - 3.5 Document Migration
   - 3.6 Telephone System Replacement
   - 3.7 GIS Developments – SLIP & Custodial Module
   - 3.8 Building Licence Software
   - 3.9 Civil Drainage Software
   - 3.10 VM Licencing
   - 3.11 WiFi Installation
   - 3.12 Electronic Meeting Papers
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 List of Payments April 2013
   - 4.2 Change of Basis of Rates

**Governance and Councillor Support**
1. Governance and Councillor Support Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Electronic Meeting Papers and Decision Making Process
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Constitutional Recognition of Local Government
   - 4.2 Ward Boundary and Councillor Representation Review
   - 4.3 National Sea Change Taskforce Newsletter

**Human Resources**
1. Human Resources Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Employee Wellness Programme
   - 3.2 Corporate Training Programme
   - 3.3 Leadership & Management Programme
   - 3.4 Values Programme
   - 3.5 Occupational Safety & Health Program
4. Information Items

**Economic Development**
1. Economic Development Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Leadership Forums
   - 3.2 Social Media
   - 3.3 Global Friendship
4. Information Items
   4.1 NBN Rollout
   4.2 Communications Plans
   4.3 Australian Business Awards 2013
   4.4 Economic Development Strategy
   4.5 Media Tracking

**Strategy Coordination**
1. Strategy Coordination Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Establishing linkages between the Community Plan, the Specific Purpose Plans and the Team Plans
   4.2 2012 Customer Satisfaction Survey
   4.3 Coordinating the development of a 10 year infrastructure plan
   4.4 4th Generation Team Plans
   4.5 Coordinating the development and implementation of a Development Contribution Scheme
   4.6 New Ideas Incentive Scheme
   4.7 City Scoreboard
   4.8 Climate Change Response Strategy
   4.10 Integrated Risk Management Framework for the City of Rockingham
   4.11 LGMA Challenge
   4.12 Other initiatives that the Strategy Coordination team is involved with

**Legal Services & General Counsel**
1. Legal Services & General Counsel Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Provision of Legal Advice
   4.2 Oversight of Systems and Documentation
   4.3 Legal Capacity Building

**Committee Recommendation**

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – May 2013 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

**Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – May 2013**

**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 Directional Signage
   4.2 Delegated Authority for Thoroughfare Closures
   4.3 Local Area Traffic Management and Road Safety Design Projects 2012/2013
   4.4 Delegated Authority for approval of Engineering Drawings - Subdivisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering Operations Team Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Road Construction Program Roads to Recovery 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Road Construction Program Main Roads Grant 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Road Construction Program State Black Spot 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Road Renewal Program Municipal Works 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Footpath Construction Program Municipal Works 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Road Maintenance Program 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Passenger Vehicle Fleet Program 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Heavy Plant Program 2012/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parks Services Team Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Groundwater Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Mundijong Road Environmental Offsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Lake Richmond Heritage Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Beautiful Gardens Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Delegated Public Open Space Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Memorial Seat Approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asset Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asset Management Team Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Access Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Asset Management Improvement Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Asset Systems Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Lease Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Parks Financial Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Building Maintenance Team Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Graffiti Removal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Procurement and Capital Projects

1. Procurement and 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/Design, Underground Power Program)
   3.4 Major Project Property Development Planning (Design Modifications/Tender Planning/Structural Testing)

4. Information Items
   4.1 Delegated Written Notification of Successful Tenders
   4.2 Delegated Approval of Tenders by CEO
   4.3 Delegated Release of Retention/Bank Guarantees
   4.4 Proposed Shoalwater North Underground Power Project
   4.5 2012 Public Area Lighting and Arterial Lighting
   4.6 Lark Hill Wind Turbine
   4.7 Bent Street Boat Launching Facility – Proposed Navigation Channel
   4.8 Point Peron Boat Launching Facility – Design, Demolition and Replacement
   4.9 Aqua Jetty – Replace/Upgrade HVAC Services
   4.10 Bell Park Toilet – Replacement including Curfew Lockout System
   4.11 Baldivis Library and Community Centre – Design
   4.12 Aqua Jetty – Solar Heating
   4.13 Baldivis Old School – Redevelopment
   4.14 Hymus Street Coastal Protection
   4.15 Repair Rock Armour at Various Boat Launching Facilities
   4.16 Challenger Court Electrical System Upgrade
   4.17 Aqua Jetty Swimming Club Office
   4.18 Secret Harbour Surf Life Saving Club – Renovation
   4.19 Baldivis Oval – Floodlighting
   4.20 Kent Street Arts Facility

### 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 recycling service
   4.3 240 litre bin recycling participation statistics
   4.4 Destroyed and stolen refuse bins
   4.5 Landfill statistics
   4.6 Education and promotion
   4.7 Landfill power station
   4.8 T12/13-70 Verge Waste Collection Services

---

**Committee Recommendation**

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – May 2013 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0
13. Agenda Items

Corporate Services

Corporate and Engineering Services

Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-009/13 Monthly Financial Management Report for April 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>FLM/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>21 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site:                  |                                                         |
| Lot Area:              |                                                         |
| Attachments:           | Monthly Financial Management Report for April 2013      |
| Maps/Diagrams:         |                                                         |

Purpose of Report

To receive the monthly Financial Management Report for April 2013.

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.
## Implications to Consider

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consultation with the Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consultation with Government Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aspiration 15:</strong> Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legal and Statutory</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Comments

The numerous variances identified will be reviewed within the next budget review.

## Voting Requirements

- **Simple Majority**

## Officer Recommendation


## Committee Recommendation


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
Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-010/13 Rating Methodology - 2013/2014 Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RTV/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>21 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>21 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Rates Modelling Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4:17pm

Moved Cr Hill, seconded Cr Dunkling:
That for the convenience of the meeting Item CS-010/13 – Rating Methodology – 2013/2014 Financial Year be deferred for consideration until the conclusion of Item 18 – Matters Behind Closed Doors.

Carried – 4/0
Purpose of Report

To present the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review for Council’s consideration and to seek Council’s authorisation of the budget amendments arising from the review.

Background

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

Details

The May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review includes details of transactions during the July 2012 – April 2013 period and adjustments required to the annual budget. The document includes the following information:

1. Summary of Budget Position
2. Summary of major budget amendments.
3. Summary of projects carried forward.
4. Detailed statement of Operating & Non-Operating Revenue and Expenditure by Department
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 15: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   The net result of the Quarterly Budget Review is detailed in the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review attachment.

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

Comments

The main amendments proposed in the Budget Review are summarised in the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review attachment.

Funds have been carried forward for work and projects not expected to be completed by the end of June 2013 which is after any matching revenue expected. These projects are summarised in the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review attachment.

The final surplus/deficit is dependent on the amount of incomplete works at the end of the financial year and will be finalised during the preparation and audit of the Annual Financial Statements.

Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council:
1. ADOPT the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review; and
2. AMEND the budget accordingly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>ADOPT</strong> the May 2013 Quarterly Budget Review; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>AMEND</strong> the budget accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate and Engineering Services
General Management

Reference No & Subject: GM-003/13 Designation of Senior Employees
File No: CPM/3-04
Proponent/s: Mr Andrew Hammond, Chief Executive Officer
Author: 
Other Contributors: 
Date of Committee Meeting: 21 May 2013
Previously before Council: 
Disclosure of Interest: 
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive

Site: 
Lot Area: 
Attachments: 
Maps/Diagrams: 

Purpose of Report

To seek Council approval for the designation of Senior Employees.

Background

The City currently has no designation of “senior employees” as is provided for in the Local Government Act 1995 (The Act).

The recent resignation of the Director Community Development has highlighted the absence of any designation which essentially excludes the Council from having involvement in decisions relating to the appointment of a replacement.

Details

The Act takes a contemporary “broad governance” approach to the appointment of employees with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) being charged with the responsibility of employing and being accountable for the performance and outputs of all staff.

Put simply, the principle tenet of the employment relationship is “the Council employs the CEO and the CEO employs the staff”.
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The Act however does provide Council with the discretion of becoming involved in the decision making part of the recruitment process by designating certain positions as “senior employee” positions.

A proposal to employ a senior employee position must be submitted by the CEO to the Council who can either accept the proposal or reject it, provided that a reason for the rejection is proffered.

Should the proposal be rejected, then the CEO must resubmit another applicant for consideration. Council therefore essentially has a right of veto notwithstanding that it does not have the power to approve the appointment of any senior employee not recommended by the CEO. Senior Employee positions must also be advertised, with the remuneration package and term of contract being detailed.

Senior Employee positions are subject to an employment contract that carries a term of no more than 5 years.

Existing senior staff employment relationships are not affected.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consultation with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aspiration 15:</strong> Governance systems that ensure decisions and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>A policy entitled “Employment of Divisional Managers” exists, however was adopted before the enactment and implementation of the Local Government Act 1995 and carries provisions that do not accord with the Act and therefore should be rescinded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legal and Statutory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Section 5.37 of the Local Government Act 1995 provides that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The local government may designate certain positions to be those of “senior employees”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The CEO is to inform the Council of any proposal to employee (or dismiss) a senior employee and the Council may either accept the proposal or reject it, so long as it informs the CEO of its reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The vacancy for the position is to be advertised in a prescribed manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5.39 of the Act provides that a senior employee's employment is to be governed by a contract that cannot exceed five years, notwithstanding that such a contract is renewable without the need for advertising at the end of any given term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

It is considered to be reasonable and appropriate for Council to have involvement in the decision making processes relating to appointment of the executive team.
In the circumstances it is proposed that the following positions be designated as “senior employee” positions:

- Director Corporate Services
- Director Community Development
- Director Engineering and Parks
- Director Legal Services and General Counsel
- Director Planning and Development

The “Employment of Divisional Managers” should be rescinded as its provisions are not congruent with those of the Local Government Act 1995.

### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DESIGNATE** the following positions as “senior employee” positions:
   - Director Corporate Services
   - Director Community Development
   - Director Engineering and Parks
   - Director Legal Services and General Counsel
   - Director Planning and Development

2. **RESCIND** the “Employment of Divisional Managers” policy.

### Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DESIGNATE** the following positions as “senior employee” positions:
   - Director Corporate Services
   - Director Community Development
   - Director Engineering and Parks
   - Director Legal Services and General Counsel
   - Director Planning and Development

2. **RESCIND** the “Employment of Divisional Managers” policy.

**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
Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T13/14-05 Supply and Lay in-situ Concrete Pavements, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

The Tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 16 March 2013. The Tender closed at 2:00pm Wednesday, 10 April 2013 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

Details

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dowsing Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextside Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Group (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Price Schedule - Schedule of Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Dowsing Concrete</th>
<th>Nextraide Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Has Group (WA) Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</td>
<td>Rate per Unit ($)</td>
<td>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 0 m² to 250 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 251 m² to 500 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 501 m² to 1000 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Footpaths – greater than 1001 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5.1 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Footpaths 100mm deep including boxing out and backing up where footprint is installed to match existing ground levels

1. Footpaths – 0 m² to 250 m²
   - m²: 48.00
   - 50.00
   - 43.00
   - 44.50
   - 52.50
   - 55.00

2. Footpaths – 251 m² to 500 m²
   - m²: 46.00
   - 48.00
   - 43.00
   - 44.50
   - 50.00
   - 52.50

3. Footpaths – 501 m² to 1000 m²
   - m²: 45.00
   - 48.00
   - 43.00
   - 44.50
   - 50.00
   - 52.50

4. Footpaths – greater than 1001 m²
   - m²: 45.00
   - 48.00
   - 43.00
   - 44.50
   - 475.00
   - 50.00

### 6.5.2 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Footpaths 150mm deep, with F62 steel reinforcing includes boxing out and backing up where footprint is installed to match existing ground level

1. Footpaths – 0 m² to 250 m²
   - m²: 75.00
   - 80.00
   - 55.50
   - 57.00
   - 62.50
   - 65.25

2. Footpaths – 251 m² to 500 m²
   - m²: 75.00
   - 80.00
   - 55.50
   - 57.00
   - 60.00
   - 63.00

3. Footpaths – 501 m² to 1000 m²
   - m²: 75.00
   - 80.00
   - 55.50
   - 57.00
   - 60.00
   - 63.00

4. Footpaths – greater than 1001 m²
   - m²: 75.00
   - 80.00
   - 55.50
   - 57.00
   - 57.50
   - 60.00

### 6.5.3 Supply and Lay In-situ Faux Brick Concrete 100mm deep including boxing out and backing up where footprint is installed to match existing ground levels

1. Faux Brick Concrete
   - m²: 85.00
   - 88.00
   - 66.50
   - 68.00
   - 87.50
   - 86.50

2. Faux Brick Concrete
   - m²: 78.00
   - 81.00
   - 66.50
   - 68.00
   - 85.00
   - 84.00

3. Faux Brick Concrete
   - m²: 78.00
   - 81.00
   - 66.50
   - 68.00
   - 80.00
   - 84.00

4. Faux Brick Concrete
   - greater than 1001 m²
   - m²: 78.00
   - 81.00
   - 66.50
   - 68.00
   - 77.50
   - 81.00
## 6.5.4 Supply and Lay In-situ Faux Brick Concrete 150mm deep including boxing out and backing up where footpath is install to match existing ground levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Faux Brick Concrete – 0 m² to 250 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Faux Brick Concrete – 251 m² to 500 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Faux Brick Concrete – 501 m² to 1000 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Faux Brick Concrete – greater than 1001 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6.5.5 Supply and Lay In-situ Limestone Concrete including sealing 100mm deep including boxing out and backing up where footpath is install to match existing ground levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Limestone Concrete including sealing – 0 m² to 250 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Limestone Concrete including sealing – 251 m² to 500 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Limestone Concrete including sealing – 501 m² to 1000 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Limestone Concrete including sealing – greater than 1001 m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6.5.6 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete pram ramps and aprons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Install Pram Ramps including cutting of asphalt to suit 1500 wide path</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>435.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Install Pram Ramps including cutting of asphalt to suit 2000 wide path</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>435.00</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Install Pram Ramps including cutting of asphalt to suit 2500 wide path</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Concrete Apron including cutting of asphalt to suit</td>
<td>Linear metre</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.5.7 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Repairs— including the removal, replacement and backfilling of damaged Footpath or Crossover (Combined m2 areas in one suburb location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 0 m² to 25 m²</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 26 m² to 50 m²</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Footpaths – 51 m² to 75 m²</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5.8 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Crossovers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Crossovers – 100mm deep including preparation of site, construction, and backfilling (includes boxing out where crossover is installed to match existing ground level)</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Crossovers – 150mm deep including preparation of site, construction, and backfilling (includes boxing out where crossover is installed to match existing ground level)</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>60.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5.9 Other items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate Only per Unit</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
<th>Year 1 Price valid to 30/6/14 Rate per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Year 2 Price valid from 1/7/2014 to 30/6/2015 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Supply and install F62 mesh</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Supply F62 mesh</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supply and install Galvanised F62 mesh</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Supply Galvanised F62 mesh</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supply and install Lock joint</td>
<td>Linear metre</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nextside Pty Ltd has qualified a minimum job charge of $800 for individual jobs. Clarification was sought and a written response received.

The assessment panel considered the qualification as acceptable, low risk and can be mitigated with sound project management.

A panel comprising Construction Engineer, Senior Maintenance Coordinator and Coordinator Engineering Operations undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tender, 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>Dowsing Concrete</th>
<th>Nextside Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Has Group (WA) Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Company Experience</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Personal Skills and Experience</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 building, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.

d. Policy

e. Financial
   Capital works expenditure will be in accordance with the City’s Business Plan as presented to Council and operational expenditure will be in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2013/2014 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

f. Legal and Statutory

Comments

Dowsing Concrete and Nextside Pty Ltd are the City’s current contractors. Under the previous concrete pavements tender, both companies have shown the capability of providing quality workmanship in a timely manner and have demonstrated the capacity to deliver large volumes of work to the required standard.

The wide range of engineering works, coupled with the understanding that at times no one contractor would be available to carry out the required tasks on demand, meant the assessment panel considered it represented better value to the City to award a panel contract with works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Dowsing Concrete and Nextside Pty Ltd are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Dowsing Concrete, 9 Ferguson Street, Kewdale WA 6105; and Nextside Pty Ltd, 34 Casuarina Place, Henley Brook WA 6055; for Tender T13/14-05 – Supply and Lay in-situ Concrete Pavements in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.
**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Dowsing Concrete, 9 Ferguson Street, Kewdale WA 6105; and Nextside Pty Ltd, 34 Casuarina Place, Henley Brook WA 6055; for Tender T13/14-05 – Supply and Lay in-situ Concrete Pavements in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.

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
### Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T13/14-01 Hire of Road Construction and Other Miscellaneous Plant, Trucks and Rubbish Compactor Trucks, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### Background

The Tender for Hire of Road Construction and Other Miscellaneous Plant, Trucks and Rubbish Compactor Trucks was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday 16 March 2013. The Tender closed at 2:00pm Wednesday 17 April 2013 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

### Details

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allwest Plant Hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldivis Landcare Group Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;M Waste Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCEG &amp; Co Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tender submitted by Sherrin Rentals Pty Ltd was considered non-conforming by the assessment panel as no prices were provided for Year 2 (1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015), hence the submission was not assessed.

A panel comprising of the City’s Construction Engineer, Senior Maintenance Coordinator and Coordinator Engineering Operations undertook tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tender, 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>Allwest Plant Hire</th>
<th>Baldivis Landcare Group Inc</th>
<th>D&amp;M Waste Services</th>
<th>ERCEG &amp; Co Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Executive Plant Hire Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Company Experience</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Personnel Skills and Experience</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>HAS Group (WA) Pty Ltd</th>
<th>M Radonich &amp; Sons</th>
<th>Mining Equipment Solutions Australia Pty Ltd</th>
<th>R&amp;R Water Truck Hire Pty Ltd</th>
<th>RD &amp; S Erceg</th>
<th>Tutt Bryant Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Company Experience</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Personnel Skills and Experience</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

e. Financial
   Capital works expenditure will be in accordance with the City’s Business Plan as presented to Council and operational expenditure will be in accordance with the Engineering and Parks Operations Maintenance Budgets as allocated in the draft 2013/2014 operational budget.

f. Legal and Statutory

Comments

The tender submissions provided by Allwest Plant Hire, D&M Waste Services, Executive Plant Hire Pty Ltd, HAS Group (WA) Pty Ltd, M Radonich & Sons, Mining Equipment Solutions Australia Pty Ltd and Tutt Bryant Hire were all identified as demonstrating the capacity and ability to perform the duties, as well as sufficient experience to provide the service required.

There was an acceptance that at times no one contractor would be available to provide the required plant or trucks on demand, and therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City and provide greater operational flexibility to award a panel contract with plant and truck hire to be allocated based on the equipment range offered, the price of the hire, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Allwest Plant Hire, D&M Waste Services, Executive Plant Hire Pty Ltd, HAS Group (WA) Pty Ltd, M Radonich & Sons, Mining Equipment Solutions Australia Pty Ltd and Tutt Bryant Hire are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted by:

- Allwest Plant Hire, 33 Edison Circuit, Forrestdale WA 6112
- D&M Waste Services, 163 Boomerang Road, Oldbury WA 6121
- Executive Plant Hire Pty Ltd, Lot 1-25 Edison Rise, Wangara WA 6065
- HAS Group (WA) Pty Ltd, 18B Elgee Road, Bellevue WA 6056
- M Radonich & Sons, 592 Rockingham Road, Munster WA 6166
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 18 JUNE 2013

- Mining Equipment Solutions Australia Pty Ltd, 45 Stebbing Road, Maddington WA 6109
- Tutt Bryant Hire, 27 Beach Road, Kwinana WA 6167

for Tender T13/14-01 Hire of Road Construction and Other Miscellaneous Plant, Trucks and Rubbish Compactor Trucks in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.

Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by:

- Allwest Plant Hire, 33 Edison Circuit, Forrestdale WA 6112
- D&M Waste Services, 163 Boomerang Road, Oldbury WA 6121
- Executive Plant Hire Pty Ltd, Lot 1-25 Edison Rise, Wangara WA 6065
- HAS Group (WA) Pty Ltd, 18B Elgee Road, Bellevue WA 6056
- M Radonich & Sons, 592 Rockingham Road, Munster WA 6166
- Mining Equipment Solutions Australia Pty Ltd, 45 Stebbing Road, Maddington WA 6109
- Tutt Bryant Hire, 27 Beach Road, Kwinana WA 6167

for Tender T13/14-01 Hire of Road Construction and Other Miscellaneous Plant, Trucks and Rubbish Compactor Trucks in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2015.

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
Purpose of Report

To seek Council’s determination in respect to the management and future development options for the Mersey Point Jetty.

Background

Following the presentation of the Mersey Point to Port Kennedy Coastal Study report to the October 2012 meeting of Marine Infrastructure and Advisory Committee, a detailed presentation of the study was made to Councillors and senior staff on 6 February 2013.

The presentation highlighted a number of issues influencing the current and future use of the Mersey Point Jetty, and the need for a specific report to address the future development and ongoing management options for the facility.

Details

Prior to 1963 the Mersey Point Jetty was leased to M.J. Dickenson. This structure was demolished and a new structure built by the Public Works Department which was subsequently licensed by the Shire of Rockingham. The extension and upgrades of the jetty were carried out in 1970, 1988 and 1999.

1 Typographical error corrected from Agenda.
The City presently meets all capital and ongoing management costs of the jetty/boardwalk. Inspections of the site and a condition assessment report of the jetty structure took place in May 2012. The accretion that continues to occur at this site and the deteriorating condition of the jetty and boardwalk requires constant maintenance. In order to cater for the 40,000 (approximately) visitors to Penguin Island the ferry service accommodates each year, there is a requirement for the jetty to be safe and suitable for the large number of passengers and to meet the constant berthing requirements of the ferries for loading and unloading of passengers. It is estimated that the ferry service provides for approximately 50% of the visitors that the Island receives each year.

The ferry operator is licenced with the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) to operate a commercial tourism business in the Shoalwater Island Marine Park. The primary purpose of the existing jetty is to accommodate the operational requirements of the commercial tourism operator.

As part of the abovementioned coastal study process MP Rogers and Associates were required to prepare a concept design for the possible future replacement of the jetty. The concept design is shown attached.

### Implications to Consider

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Consultation with the Operators of Penguin Island Ferry Service took place as part of the recent coastal study.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Consultation was also undertaken with the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Department of Transport in preparing the coastal study report.

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 5:** Community facilities and services delivered in a timely manner, able to meet expectations and serve new and growing neighbourhoods

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

d. **Policy**
   
   Not Applicable

e. **Financial**
   
   There are funds within the 2012/2013 budget for the upgrading of the Mersey Point Jetty and boardwalk. Due to the condition of the jetty it is considered that expenditure of these funds to mitigate short term maintenance issues would not suitably address the long term maintenance and management requirements referred to in the Mersey Point to Port Kennedy Coastal study (2012).

   The jetty replacement would not qualify for state government support through existing funding schemes such as the Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme. Unless alternative external funding support is able to be secured the City would be required to meet the entire costs of demolition and replacement. Dependent upon the location and design parameters it is estimated that demolition costs would be approximately $100,000 and replacement costs would exceed $1,100,000.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   
   Development within the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park must be consistent with the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park Management Plant 2007 – 2017.
Comments

The condition of the jetty, and the level of accretion that continues to occur at the current location, results in the jetty requiring a significant level of ongoing maintenance. In addition, these factors also restrict the ferry’s ability to manoeuvre in variable weather conditions.

Given the poor appearance, ongoing safety concerns and limited operational outcomes there is a need for Council to immediately consider the best long term plan for the jetty. Over the last 12 months foreshore and jetty maintenance costs directly associated with the jetty and it’s use have exceeded $35,000.

The following options need to be considered in relation to the existing structure:

1. **Demolish existing jetty and relocate to an alternative location ($1.0m).** Should the decision be made to replace the jetty, it is recommended that due to the existing site being significantly impacted upon by sand movement and accretion an alternative location approximately 80 meters north would be a more suitable site. The shoreline to the north of the current jetty is more stable, however it is also undergoing a long term accretion trend. Approval would be required from the Department of Environment and Conservation as the piling of the jetty would extend into existing seagrass beds.

   Please refer to Appendix 1 providing details of the location and concept design of the new jetty.

2. **The City gifts the jetty to the DEC.** As the structure is used primarily to service the berthing/landing requirements of a commercial operator licenced with the DEC, it is suggested that it would be appropriate for the DEC to manage the infrastructure directly associated with the operations of the lessee.

   **Note:** the DEC maintain and manage the jetty located on Penguin Island.

3. **Demolish and reinstate the beach to its natural state (100k).** Due to replacement costs and long term sustainability concerns should the decision be to not construct a new relocated jetty, it is suggested that the City consider demolition and reinstatement of the beach area. As part of the discussions held with the operator when undertaking the coastal study other options such as the use of dinghies to transfer passengers and/or using an amphibious vessel were briefly discussed however the operator advised that these were not favoured options.

4. **Demolish and replace on current site.($1.2M)** As stated previously the dynamics of the local coastal environment are such that the replacement of the jetty at the current location would require the jetty to be further extended into deeper water, resulting in the jetty having a higher capital cost than Option 1 above. Also the long term sustainability of the jetty due to sand accretion will, despite design improvements, result in the City continuing to be required to regularly harvest sand to ensure jetty access is not impeded, and potentially require dredging at the end of the jetty to be undertaken in future years. The major advantage of this option is that environmental approval should be easier as no seagrass beds would be disturbed. In addition the current location is supported by the commercial ferry operator.

While providing for the berthing requirements of the commercial ferry operator, the jetty provides minimal additional social outcomes. Given the age and condition of this structure, and the dynamic environmental conditions associated with the site, without active management of the boardwalk and jetty structure public safety is concerning.

In order for further consideration to be given to the demolition and replacement, it is recommended that formal discussions be held with Department of Environment and Conservation and the operator of the commercial ferry services regarding design, location, capital cost and ongoing contributions towards a new jetty.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
**Officer Recommendation**

That Council *AGREE* to the Chief Executive Officer initiating discussions with the Department of Environment and Conservation and the commercial ferry operator in order to seek agreement on the future management and development options for the Mersey Point jetty including possible levels of funding support to be provided to the City should the jetty be replaced and relocated.

Further should these discussions not be successful in reaching an agreement, the Chief Executive Officer shall offer to gift the existing jetty to the Department of Environment and Conservation, and should the offer be refused, the jetty be demolished, and the affected foreshore repatriated as soon as possible.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council *AGREE* to the Chief Executive Officer initiating discussions with the Department of Environment and Conservation and the commercial ferry operator in order to seek agreement on the future management and development options for the Mersey Point jetty including possible levels of funding support to be provided to the City should the jetty be replaced and relocated.

Further should these discussions not be successful in reaching an agreement, the Chief Executive Officer shall offer to gift the existing jetty to the Department of Environment and Conservation, and should the offer be refused a further report be presented to Council for consideration of the future of the Mersey Point Jetty including jetty demolition and foreshore repatriation.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

To provide Council a further opportunity to consider the future of the Mersey Point Jetty after discussions with relevant parties.

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

Not Applicable
## Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T13/14-08 - Maintenance of various parks, reserves and streetscape areas in Secret Harbour; document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

## Background

Tender T13/14-08 – Maintenance of various parks, reserves and streetscape areas in Secret Harbour was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 2 March 2013. The Tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 27 March 2013 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

## Details

The scope of the contract is for the maintenance of all landscape treatments including turf areas, garden beds, arboriculture works, lakes and irrigation in the locality of Secret Harbour.

The period of the contract shall be from the date of award until 30 June 2016 and will be subject to a Consumer Price Index increase every 12 months from the date of award.
Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Lump Price per annum (GST Exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cobey Maintenance Services</td>
<td>$572,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochness Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$827,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockingham – Parks Operations</td>
<td>$876,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Systems Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$1,073,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Industries Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$1,112,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Parks Development, Irrigation Assets Officer and the Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tender, 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>Cobey Maintenance Services</th>
<th>Lochness Pty Ltd</th>
<th>CoR Parks Operations</th>
<th>Land Systems Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Environ Industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Tenderer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderer's Resources</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the mutual agreement of both the Principal and the Contractor, and with the absolute discretion of either party not to extend, the Contract may be extended for maximum of up to 24 additional calendar months, in periods not greater than 12 calendar months.

**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.
d. **Policy**  

e. **Financial**  
Operating expenditure will be in accordance with the City’s Business Plan and the Engineering and Parks operations maintenance budgets as allocated in the draft 2013/2014 budget.

f. **Legal and Statutory**  

**Comments**

The City’s Parks Operations team submitted an internal bid for the tendered contract and as a result the evaluation of the submissions was conducted independently of anyone involved with the preparation and/or works associated with a contract award.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender assessment criteria all companies, including the City, demonstrated a capacity to undertake the works, however, the submission received from Cobey Maintenance Services achieved the highest total which was largely determined on price and are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Cobey Maintenance Services, 37 Roscoe Street, Henderson, WA 6165 for Tender T13/14-08 – Maintenance of various parks, reserves and streetscape areas in Secret Harbour in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2016.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Cobey Maintenance Services, 37 Roscoe Street, Henderson, WA 6165 for Tender T13/14-08 – Maintenance of various parks, reserves and streetscape areas in Secret Harbour in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2016.

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
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Reports of Councillors</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Addendum Agenda</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Notices of motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Matters Behind Closed Doors</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4:38pm Mr Rogers, Mr Hincks and Mrs Strachan left the meeting.
19. Agenda Items - Continued

Corporate Services

Corporate and Engineering Services

Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-010/13 Rating Methodology - 2013/2014 Financial Year2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RTV/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>21 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site:
Lot Area:
Attachments:
Maps/Diagrams:

Rates Modelling Summary

Purpose of Report

This report is written to adopt “in principle” proposed rates in the dollar for the 2013/2014 financial year.

Background

The City’s Business Plan that has been adopted indicates the level of rates needed to service current and future City requirements. This plan provided detailed financial information for the City which gave clarity to rate changes needed. The rate changes recommended are in accordance with previous resolutions of Council associated with the City Business Plan.

---

2 The Director Corporate Services tabled a replacement report for Item CS-010/13 which included changes to better reflect statutory requirements with regard to differential rating and associated objects and reasons. Materially the rate increases and changes are no different to those recommended in the Agenda. These minutes reflect the tabled report.
The new yield from all rates for the 2013/2014 year is projected to be some $57 million excluding any specified area rates associated with Harrington Waters. All money from rates is used across a wide array of services.

## Details

The proposed rating methodology is to apply differential rates for the 2013/2014 financial year in accordance with Section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995 as follows,

### Gross Rental Valuation (GRV) Properties

Properties rated on a GRV basis make up approximately 99% of the total rates levied and have been classified into the following rate categories.

- **GRV – Residential**
  
  A differential general rate of 6.974 cents in the $ applies to Residential Land.
  
  “Residential Land” means any land used, or designed, or adapted for use, for the purpose of a dwelling and includes vacant land within the Residential, Rural, Special Rural, Special Residential, Commercial, District Town Centre, Primary Centre Water Front Village, Primary Centre Urban Village and Primary Centre City Centre zones under the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.
  
  “Dwelling” has the meaning given to it in the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.
  
  The rate applied to GRV - Residential is the differential general rate used as the basis on which the other GRV rate categories are calculated. The GRV – Residential rate is an increase of 6.3% over the 2012/2013 rate in the $. Residential properties make up approximately 83% of the total GRV rates levied.

- **GRV – Non-Residential**
  
  A differential rate of 7.462 cents in the $ applies to Non-Residential Land.
  
  “Non-Residential Land” means all land other than Residential Land.
  
  The City has implemented a 7% differential rate on Non-Residential properties to assist in the cost of infrastructure specifically designed to support the non-residential sector. This includes construction of major City Centre infrastructure and roads specifically designed to form new ‘gateways’ into the City from major traffic thoroughfares. Non Residential properties make up approximately 17% of the total GRV rates levied.

- **GRV – Minimum Rate**
  
  It is proposed that the minimum rate on all GRV properties be increased from $799 to $899 for the 2013/2014 year.

### Unimproved Valuation (UV) Properties

Properties rated on a UV basis make up approximately 1% of the total rates levied and have been classified into the following rate categories.

- **UV – Improved**
  
  A differential general rate of 0.102 cents in the $ applies to Improved Land.
  
  “Improved Land” means all land other than Vacant Land.
  
  The rate applied to UV - Improved is the differential general rate used as the basis on which the other UV rate categories are calculated. The UV – Improved rate is an increase of 9.7% over the 2012/2013 rate in the $. Improved properties make up approximately 43% of the total UV rates levied.

- **UV – Vacant**
  
  A differential general rate of 0.092 cents in the $ applies to Vacant Land.
  
  “Vacant Land” means any land which is vacant land.
The City has implemented a minus 10% differential rate on UV - Vacant properties to address rapid valuation increases experienced a number of years ago. The City is in the process of phasing out this differential rate as it is no longer needed. Vacant Land properties make up approximately 57% of the total UV rates levied.

**UV – Urban Farm Land**

It is proposed to apply up to a 10% concession to Rural Zone Urban Farm Land properties which do not make a minimum payment. Any concession applied will not reduce the rates payable below what would be payable under a minimum payment.

“Rural Zone” means land zoned Rural under the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2. “Urban Farm Land” means

a) any single lot or portion of rateable property which is wholly or mainly maintained or used for the time being for carrying on one or more of the following businesses or industries, namely, grazing (including agistment), dairying, pig-farming, poultry-farming, tree-farming, fish-farming, bee-keeping, viticulture, horticulture, fruit growing or the growing of crops of any kind where either –
   i) the occupier derives the whole or a substantial part of his livelihood from such businesses or industries, or
   ii) the owner is ordinarily resident on such lot or portion of rateable property; or
b) 2 or more separate lots or portions of rateable property which have the same owner, on one of which the owner is ordinarily resident, and which are together wholly or mainly maintained or used for the time being for carrying on one or more of the businesses or industries mentioned in paragraph a) of this definition.

The City is proposing to utilise a 10% concession on Urban Farm Land properties to address rapid valuation increases experienced a number of years ago. The City is in the process of phasing out this concession as it is no longer needed.

**UV - Minimum Rate**

It is proposed that the minimum rate for all UV properties be increased from $400 to $450 for the 2013/2014 year.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil at this stage. Advertising of rate differentials will be in accordance with 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995. The community has an opportunity to provide comment from this advertising process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>Consultation with Government agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c.</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The recently endorsed Community Plan requires the investigation of new revenue streams. To this end, the endorsement of rate changes assists in revenue creation and ensures service delivery and asset preservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e.</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The adoption “in principle” of the proposed rates for the 2013/2014 are anticipated to yield approximately $57 million. This is a net increase of $6.09 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. **Legal and Statutory**

Adoption of rates occurs as part of the budget adoption, which is proposed to occur in June 2013. This report proposes to adopt the rate levels “in principle” at this time.

It is a requirement under section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995 that where a Council elects to utilise Differential Rates then it shall advertise its intention to do so, and call for submissions for a period of least 21 days before any further action occurs. Further, in accordance with Section 6.33 (3) of the Local Government Act 1995, ministerial approval will be required to impose a differential rate that is more than twice the lowest differential general rate imposed. With proposed rates presented for endorsement by Council at this meeting, ministerial approval will not be required.

---

**Comments**

Council staff have presented to Council a long term business plan that integrates suitable financial models. The plan indicates the need to spend significant resources on asset preservation. There are expectations by the community that the Council will act in a wide variety of fields; in the majority of cases this involves additional costs.

---

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

This is all that is required, as the matter is merely an “in principle” issue at this time, as the formal adoption of rates is part of the budget resolutions.

---

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council ADOPT “in principle” the following rates in the dollar and minimum rates for the 2013/2014 financial year:

**Gross Rental Valuation (GRV) Properties**

**GRV – Residential**

A differential general rate of **6.974 cents** in the $ applies to Residential Land.

“Residential Land” means any land used, or designed, or adapted for use, for the purpose of a dwelling and includes vacant land within the Residential, Rural, Special Rural, Special Residential, Commercial, District Town Centre, Primary Centre Water Front Village, Primary Centre Urban Village and Primary Centre City Centre zones under the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

“Dwelling” has the meaning given to it in the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

**GRV – Non-Residential**

A differential rate of **7.462 cents** in the $ applies to Non-Residential Land.

“Non-Residential Land” means all land other than Residential Land.

**GRV - Minimum Rate**

The minimum rate on all GRV properties is **$899**.

**Unimproved Valuation (UV) Properties**

**UV – Improved**

A differential general rate of **0.102 cents** in the $ applies to Improved Land.

“Improved Land” means all land other than Vacant Land.

**UV – Vacant**

A differential general rate of **0.092 cents** in the $ applies to Vacant Land.
“Vacant Land” means any land which is vacant land.

**UV - Minimum Rate**
The minimum rate for all UV properties is **$450**.

### Supplementary Information

Cr Elliott tabled an alternate Rates Modelling proposal for GRV properties which in summary comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cr Elliott’s Proposed Model</th>
<th>GRV – Residential</th>
<th>7.106 cents in $</th>
<th>8.3% increase</th>
<th>27,219 properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRV Minimum Rate</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,561 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRV – Non Residential</td>
<td>7.213 cents in $</td>
<td>9.9% increase</td>
<td>1,126 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cr Sammels tabled an alternate Rates Modelling proposal for GRV properties which in summary comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cr Sammels’ Proposed Model</th>
<th>GRV – Residential</th>
<th>7.06 cents in $</th>
<th>7.6% increase</th>
<th>25,939 properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRV Minimum Rate</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,837 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRV – Non Residential</td>
<td>7.272 cents in $</td>
<td>10.8% increase</td>
<td>1,130 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Recommendation

That Council **ADOPT** “in principle” the following rates in the dollar and minimum rates for the 2013/2014 financial year:

**Gross Rental Valuation (GRV) Properties**

**GRV – Residential**

A differential general rate of **7.060 cents** in the $ applies to Residential Land.

“Residential Land” means any land used, or designed, or adapted for use, for the purpose of a dwelling and includes vacant land within the Residential, Rural, Special Rural, Special Residential, Commercial, District Town Centre, Primary Centre Water Front Village, Primary Centre Urban Village and Primary Centre City Centre zones under the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

“Dwelling” has the meaning given to it in the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

**GRV – Non-Residential**

A differential rate of **7.272 cents** in the $ applies to Non-Residential Land.

“Non-Residential Land” means all land other than Residential Land.

**GRV - Minimum Rate**

The minimum rate on all GRV properties is **$885**.

**Unimproved Valuation (UV) Properties**

**UV – Improved**

A differential general rate of **0.102 cents** in the $ applies to Improved Land.

“Improved Land” means all land other than Vacant Land.
UV – Vacant
A differential general rate of **0.092 cents** in the $ applies to Vacant Land.
"Vacant Land" means any land which is vacant land.

**UV - Minimum Rate**
The minimum rate for all UV properties is **$450**.
**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

To provide a more equitable distribution of rates between residential and non-residential properties and the level of those properties affected by the imposition of minimum rates payments.

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

Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date and Time of Next Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The next Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on <strong>Tuesday 18 June 2013</strong> in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There being no further business, the Chairperson thanked those persons present for attending the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at <strong>5:16pm</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>