



City of Nedlands

Minutes

Council Committee Meeting

3 December 2019

ATTENTION

This is a Committee which has only made recommendations to Council. No action should be taken on any recommendation contained in these Minutes. The Council resolution pertaining to an item will be made at the next Ordinary Meeting of Council following this meeting.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Opening	3
Present and Apologies and Leave of Absence (Previously Approved)	3
1. Public Question Time	4
1.1 Mr Simon Edis, 72 Kingsway, Nedlands	4
2. Addresses By Members of the Public (only for items listed on the agenda)	5
3. Disclosures of Financial Interest	5
4. Disclosures of Interests Affecting Impartiality	5
4.1 Councillor McManus – CM07.19-	5
5. Declarations by Members That They Have Not Given Due Consideration to Papers	6
6. Confirmation of Minutes	6
6.1 Committee Meeting 12 November 2019	6
7. Matters for Which the Meeting May Be Closed	6
8. Divisional Reports	6
8.1 Planning & Development Report No’s PD48.19 to PD56.19	7
PD48.19 No. 3 Circe Circle, Dalkeith – Additions to a Single House (Carport and Primary Street Fencing)	7
PD49.19 No. 2 Burwood Street, Nedlands – Additions to a Single House (Ancillary Dwelling and Carport)	10
PD50.19 No. 85 Clifton St, Nedlands – Change of Use (Residential to Short Term Accommodation, Holiday House)	16
PD51.19 No. 7 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne – Additions to a Single House (Privacy Screen)	18
PD52.19 Local Planning Scheme 3 - Local Planning Policy - Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings	20
PD53.19 Local Planning Scheme 3 – Local Planning Policy Waste Management and Guidelines	22
CM07.19 Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre	23
PD54.19 Local Planning Scheme 3 – Residential Aged Care Facilities	24
PD55.19 Mt Claremont North-East Structure Plan Investigation	25
CM08.19 Shared Satellite Depot at Nedlands Golf Club	27
PD56.19 Local Planning Scheme 3 – Local Planning Policy Waratah Village Laneway Requirements	29
8.2 Technical Services Report No’s TS24.19	30
TS24.19 Montgomery Avenue – Leaning Wall	30
8.3 Community Development No’s CM07.19 to CM09.19	32
CM07.19 Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre	32
CM08.19 Shared Satellite Depot at Nedlands Golf Club	33
CM09.19 Jo Wheatley All Abilities Play Space Food Trucks	34
8.4 Corporate & Strategy Report No’s CPS20.19	35
CPS20.19 List of Accounts Paid – October 2019	35
9. Reports by the Chief Executive Officer	36
9.1 Options for Advancing Smart Cities	36
10. Urgent Business Approved By the Presiding Member or By Decision	46
11. Confidential Items	46
Declaration of Closure	46

City of Nedlands

Minutes of a meeting of the Council Committee held in the Council Chambers, Nedlands on Tuesday 3 December 2019 at 7 pm.

Declaration of Opening

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 7 pm and drew attention to the disclaimer below.

(NOTE: Council at its meeting on 24 August 2004 resolved that should the meeting time reach 11.00 p.m. the meeting is to consider an adjournment motion to reconvene the next day).

Present and Apologies and Leave of Absence (Previously Approved)

Councillors	Her Worship the Mayor, C M de Lacy	(Presiding Member)
	Councillor F J O Bennett	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor W R B Hassell	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor A W Mangano	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor B G Hodsdon	Hollywood Ward
	Councillor J D Wetherall	Hollywood Ward
	Councillor R A Coghlan	Melvista Ward
	Councillor R Senathirajah	Melvista Ward
	Councillor N B J Horley	Coastal Districts Ward
	Councillor L J McManus	Coastal Districts Ward
	Councillor K A Smyth	Coastal Districts Ward

Staff	Mr M A Goodlet	Chief Executive Officer
	Mrs L M Driscoll	Director Corporate & Strategy
	Mr P L Mickleson	Director Planning & Development
	Mr J Duff	Director Technical Services
	Mrs N M Ceric	Executive Assistant to CEO & Mayor

Public There were 16 members of the public present.

Press The Post Newspaper representative.

Leave of Absence Nil.
(Previously Approved)

Apologies Councillor G A R Hay Melvista Ward

Disclaimer

Members of the public who attend Council meetings should not act immediately on anything they hear at the meetings, without first seeking clarification of Council's position. For example, by reference to the confirmed Minutes of Council meeting. Members of the public are also advised to wait for written advice from the Council prior to taking action on any matter that they may have before Council.

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

1. Public Question Time

A member of the public wishing to ask a question should register that interest by notification in writing to the CEO in advance, setting out the text or substance of the question.

1.1 Mr Simon Edis, 72 Kingsway, Nedlands

Question 1

Discretionary Use - According to LPS 3, 'Serviced Apartments' are 'D' Discretionary use: defined as not permitted unless the local government has exercised its discretion by granting development approval.

Can the council make a statement that they do not approve the discretionary use?

Answer 1

Such a blanket statement is not possible. Where Council is the decision maker it is required to take into account all relevant information before exercising its discretion. There may be cases where Council does approve such a use.

Question 2

Plot Ratio - R-Codes Table 4 states that the maximum plot ratio for R-AC3 developments is 2.0.

Why have the city planners allowed a plot ratio (approx 2.7) that exceeds what is in the R-Codes?

Answer 2

City Planners have not allowed anything as they are not the decision makers however, they have recommended refusal of this application. City Planners were satisfied the proposal met the Element Objectives of the R-Codes Volume 2 in relation to plot ratio.

2. Addresses By Members of the Public (only for items listed on the agenda)

Addresses by members of the public who have completed Public Address Session Forms will be invited to be made as each item relating to their address is discussed by the Committee.

Mr John Edwards, 2 Burwood Street, Nedlands PD49.19
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

Mr Jerome Barley, 9 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne PD51.19
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

Mr Petar Mrdja, 7 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne PD51.19
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

Mr Ian Love, 70 Kingsway, Nedlands PD52.19
(spoke in opposition to the recommendation)

Mr Geoffrey Jones, 8 Landon Way, Mt Claremont CM07.19
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

Mr Ian Mumford, 95 Stanley Street, Nedlands CM08.19
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

3. Disclosures of Financial Interest

The Presiding Member reminded Councillors and Staff of the requirements of Section 5.65 of the *Local Government Act* to disclose any interest during the meeting when the matter is discussed.

There were no disclosures of financial interest.

4. Disclosures of Interests Affecting Impartiality

The Presiding Member reminded Councillors and Staff of the requirements of Council's Code of Conduct in accordance with Section 5.103 of the *Local Government Act*.

4.1 Councillor McManus – CM07.19 - Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre

Councillor McManus disclosed an impartiality interest in Item CM07.19 - Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre. Councillor McManus disclosed that he is a member of the Perth Western Suburbs National Seniors, and as a consequence, there may be a perception that his impartiality on the matter may be affected. Councillor McManus declared that he would consider this matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

5. Declarations by Members That They Have Not Given Due Consideration to Papers

Nil.

6. Confirmation of Minutes

6.1 Committee Meeting 12 November 2019

Moved – Councillor Mangano
Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

The Minutes of the Council Committee held 12 November 2019 be confirmed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 11/-

7. Matters for Which the Meeting May Be Closed

In accordance with Standing Orders and for the convenience of the public, the Committee is to identify any matter which is to be discussed behind closed doors at this meeting and that matter is to be deferred for consideration as the last item of this meeting.

Nil.

8. Divisional Reports

Note: Regulation 11(da) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* requires written reasons for each decision made at the meeting that is significantly different from the relevant written recommendation of a committee or an employee as defined in section 5.70, but not a decision to only note the matter or to return the recommendation for further consideration.

8.1 Planning & Development Report No's PD48.19 to PD56.19

Planning & Development Report No's PD48.19 to PD56.19 to be dealt with at this point (copy attached yellow cover sheet).

PD48.19	No. 3 Circe Circle, Dalkeith – Additions to a Single House (Carport and Primary Street Fencing)
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	Alex and Ruth Temelcos
Landowner	Alex and Ruth Temelcos
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Report Type Quasi-Judicial	When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.
Reference	DA19/36044
Previous Item	Nil
Delegation	In accordance with the City's Instrument of Delegation, Council is required to determine the application due to objections being received.
Attachments	1. Applicant Submission in Support of the Development Proposal 1. Plans (Confidential) 2. Assessment (Confidential) 3. Submission (Confidential)

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Hassell
Seconded – Councillor Senathirajah

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED 9/2
(Against: Crs. Bennett & Mangano)

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council approves the development application dated 20 May 2019, to install a carport within the front setback area at No. 3 (Lot 749) Circe Circle, Dalkeith, subject to the following conditions and advice/for the following reasons:

- 1. The development shall at all times comply with the application and the approved plans, subject to any modifications required as a consequence of any condition(s) of this approval.**
- 2. This development approval only pertains to the addition of a carport to a single dwelling, as indicated on the plans attached.**
- 3. Revised drawings shall be submitted with the Building Permit application, to the satisfaction of the City, incorporating the following modifications as shown in red on the approved plans:
 - a) The proposed primary street fencing is to provide a minimum 1.5m visual truncation area in accordance with Clause 5.2.5 of the R-Codes (Sight Lines), where the driveway/crossover intersects with the proposed primary street fencing.****
- 4. The carport shall remain open on all sides and shall not accommodate a door.**
- 5. All footings and structures shall be constructed wholly inside the site boundaries of the property's Certificate of Title.**
- 6. All stormwater from the development, which includes permeable and non-permeable areas shall be contained onsite.**

Advice Notes specific to this proposal:

- 1. Any development in the nature-strip (verge), including footpaths, will require a Nature-Strip Improvement Application and/or a Crossover Permit to be lodged with, and approved by, the City's Technical Services department, prior to construction commencing.**
- 2. All street tree assets in the nature-strip (verge) shall not be removed. Any approved street tree removals shall be undertaken by the City of Nedlands and paid for by the owner of the property where the development is proposed, unless otherwise approved under the Nature Strip Development approval.**

- 3. All downpipes from guttering shall be connected so as to discharge into drains, which shall empty into a soak-well; and each soak-well shall be located at least 1.8m from any building, and at least 1.8m from the boundary of the block. Soak-wells of adequate capacity to contain runoff from a 20-year recurrent storm event. Soak-wells shall be a minimum capacity of 1.0m³ for every 80m² of calculated surface area of the development.**
- 4. This decision constitutes planning approval only and is valid for a period of two years from the date of approval. If the subject development is not substantially commenced within the two-year period, the approval shall lapse and be of no further effect.**

PD49.19	No. 2 Burwood Street, Nedlands – Additions to a Single House (Ancillary Dwelling and Carport)
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	Michael Cardinale
Landowner	John Edwards
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Report Type Quasi-Judicial	When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.
Reference	DA19/37053
Previous Item	Nil
Delegation	In accordance with the City's Instrument of Delegation, Council is required to determine the application due to the City's Administration recommending refusal for elements of this application.
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landowner Justification Letter 1. Alternate Recommendation (Confidential) 2. Plans (Confidential) 3. Assessment Sheet (Confidential)

Mr John Edwards, 2 Burwood Street, Nedlands
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

PD49.19

Moved – Councillor Wetherall
Seconded – Councillor McManus

Council approves the application subject to the following conditions and advice notes:

1. The development shall at all times comply with the application and the approved plans, subject to any modifications required as a consequence of any condition(s) of this approval.

2. This development approval only pertains to a garage conversion to an ancillary dwelling and the installation of a carport as indicated on the plans attached.
3. Revised plans shall be submitted prior to the lodgement of a Building Permit application, incorporating the following modifications as shown in red on the approved plans to the satisfaction of the City:
 - a. A minimum as per plans setback to the carport from the primary street.
 - b. The carport is not to accommodate a solid door.
4. All footings and shall be constructed wholly inside the site boundaries of the property's Certificate of Title.
5. All stormwater from the development, which includes permeable and nonpermeable areas shall be contained onsite.

Advice Notes specific to this proposal:

1. All crossovers to the street(s) shall be constructed to the Council's Crossover Specifications and the applicant / landowner to obtain levels for crossovers from the Council's Infrastructure Services under supervision onsite, prior to commencement of works.
2. The concrete footpath(s) shall be retained across the proposed crossover(s).
3. Any development in the nature-strip (verge), including footpaths, will require a Nature-Strip Improvement Application to be lodged with, and approved by, the City's Technical Services department, prior to construction commencing.
4. All street tree assets in the nature-strip (verge) shall not be removed. Any approved street tree removals shall be undertaken by the City of Nedlands and paid for by the owner of the property where the development is proposed, unless otherwise approved under the Nature Strip Improvement Application approval.
5. All downpipes from guttering shall be connected so as to discharge into drains, which shall empty into a soak-well; and each soak-well shall be located at least 1.8m from any building, and at least 1.8m from the boundary of the block. Soak-wells of adequate capacity to contain runoff from a 20-year recurrent storm event. Soak-wells shall be a minimum capacity of 1.0m³ for every 80m² of calculated surface area of the development.

6. All internal water closets and ensuites without fixed or permanent window access to outside air or which open onto a hall, passage, hobby or staircase, shall be serviced by a mechanical ventilation exhaust system which is ducted to outside air, with a minimum rate of air change equal to or greater than 25 litres / second.
7. Prior to the commencement of any demolition works, any Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) in the structure to be demolished, shall be identified, safely removed and conveyed to an appropriate landfill which accepts ACM.

Removal and disposal of ACM shall be in accordance with Health (Asbestos) Regulations 1992, Regulations 5.43 - 5.53 of the Occupational Safety and Health Regulations 1996, Code of Practice for the Safe Removal of Asbestos 2nd Edition, Code of Practice for the Management and Control of Asbestos in a Workplace, and any Department of Commerce Worksafe requirements.

Where there is over 10m² of ACM or any amount of friable ACM to be removed, it shall be removed by a Worksafe licensed and trained individual or business.

8. The applicant is advised to consult the City's Visual and Acoustic Privacy Advisory Information in relation to locating any mechanical equipment (e.g. air-conditioner, swimming pool or spa) such that noise, vibration and visual impacts on neighbours are mitigated. The City does not recommend installing any equipment near a property boundary where it is likely that noise will intrude upon neighbours.

Prior to selecting a location for an air-conditioner, the applicant is advised to consult the online fairair noise calculator at www.fairair.com.au and use this as a guide to prevent noise affecting neighbouring properties.

Prior to installing mechanical equipment, the applicant is advised to consult neighbours, and if necessary, take measures to suppress noise.

9. A sewage treatment and effluent disposal system or greywater reuse or treatment system shall not be installed unless an Approval to Construct or Install an Apparatus for the Treatment of Sewage has been issued by the City beforehand.
10. This decision constitutes planning approval only and is valid for a period of two years from the date of approval. If the subject development is not substantially commenced within the two-year period, the approval shall lapse and be of no further effect.

Lost 3/6
(Against: Mayor de Lacy Crs. Horley Smyth Bennett
Senathirajah Coghlan)
(Abstained: Crs. Hassell & Hodsdon)

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Mayor de Lacy
Seconded – Councillor Mangano

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED 7/1
(Against: Cr. Wetherall)
(Abstained: Crs. McManus Hassell & Hodsdon)

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council:

1. refuses the proposed installation a carport within the front setback area for the following reasons:
 - a. The City of Nedlands Draft Residential Development Policy varies the primary street setback requirement for carports on properties zoned R15 or less from 9.0m to a minimum of 3.5m (Clause 4.2). The applicant can provide a complaint 3.5m primary street setback, however, has proposed a 1.5m primary street setback which is inconsistent with this policy.
 - b. The proposed carport does not meet the objectives of the Draft Residential Development Policy or the objectives of the Residential Zone as outlined in LPS3. The proposed carport development is not considered to be appropriate in scale, bulk or setbacks as viewed from the street.
2. approves the proposed garage conversion to an ancillary dwelling subject to the following conditions and advice notes be observed for the partial approval:

Conditions

1. The development shall at all times comply with the application and the approved plans, subject to any modifications required as a consequence of any condition(s) of this approval.

2. **This development approval only pertains to a garage conversion to an ancillary dwelling and the installation of a carport as indicated on the plans attached.**
3. **All footings and shall be constructed wholly inside the site boundaries of the property's Certificate of Title.**
4. **All stormwater from the development, which includes permeable and non-permeable areas shall be contained onsite.**

Advice Notes specific to this proposal:

1. **All downpipes from guttering shall be connected so as to discharge into drains, which shall empty into a soak-well; and each soak-well shall be located at least 1.8m from any building, and at least 1.8m from the boundary of the block. Soak-wells of adequate capacity to contain runoff from a 20-year recurrent storm event. Soak-wells shall be a minimum capacity of 1.0m³ for every 80m² of calculated surface area of the development.**
2. **All internal water closets and ensuites without fixed or permanent window access to outside air or which open onto a hall, passage, hobby or staircase, shall be serviced by a mechanical ventilation exhaust system which is ducted to outside air, with a minimum rate of air change equal to or greater than 25 litres / second.**
3. **Prior to the commencement of any demolition works, any Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) in the structure to be demolished, shall be identified, safely removed and conveyed to an appropriate landfill which accepts ACM.**

Removal and disposal of ACM shall be in accordance with Health (Asbestos) Regulations 1992, Regulations 5.43 - 5.53 of the Occupational Safety and Health Regulations 1996, Code of Practice for the Safe Removal of Asbestos 2nd Edition, Code of Practice for the Management and Control of Asbestos in a Workplace, and any Department of Commerce Worksafe requirements.

Where there is over 10m² of ACM or any amount of friable ACM to be removed, it shall be removed by a Worksafe licensed and trained individual or business.

4. **The applicant is advised to consult the City's Visual and Acoustic Privacy Advisory Information in relation to locating any mechanical equipment (e.g. air-conditioner, swimming pool or spa) such that noise, vibration and visual impacts on neighbours are mitigated. The City does not recommend installing any equipment near a property boundary where it is likely that noise will intrude upon neighbours.**

Prior to selecting a location for an air-conditioner, the applicant is advised to consult the online fairair noise calculator at www.fairair.com.au and use this as a guide to prevent noise affecting neighbouring properties.

Prior to installing mechanical equipment, the applicant is advised to consult neighbours, and if necessary, take measures to suppress noise.

- 5. A sewage treatment and effluent disposal system or greywater reuse or treatment system shall not be installed unless an Approval to Construct or Install an Apparatus for the Treatment of Sewage has been issued by the City beforehand.**
- 6. This decision constitutes planning approval only and is valid for a period of two years from the date of approval. If the subject development is not substantially commenced within the two-year period, the approval shall lapse and be of no further effect.**

PD50.19	No. 85 Clifton St, Nedlands – Change of Use (Residential to Short Term Accommodation, Holiday House)
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	Karen Morris
Landowner	Karen Morris
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Report Type Quasi-Judicial	When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person’s right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.
Reference	DA19/38823
Previous Item	Nil
Delegation	In accordance with the City’s Instrument of Delegation, Council is required to determine the application due to objections being received.
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management Plan 2. Applicant Justification 1. Assessment Sheet (Confidential) 2. Submissions (Confidential)

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – No Recommendation made.

Moved – Councillor Senathirajah
 Seconded – Councillor Wetherall

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
 (Printed below for ease of reference)

Lost on the Casting Vote of the Mayor 5/5
 (Against: Crs. Horley Smyth Bennett Mangano & Coghlan)
 (Abstained: Mayor de Lacy)

Recommendation to Committee

Council approves the retrospective development application dated 16 August 2019 for short term accommodation at 85 Clifton St, Nedlands, subject to the following conditions and advice notes:

1. The development shall at all times comply with the application and the approved plans, subject to any modifications required as a consequence of any condition(s) of this approval.
2. This development approval only pertains to the use of 85 Clifton St, Nedlands as short-term accommodation.
3. A maximum of 6 guests are permitted on the premises at any one time.
4. The Management Plan forms part of this approval and is to be complied with at all times to the City's satisfaction.
5. All car parking associated with the short-term accommodation being contained on site.
6. The proposed use complying with the Holiday House definition stipulated under the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (refer to advice note 1).
7. No materials and/or equipment being stored externally on the property, which is visible from off site, and/or obstructs vehicle manoeuvring areas, vehicle access ways, pedestrian access ways, parking bays and/or (un)loading bays.
8. Service and/or delivery vehicles are not to service the premises before 7.00 am or after 7.00 pm Monday to Saturday, and/or before 9.00 am or after 7.00 pm on Sundays and Public Holidays unless otherwise approved by the City beforehand.

Advice Notes specific to this proposal:

1. With regard to condition 6, the applicant and landowner are advised that the use Holiday House is defined as the following in accordance with Local Planning Scheme No. 3:

'Holiday House means a single dwelling on one lot used to provide short-term accommodation for persons other than the owner of the lot'.
2. This decision does not obviate rights and responsibilities of strata owners under the Strata Titles Act 1985, which may require additional consultation and/or permissions from the stratum, prior to the commencement of works.
3. Noise levels are to comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.

PD51.19	No. 7 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne – Additions to a Single House (Privacy Screen)
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	Niche Living
Landowner	Halina and Paul Bitdorf
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Report Type Quasi-Judicial	When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.
Reference	DA19/38434
Previous Item	DA16/307
Delegation	In accordance with the City's Instrument of Delegation, Council is required to determine the application due to objections being received.
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicants Justification 1. Assessment (Confidential) 2. Plans (Confidential) 3. Submission (Confidential)

Mr Jerome Barley, 9 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

PD51.19

Mr Petar Mrdja, 7 Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne
(spoke against the recommendation)

PD51.19

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Mangano
Seconded – Councillor Senathirajah

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED 10/-
(Abstained: Cr. Wetherall)

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

1. Council refuses the development application dated 9 August 2019 to install a privacy screen at No. 7 (Lot 12) Nidjalla Loop, Swanbourne for the following reasons:
 - a) The proposed screen is classified as ‘building on boundary’ and is not compliant with State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes in terms of scale and setback requirements.
 - b) The proposed privacy screen does not meet the objectives of the City’s Fill and Fencing Policy, clauses 2.0 and 9.0.

Advice Notes

2. The applicant is advised that the City deems the screen to be unnecessary due to the screen obscuring non-habitable rooms, and therefore those rooms are not subject to visual privacy provisions as described by State Planning Policy 7.3, Residential Design Codes Volume 1.

PD52.19	Local Planning Scheme 3 - Local Planning Policy - Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Previous Item	Item 6 – 2 May 2019 - Special Council Meeting PD27.19 – 23 July 2019 – Ordinary Council Meeting PD40.19 – 24 September 2019 – Ordinary Council Meeting
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings LPP - tracked changes 2. Draft Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings LPP 3. Submission 4. Fill and Fencing LPP – Comparison Table

Mr Ian Love, 70 Kingsway, Nedlands
(spoke in opposition to the recommendation)

PD52.19

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted with minor addition to review policy in 12 months.

Moved – Councillor Mangano
Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted subject to the removal of clause 4.1.2 and the policy be reviewed in 12 months.

Amendment

Moved - Councillor Hassell
Seconded - Councillor McManus

That the exclusion of clause 4.1.2 be removed.

The AMENDMENT was PUT and was

CARRIED 7/4
(Against: Crs. Horley Bennett Mangano & Hodson)

The Substantive was PUT and was

**CARRIED 8/3
(Against: Crs. Bennett Mangano & Hodsdon)**

Committee Recommendation

Council:

- 1. proceeds to adopt the Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings Local Planning Policy, with modifications as set out in Attachment 2, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(3)(b)(ii);**
- 2. refers the Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings Local Planning Policy to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final approval in accordance with State Planning Policy SPP7.3, Residential Design Codes Volume 2 – Apartments 2019 Clause 1.2.3 and the City’s Local Planning Scheme No 3 Clause 32.4(5);**
- 3. revokes the current Fill and Fencing Local Planning Policy in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 6; and**
- 4. reviews the Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings Local Planning Policy in 12 months.**

Recommendation to Committee

Council:

- 1. proceeds to adopt the Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings Local Planning Policy, with modifications as set out in Attachment 2, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4(3)(b)(ii);**
- 2. refers the Residential Development: Single and Grouped Dwellings Local Planning Policy to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final approval in accordance with State Planning Policy SPP7.3, Residential Design Codes Volume 2 – Apartments 2019 Clause 1.2.3 and the City’s Local Planning Scheme No 3 Clause 32.4(5); and**
- 3. revokes the current Fill and Fencing Local Planning Policy in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 6.**

PD53.19	Local Planning Scheme 3 – Local Planning Policy Waste Management and Guidelines
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Previous Item	PD38.19 – OCM 24 September 2019
Attachments	1. Draft Waste Management LPP 2. Draft Waste Management Guidelines

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation adopted with a minor deletion.

Moved – Councillor Smyth
Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted subject to the deletion of clause 17.1.

CARRIED 7/4
(Against: Crs. Bennett Mangano Hassell & Coghlan)

Committee Recommendation

Council prepares, and advertises for a period of 21 days, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4, the Waste Management and Guidelines Local Planning Policy (refer to Attachments 1 & 2) with the deletion of clause 17.1.

Recommendation to Committee

Council prepares, and advertises for a period of 21 days, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4, the Waste Management and Guidelines Local Planning Policy (refer to Attachments 1 & 2).

Please note: This item was brought forward from page 31.

CM07.19	Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil.
Director	Lorraine Driscoll – Director Corporate & Strategy
Attachments	Nil.

Councillor McManus – Impartiality Interest

Councillor McManus disclosed that he is a member of the Perth Western Suburbs National Seniors, and as a consequence, there may be a perception that his impartiality on the matter may be affected. Councillor McManus declared that he would consider this matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

Mr Geoffrey Jones, 8 Landon Way, Mt Claremont
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

CM07.19

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor McManus
Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 11/-

Committee Recommendation	/	Recommendation to Committee
Council:		
1.		receives the information on the Western Suburbs Branch of the National Seniors Organisation’s request for a defibrillator at the Mt Claremont Community Centre; and
2.		requests the CEO to include \$3,500 for the item listed above, for Council consideration in the 2019/20 midyear budget review.

PD54.19	Local Planning Scheme 3 – Residential Aged Care Facilities
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Previous Item	Nil
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Residential Aged Care Facilities LPP 2. WAPC Draft Position Statement Residential Aged Care

Councillor Mangano left the room at 9.15 pm.

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Hassell
 Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
 (Printed below for ease of reference)

Councillor Mangano returned at 9.17 pm.

CARRIED 10/-
(Abstained: Cr. Bennett)

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council prepares, and advertises for a period of 21 days, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4, the Residential Aged Care Facilities Local Planning Policy (Attachment 1).

PD55.19	Mt Claremont North-East Structure Plan Investigation
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Previous Item	OCM 26 June 2018 – 14.4 PD53.18 – 23 October 2018
Attachments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mt Claremont subject site map 2. Mt Claremont subject site map with zoning 3. Letter from the City to the DPLH 4. Response letter from the DPLH

Regulation 11(da) – Council determined that some work should continue on planning for the area.

Moved – Councillor Hodsdon
Seconded – Councillor Senathirajah

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

Councillor Hassell left the room at 9.23 pm and returned at 9.26 pm.

Amendment

Moved - Councillor Smyth
Seconded - Councillor Horley

That replace the words “until such time as critical priorities of developing Local Precinct Plans can be resolved and when a Statutory Planning Mechanism can be established over the land of concern.” with the words “and commence work on a Master Plan for the area as per the WAPC advice.”

The AMENDMENT was PUT and was

**CARRIED 11/1
(Against: Cr. Wetherall)**

The Substantive Motion was PUT and was

**CARRIED 11/1
(Against: Cr. Wetherall)**

Committee Recommendation

Council resolves to instruct the CEO to cease current work on the Mt Claremont Structure Plan Investigation and commence work on a Master Plan for the area as per the WAPC advice.

Recommendation to Committee

Council resolves to instruct the CEO to cease current work on the Mt Claremont Structure Plan Investigation until such time as critical priorities of developing Local Precinct Plans can be resolved and when a Statutory Planning Mechanism can be established over the land of concern.

Please note: This item was brought forward from page 32.

CM08.19	Shared Satellite Depot at Nedlands Golf Club
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Director	Lorraine Driscoll – Director Corporate and Strategy
Attachments	Nil.

Mr Ian Mumford, 95 Stanley Street, Nedlands
(spoke in support of the recommendation)

CM08.19

Regulation 11(da) – Council wished to continue to seek funding solutions for this proposal.

Moved – Councillor Hassell
Seconded – Councillor Mangano

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted subject to adding an additional clause 3 as follows:

Requests the CEO to enter into discussion with the Nedlands Golf Club to consider funding requirements for a new shed.

Councillor Horley & Councillor Smyth left the room at 9.57 pm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 9/-

Committee Recommendation

Council:

- 1. notes that the City has considered the possibility of a shared depot facility on Melvista Reserve that would meet the needs of both the Nedlands Golf Club and the City of Nedlands;**
- 2. established that the City has no need for such a facility; and**
- 3. requests the CEO to enter into discussion with the Nedlands Golf Club to consider funding requirements for a new shed.**

Recommendation to Committee

Council:

1. notes that the City has considered the possibility of a shared depot facility on Melvista Reserve that would meet the needs of both the Nedlands Golf Club and the City of Nedlands; and
2. established that the City has no need for such a facility.

PD56.19	Local Planning Scheme 3 – Local Planning Policy Waratah Village Laneway Requirements
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Director	Peter Mickleson – Director Planning & Development
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Previous Item	Nil
Attachments	1. Draft Waratah Village Laneway Requirements Local Planning Policy (LPP)

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Mangano
 Seconded – Councillor Hassell

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
 (Printed below for ease of reference)

Councillor Smyth returned to the room at 9.58 pm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 10/-

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council prepares, and advertises for a period of 21 days, in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 Schedule 2, Part 2, Clause 4, the Waratah Village Laneway Requirements Local Planning Policy (Attachment 1).

8.2 Technical Services Report No's TS24.19

Technical Services Report No's TS24.19 to be dealt with at this point (copy attached blue cover sheet).

TS24.19 Montgomery Avenue – Leaning Wall	
Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Director	Jim Duff
Attachments	1. Mount Claremont Subdivision Drawings – Stage 7 2. Temporary Footpath Drawing 3. Legal Advice from McLeods (CONFIDENTIAL)

Councillor Horley returned to the room at 10.04 pm.

Regulation 11(da) – Council wished to minimise the direct financial impact on the affected landowners.

Moved – Councillor McManus
 Seconded – Councillor Smyth

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted subject to adding the words “excluding by the landowners” after the word costs in clause 3.

Councillor Hodsdon left the room at 10.05 pm and returned at 10.07 pm.

**CARRIED 11/-
 (Abstained: Cr. Hassell)**

Committee Recommendation

Council:

- 1. approves construction of a temporary alternative footpath to address safety issues for pedestrians and school children on bikes;**
- 2. approves funding of the \$10,000 cost for the temporary footpath construction from Technical Services Operational budget;**
- 3. requests the CEO to seek appropriate recovery of costs excluding by the landowners for the temporary footpath required due to the ongoing unsafe boundary wall at Montgomery Avenue, Mt Claremont; and**
- 4. approves Administration waiving the city component of the Development Application and Building Application fees associated with the demolition and reconstruction of the section of boundary wall.**

Recommendation to Committee

Council:

1. approves construction of a temporary alternative footpath to address safety issues for pedestrians and school children on bikes;
2. approves funding of the \$10,000 cost for the temporary footpath construction from Technical Services Operational budget;
3. requests the CEO to seek appropriate recovery of costs for the temporary footpath required due to the ongoing unsafe boundary wall at Montgomery Avenue, Mt Claremont; and
4. approves Administration waiving the city component of the Development Application and Building Application fees associated with the demolition and reconstruction of the section of boundary wall.

8.3 Community Development No's CM07.19 to CM09.19

Report No's CM07.19 to CM09.19 to be dealt with at this point (copy attached orange cover sheet).

Please note: This item was brought forward see page 23

CM07.19	Defibrillator Mt Claremont Community Centre
----------------	--

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil.
Director	Lorraine Driscoll – Director Corporate & Strategy
Attachments	Nil.

Please note: This item was brought forward see page 27

CM08.19	Shared Satellite Depot at Nedlands Golf Club
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Director	Lorraine Driscoll – Director Corporate and Strategy
Attachments	Nil.

CM09.19	Jo Wheatley All Abilities Play Space Food Trucks
----------------	---

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil
Director	Lorraine Driscoll
Attachments	Nil

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Hassell
 Seconded – Councillor Hodsdon

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
 (Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 11/-

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council approves:

1. splitting the annual Street Trading fee of \$1,580 equally between the selected food vendors at the Jo Wheatley All Abilities Play Space; and
2. the annual fee to be applied on a pro rata basis.

8.4 Corporate & Strategy Report No's CPS20.19

Report No's CPS20.19 to be dealt with at this point (copy attached green cover sheet).

CPS20.19 List of Accounts Paid – October 2019

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil.
Director	Lorraine Driscoll – Director Corporate & Strategy
Attachments	4. Creditor Payment Listing October 2019 5. Purchasing Card Payments October 2019 (30 September 2019 – 27 October 2019)

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adotped

Moved – Councillor McManus
Seconded – Councillor Senathirajah

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
(Printed below for ease of reference)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 11/-

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council receives the List of Accounts Paid for the month of October 2019 (refer to attachments).

9. Reports by the Chief Executive Officer

9.1 Options for Advancing Smart Cities

Committee	3 December 2019
Council	17 December 2019
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil.
Director	N/A
CEO	Mark Goodlet
Attachments	Nil

Regulation 11(da) – Not Applicable – Recommendation Adopted

Moved – Councillor Smyth
 Seconded – Councillor Horley

That the Recommendation to Committee be adopted.
 (Printed below for ease of reference)

Councillor McManus left the room at 10.27 pm and returned at 10.28 pm.

CARRIED 9/1
(Against: Cr. Mangano)
(Abstained: Cr. Bennett)

Committee Recommendation / Recommendation to Committee

Council, while acknowledging the successful outcomes and practice with respect to local innovation within the City, requests the CEO, Mayor and Councillor Smyth investigate regional opportunities for Smart Cities by;

- 1. presenting the concept of a Smart Cities focus or group to the WESROC local governments, the Town of Cambridge, the City of Perth, the City of Fremantle, the City of Stirling and the City of Vincent, for discussion; and**
- 2. report their findings back to Council.**

Executive Summary

This report considers appropriate Council and community representation for Smart City matters including options of a formal committee, advisory group or other mechanisms, and proposed Terms of Reference.

The City has a strong history and ongoing practice of successful innovation at a local level. With the likelihood that a Smart Cities group has the potential to be most successful in attracting funding through a regional focus, it is recommended that this concept be presented to the neighbouring local governments to ascertain their interest.

Discussion/Overview

Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions:

Special Meeting of Council – 5 November 2019

“Council instructs the Chief Executive Officer to provide a report to Council in December 2019 which considers appropriate Council and community representation for Smart City matters including options of a formal committee, advisory group or other mechanisms, and proposed Terms of Reference.”

History of Smart Cities

“Smart Cities” is a term that has been used since the 1990s. It is based on the concept that technological solutions can improve and will continue to improve lives and Cities.

Federal Government Smart Cities Plan

Smart Cities has been picked up by the Federal Government in it's the Smart Cities Plan. This plan has three (3) pillars – Smart Investment, Smart Policy and Smart Technology. It appears that Smart Cities has broadened as a concept to emphasize that well-considered strategic thinking is needed and should be applied to investment and policy as well as to technology. This then integrates finance, strategy and solutions.

“We will become smarter investors in our cities’ infrastructure”

“We will prioritise projects that meet broader economic and city objectives such as accessibility, jobs, affordable housing and healthy environments. We will treat infrastructure funding as a long-term investment not a grant and get involved early to ensure projects create opportunities for urban renewal and raise private capital. By drawing on innovative financing approaches—including value capture—we will leverage our balance sheet and deliver more essential infrastructure sooner.”

“We will coordinate and drive smarter city policy”

“We will work across all levels of government to develop City Deals that unlock public and private investment in key economic centres. By incentivising reforms, we will generate additional benefits for the economy making cities better places to live in and do business.”

“We will collect and analyse data about the performance of our cities, so we can measure our policies’ success and respond to new needs.”

“We will drive the take up of smart technology, to improve the sustainability of our cities and drive innovation”

“We will embrace new technology with the potential to revolutionise how cities are planned, function, and how our economy grows. Disruptive new technology in transport, communications and energy efficiency are becoming a reality—we will position our cities to take full advantage. We will leverage real time open data driven solutions and support investment in sectors commercialising new innovations to grow Australian’s economy.”

The Federal Government has a City Deals funding program that align with Smart Cities. “City Deals are the key mechanism for delivering on the Smart Cities Plan. They are a genuine partnership between the three levels of government and the community to work towards a shared vision for productive and liveable cities.”

City Deals targets large multi-agency projects which are of significance to a whole metropolitan area or a large part of one.

Strategic Alignment

The Strategic Community Plan (SCP) does not use the phrase “Smart City” or the word “innovation” and this is not a formal priority of this Plan.

The Strategic Community Plan does refer to innovative leadership, under the Values heading of Great Governance and Civic Leadership.

A value of the City is that it is “Great for Business. Our City has a strong economic base with renowned Centres of Excellence and is attractive to entrepreneurs and start-ups.” A focus on innovation and Smart Cities may be an ally to this value, although it is noted that no specific actions or priorities are assigned to this value in the Strategic Community Plan.

A priority of the Strategic Community Plan is “working with neighbouring Councils to achieve the best outcomes for the western suburbs as a whole”.

Options to Deliver Smart City Innovation

Option 1 - Current Approach

The current approach works within the existing organisation structure. It relies on information received by the organisation through formal and informal industry affiliations and various government sources of information. Elected members are part of this information gathering through their attendance at conferences and industry contacts.

Individual proposals are considered by the organisation and by Council then implemented as per approved budgets.

The organisation, including the elected members, has formal email network updates for when grant funding is available. As opportunities come through, they are assessed against the pipeline of future work at the City, or as a new community benefit solution.

This approach has delivered a number of innovative projects and continues to do so. Examples include, smart irrigations, asset management with predictive capabilities, smart street lighting, advanced cyber security, Currently the City is assessing smart engagement tools through mobile phone data acquisition and 3D planning assessment software.

If the aim is to provide the organisation with ideas for implementation then a group or committee is not warranted, as the City already follows up on as many ideas as it has the need for and the capacity to deliver.

The current approach will still have a place alongside any other group / committee, but would ideally sit as the local approach, alongside option 4 – the regional approach.

Pros	Cons
No extra cost.	Does not actively attract and use City of Nedlands talent.
The going it alone approach is more agile and less commitment to outside partners.	Makes it very difficult to attract funding at a City Deals scale.
At a City of Nedlands level this approach has been successful historically.	
Provides very good transparency and accountability by using the Council reporting and decision-making process.	

Option 2 – Internal Committee

This option instigates a formal committee with or without delegations to advance the Smart Cities concept.

The purpose of a committee under the Local Government Act 1995 is to “assist the Council and to exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the local government that can be delegated to committees”.

The operative idea is here is to assign some of Council’s work to the committee. Committees are primarily to take some of the workload of Council, making for efficient decision-making in the discharge of its duties. Delegation of duties to a committee is a key mechanism for achieving this.

The committee structure provides for the same level of transparency and accountability as exists for Council itself.

Pros	Cons
If Council wishes Smart Cities to be a priority, then a committee structure provides this prominence.	Cost is in the order of \$7,000 per meeting including report preparation and meeting time. This doesn’t include the value of the Committee members’ time.
Targets local Smart Cities initiatives.	With delegation this committee will need additional administrative support to implement any actions that it has budget for. It is assumed that Council would not intend to provide additional resourcing to carry out any projects of the committee and that they would be programmed within existing resources.
Can add significant value by including community expertise from within the City.	Cannot easily target regional Smart Cities initiatives or access federal funding.
Community may feel they are more involved/engaged in the process.	Significantly slows down progress of action through a minimum seven (7) week committee to Council reporting and approval cycle. Delegation would assist this only for projects less than \$150,000 and not subject to tender approval provisions, so delegation may have limited value in creating efficiency.
Provides very good transparency and accountability	

Option 3 – Internal Advisory Group

The internal Advisory Group is like a committee; however, it cannot have any delegation and must report any proposals through to Council for approval.

This is a way of elevating the Smart Cities into prominence for the City of Nedlands.

Pros	Cons
If Council wishes Smart Cities to be a priority, then an Advisory Group structure provides this prominence.	Cost is in the order of \$7,000 per meeting including report preparation and meeting time. This doesn't include the value of the Advisory Group members' time.
Targets local Smart Cities initiatives.	No delegation can be made to an Advisory Group and all ideas must come back to Council for approval.
Community may feel they are more involved/engaged in the process.	Less agile and slower than the current approach.
Provides good transparency and accountability.	

Option 4 – Regional Smart Cities Group

Under this option the City would team up with neighbouring local governments, potentially under the WESROC banner to explore and develop Smart Cities options. A similar group, the WESROC environmental committee, meets to deliver regional wide environmental initiative.

A regional group could include community expertise from within the participating local governments.

Pros	Cons
If Council wishes Smart Cities to be a priority, then a Regional Advisory Group structure provides this prominence.	Cost is in the order of \$7,000 per meeting including report preparation and meeting time. This doesn't include the value of the Advisory Group members' time.
Targets large regional Smart Cities initiatives with access to significant funding.	No delegation can be made to an Advisory Group and all ideas must come back to Council for approval.
Community may feel they are more involved/engaged in the process.	Less agile and slower than the current approach, and slower than a local group or committee.
Provides good transparency and accountability.	A City Deal will be expensive to develop and implement and must be carefully assessed for return on investment.
Aligns with the SCP's priority to "with neighbouring Councils to achieve the best outcomes for the western suburbs as a whole".	A City Deal, if done poorly, has the potential to fail financially and must be accompanied by thorough risk assessment and must bring

	appropriate expertise to the chosen project.
Shared funding would enable cost efficiencies of administrative assistance and actions.	
This structure is familiar to western suburbs local governments.	
Currently individual Council reporting and approval process would still apply meaning control and individual autonomy of the Councils is not sacrificed.	
A City Deal has the potential to provide a large return on investment.	

Terms of Reference

In addition to standard operating parameters the Terms of Reference for a Smart Cities Advisory Group or Committee should address the following matters

1. Whether it will be primarily addressing local or regional initiatives, as this will shape the stakeholder participation, and direct the efforts of the group;
2. What the key deliverables will be and how the performance will be measured. Without these there is a risk that the group or committee will have little value to the City;
3. Development of assessment, selection and implementation criteria for smart technologies that ensure a positive return to the City;
4. Included of appropriate risk appetite provisions;
5. Development of measures that assess new technologies' risk appropriately.
6. Selection criteria for suitably qualified and experienced members.
7. Whether the Advisory Group's role is to generate ideas, assess ideas, or both.

Relevant Legislation

Local Government Act 1995, section 5.8 – Establishment of Committees

“A local government may establish committees of 3 or more persons to assist the council and to exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the local government that can be delegated to committees.”

Risk

The most significant Smart Cities strategic risk is investment in technologies that fail.

An example within the City of Nedlands is its early adoption of parking enforcement technology using character recognition to read car number plates. The technology was not sophisticated enough to decipher between car number plates and other writing, leading to significant human intervention to manually review all the data it provided.

At a regional level the DiCom technology at the Western Metropolitan Regional Council failed to meet expectations despite years of endeavour. The City of Nedlands assessed its participation in this Council and elected not to participate.

On the other hand, the City's deployment of smart streetlights with sensor capabilities has been a success having met functional requirements, running more efficiently with lower maintenance costs going forward, and with the ability to add functionality in the future. It is worth noting that the City explored this option for the Adam Armstrong pavilion car park just three years earlier, however, at that time it was evident that the costs were too high, and the concept was shelved. This is an example therefore of successful deployment at the right time.

In order to mitigate risk related to new technology it is appropriate that:

- Council's risk appetite be enunciated and included in the terms of reference should this progress to a formal group/committee stage; and
- That assessment, selection and implementation criteria be developed as part of the terms of reference for any group or committee dealing with this.

Budget/Financial Implications

Option 1 – no additional cost for the business as usual option.

Option 2 – The following are some indicative costs for the preparation of a Committee agenda assuming 3 reports per agenda. This is the additional governance cost per meeting. It excludes the value of the committee members time.

				Hrs	\$
Activity	No. off	Hrly/rate	Rate	Amount	Amount
Report Preparation	3	15.2	\$100	45.6	\$4,560
Report Proof, edit, finalize	3	2	\$ 80	6	\$480
Report Approval	3	1	\$150	3	\$450
Agenda Preparation	1	2	\$80	2	\$160
Public Notice	1	1	\$180		\$180
Meeting Setup and dismantle	1	1	\$ 80	1	\$80
Meeting Attendance Minute taker	1	2	\$80	2	\$160
Meeting Attendance Senior Officer	1	2	\$100	2	\$200
Meeting Attendance Report Officer	1	2	\$150	2	\$300
Drafting Minutes	1	1	\$80	1	\$80
Minutes Approval	1	0.5	\$150	0.5	\$75
Minutes Distribution	1	0.5	\$ 80	0.5	\$40
Minutes through Council	1	1.5	\$100	1.5	\$150
			Total	67.1	\$6,915

Option 3 – Costs would be similar to option 2 in that reports would have to be prepared for the Advisory Group to consider; however, additional costs would be facilitator and meeting venue costs. There is possibly a saving in meeting advertising costs if members of the public were excluded from the meetings.

Option 4 – Costs would be similar to option 2, except that these costs would be divided over the stakeholder local governments. In the case of WESROC committee this equates to the City of Nedlands contributing about 15% of costs.

Consultation

No consultation has occurred in relation to this report.

It is recommended that the neighbouring local governments be consulted in relation to a Smart Cities focus or group.

Conclusion

Innovation has been a strong outcome for the City in delivery of a number of projects over the years. Importantly, knowing when not to move into new technologies has been part of the learning journey for the City. On the whole the organisation captures Smart City ideas as it has the capacity to deliver projects and it is not short of ideas.

The City has many talented and capable experts living within its borders and harnessing this capacity is an attractive proposition for the sake of collaboration with the community and the direct benefit their expertise will bring.

With the focus of grant funding being in the regional sphere it is considered that the City should seek the views of its neighbouring local governments to advancing Smart Cities as a collective, using its local talent.

10. Urgent Business Approved By the Presiding Member or By Decision

Nil.

11. Confidential Items

Nil.

Declaration of Closure

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 10.29 pm.