



MINUTES

Special Council Meeting

Tuesday 9 April 2024

These Minutes are subject to confirmation.

Prior to acting on any resolution of the Council contained in these minutes, a check should be made of the Ordinary Meeting of Council following this meeting to ensure that there has not been a correction made to any resolution.



Information

Special Council Meetings are run in accordance with the City of Nedlands Standing Orders Local Law. If you have any questions in relation to items on the agenda, procedural matters, public question time, addressing Council or attending meetings please contact the Executive Officer on 9273 3500 or council@nedlands.wa.gov.au

Public Question Time

Public question time at a Special Council Meeting is available for members of the public to ask a question about items on the agenda. Questions asked by members of the public are not to be accompanied by any statement reflecting adversely upon any Council Member or Employee.

Questions should be submitted as early as possible via the online form available on the City's website: [Public question time | City of Nedlands](#)

Questions may be taken on notice to allow adequate time to prepare a response and all answers will be published in the minutes of the meeting.

Addresses by Members of the Public

Members of the public wishing to address Council in relation to an item on the agenda must complete the online registration form available on the City's website: [Public Address Registration Form | City of Nedlands](#)

The Presiding Member will determine the order of speakers to address the Council and the number of speakers is to be limited to 2 in support and 2 against any particular item on a Special Council Meeting Agenda. The Public address session will be restricted to 15 minutes unless the Council, by resolution decides otherwise.

Disclaimer

Members of the public who attend Council Meetings Agenda Forum 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.



Table Of Contents

1. Declaration of Opening	4
2. Present and Apologies and Leave of Absence (Previously Approved)	4
3. Public Question Time	5
4. Address by Members of the Public	8
5. Disclosures of Financial Interest	16
6. Disclosures of Interest Affecting Impartiality	16
7. Declaration by Members That They Have Not Given Due Consideration to Papers ..	16
8. Divisional Reports	17
8.1 TS10.04.24 – Vincent Street Black Spot.....	17
9. Declaration of Closure	22



1. Declaration of Opening

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.30pm and acknowledged the Whadjuk Nyoongar people, Traditional Custodians of the land on which we meet, and paid respect to Elders past, present and emerging. The Presiding Member drew attention to the disclaimer on page 2 and advised that the meeting was being livestreamed and recorded.

2. Present and Apologies and Leave of Absence (Previously Approved)

Councillors	Councillor K A Smyth (Presiding Member)	Coastal Ward
	Councillor B G Hodsdon	Hollywood Ward
	Councillor B Brackenridge	Melvista Ward
	Councillor R A Coghlan	Melvista Ward
	Councillor H Amiry	Coastal Ward
	Councillor F J O Bennett	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor N R Youngman	Dalkeith Ward

Staff	Mr T G Free	Acting Chief Executive Officer
	Mr M R Cole	Director Corporate Services
	Mr M K MacPherson	Director Technical Services
	Mr R A Winslow	Acting Director Planning & Development
	Mrs N M Ceric	Executive Officer
	Ms L J Kania	Coordinator Governance & Risk

Public There were 21 members of the public present and 5 online.

Press The Post Newspaper Representative.

Leave of Absence (Previously Approved) Councillor L J McManus Hollywood Ward

Apologies Mayor F E M Argyle



3. Public Question Time

Public questions submitted were read at this point.

3.1. Mr Michael Lindroos

Planned speed humps for Vincent Street, to be counter proposed.

Question 1

Accidents cited are mostly at intersections of Vincent & Princess and Melvista. Why are speed humps not included on Princess & Melvista to the same extent as 14 on Vincent?

Answer 1

Black Spot submissions can be based on either single intersections or road sections. This Black Spot project submitted for federal funding was for the road section of Vincent Street between Adelma Road and Jenkins Avenue.

Princess Road between Marita Road and Viewway is also on the prequalified list and will be investigated and considered for an application in future years.

Question 2

It appears by admission - that the City engineering did not know of the original speed humps some 22 years ago that were subsequently removed after one year. Why did they not know?

Answer 2

The Officer you have previously spoken to is the officer tasked with delivering the project, not the Officer who has analysed the crash statistics, developed the project scope to address the current safety issues and prepared the grant application.

Information regarding the original speed plateaus was taken into account during the investigation stage of the project and raised plateaus remained the preferred option to address the current safety issues along this section of Vincent Street. Had the original plateaus still been in place it is expected that the severity and frequency of crashes/fatalities along this section of Vincent Street would have been lower.

Question 3

Was the council adequately informed of the prior history of this widely disliked modification and its subsequent removal?

Answer 3

Early on in the investigation process, a Councillor informed city officers that there was previously "a speed plateau on Vincent Street north of the Melvista Ave roundabout". No further details were provided regarding the level of support for the device or its removal.

Updated community consultation was undertaken in March 23, with approx. 67% of respondents in favour of the proposed treatment option. This recent feedback from local community members is considered more recent and therefore more relevant than sentiment of the community over two decades past.



Question 4

Is the City aware that Vincent Street is an arterial road for the purpose of emergency services and ambulance vehicles? Have the Police, DFES and Ambulance services been informed?

Answer 4

The City is aware that Vincent Street is classified as a Local Distributor Road. WA Police, DFES and Ambulance services have not been specifically consulted for this project, however, the proposed treatment does not prevent any of the emergency services from accessing or travelling along Vincent Street if and when necessary.

Question 5

Has a reduction in speed to 40Kph been considered?

Answer 5

Determinations around speed zones for all roads throughout the City are the jurisdiction of Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA). Generally, MRWA will not change the posted speed limit of a road unless modifications to the road environment are made to modify driver behaviour to reduce their speed.

In this instance, it is unlikely that MRWA would approve a speed reduction to 40km/h without some form of traffic calming measures. Speed reductions alone without any changes to the road environment are ineffective in controlling vehicle speed, no application has been made to Main Roads WA yet for a speed zoning review of Vincent Street to 40 km/h. Main Roads WA would see the proposed treatments as supportive of a 40 km/h speed zone.

An example of this is the recent changes to Waratah Avenue. Prior to the introduction of narrowed carriageways, the City's application for a reduction in posted speed limit was rejected. Subsequent to the road works being complete, MRWA has reduced the posted speed limit to 40km/h.

Question 6

What are the published numbers of residents in Vincent Street who were in the door to door survey for the purpose of planning the speed humps?

Answer 6

Door-to-door surveys were not conducted for the purpose of planning the Vincent Street Black Spot project, nor is this standard City process for community consultation. A consultation letter was sent to residents in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project area with a feedback form attached and a link to the City's online feedback portal Your Voice.

148 letters were sent in total as per the below breakdown:

- 102 along Vincent Street
- 2 along Betty Street
- 1 along Davies Road
- 2 along Jenkins Ave
- 1 along Louise Street
- 39 along Melvista Avenue



1 along Princess Road

A total of 17 responses were received plus an additional 2 emails with comments generally in support but not in direct response; Of these - 10 answered “yes”, 5 answered “no” and 2 were “Other – please specify”.

Of the 5 responses which did not support the proposed changes, 4 resided on Gallop Road, Minora Road or Waratah Avenue, while one did not list their address.

All respondents who resided on Vincent Street responded in support of the proposed changes or responded “other” with comments generally supportive of the project.

Question 7

The present number of unhappy residents indicates that the proposed speed humps are undesirable for excessive noise and of little benefit to safety along Vincent Street. Why has alternative measures not been considered and circulated to the residents before deciding on the proposed modification?

Answer 7

As part of the initial community consultation undertaken in March 23, all respondents who resided on Vincent Street responded as in support of the changes or responded “other” with comments generally supportive of the project.

Alternate options were considered to improve safety conditions along Vincent Street, however, did not meet the Benefit Cost Ratio to be successful for Federal Funding. The other treatment methods considered have also been demonstrated to be less effective than raised plateaus in controlling vehicle speed.

Question 8

Is the Council aware a petition has been raised to object to the proposed speed humps and that alternatives must be considered before any works initiated.

Answer 8

The City is aware of the intention for residents to submit a petition at the Special Council Meeting.



3.2. Mr David Kuek

I note that the designation of Vincent Street as a Black Spot by the City of Nedlands was cited as a justification for the installation of local traffic calming devices along that stretch of road between Jenkins Avenue and Melvista Avenue. In the City of Nedlands' "Voice of Nedlands" website it was stated that 17 crashes were reported on the street between 2017 and 2021, and that traffic counts had determined that the 85th percentile speed for vehicles travelling along the Vincent Street AND Melvista Avenue was ca. 10 km/h above the posted speed limit.

The designation of the street as a Black Spot by the City of Nedlands comes as a surprise to many property owners on the street. I would like the City of Nedlands to provide affected property owners with details of the 17 traffic accidents that were reported between 2017 and 2021:

Question 1

Where were the locations of these accidents?

Answer 1

- 3 crashes were at the intersection of Jenkins Av and Vincent St
- 1 crash was on Vincent St approximately midway between Jenkins Av and Princess Road
- 4 crashes were at the intersection of Princess Rd and Vincent St
- 1 crash was on Vincent St approximately 70 meters south of Princess Road
- 11 crashes were at the intersection of Melvista Av and Vincent St

Question 2

Were the accidents on Vincent Street itself or at intersections with adjoining streets?

Answer 2

2 crashes were mid-block on Vincent Street, the others occurred at intersections along Vincent Street.

Question 3

Were the accidents caused by vehicles traversing Melvista Avenue and Princess Road, or by vehicles travelling along Vincent Street?

I request that the City of Nedlands provide affected property owners with more granular information on the speed count data, so that we can confirm that the vehicles recorded as exceeding the speed limit were actually travelling along Vincent Street and not Melvista Avenue or Princess Road. Given that Vincent Street is congested relative to Melvista Avenue and Princess Road (at any time, there are lots of cars and trade vehicles parked on Vincent Street) I believe that it is more likely that the cars exceeding the speed limit were driving along Melvista Avenue and not Vincent Street.

My overriding concern is that irrelevant traffic data are being used or are being conflated by the City of Nedlands to justify the designation of Vincent Street as a Black Spot and to justify the installation of local traffic calming devices on our street.



Answer 3

The crash investigation does not assign fault for the crashes that occur. All intersections have treatments applied on all approaches to slow vehicle speeds, as the focus was on Vincent Street between Jenkins Avenue and Melvista Avenue additional infrastructure was proposed to address the mid-block crashes as well.

Officer Comment

Black Spot locations are those that meet a set of criteria stipulated by the Federal and State Governments. The City of Nedlands does not designate streets as Black Spots, the City reviews the 5-year crash history at the location and where the criteria are met, the location is eligible for Black Spot funding. In this instance, the criteria for federal Black Spot funding are:

1. Average of 0.2 casualty crashes per km per year over five years (the Vincent Street average is 1.1)
2. The project has a benefit-cost-ratio (BCR) greater than or equal to two. (the Vincent Street project has a BCR of 8.85)

Question 4

Is the City of Nedlands aware that in or around 2001 the council installed a speed bump in front of my neighbour's property at 40 Vincent Street, Nedlands? The owner of the said property, Mr. Mark Pestell, petitioned to have the speed bump removed on the grounds that it did little to reduce the speed of passing vehicles but instead contributed to excessive noise pollution caused by vehicles surmounting the speed bump at speed, or accelerating hard once they had overcome the speed bump. The City of Nedlands must have concurred with Mr. Pestell's assertion because it agreed to remove the speed bump in front of his property. Speed bumps did not reduce the speed of vehicular traffic on Vincent Street in 2001, why does the City of Nedlands think it's any different in 2024?

Answer 4

For Local Area Traffic Management devices to be successful they should be spaced out along a route, not installed in isolation. Research has determined that the appropriate spacing for raised speed plateaus is between 80 m – 120 m which is what is proposed now. Reviewing aerial imagery of the area, it appears two plateaus were installed along Vincent Street, one approximately 300 m south of Melvista Avenue (this is still in place today) and one approximately 230m north of Princess Road which is the one that was subsequently removed. The Local Area Traffic Management was installed in isolation and not as part of a route treatment meaning that it would have a very localised impact on vehicle speeds along Vincent Street. At the time it was installed Vincent Street had priority from Stirling Highway to the roundabout at Princess Road, this represents a 700 m straight stretch of road with only a single isolated treatment, it's likely that this is why there are assertions that the "speed bumps" did not reduce the speed of vehicle traffic on Vincent Street in 2001.

Question 5

I would also like to know what alternative measures have been considered by the City of Nedlands, and how the final decision to install the "speed plateaus" was arrived at. Has the City of Nedlands considered other alternatives, such as reducing the speed limit further to 40 km/h as the primary and more cost-effective solution to calming traffic along our street?



Answer 5

The administration prepared a treatment option that used horizontal deflection devices in the form of mid-block blister islands and roundabout pre-deflection when preparing the initial Black Spot application. The estimated cost of the work associated with these devices was just under \$1 million and did not include anticipated service relocations and land acquisition required at the intersections to install the treatments. This high cost meant the BCR would be significantly lower and unlikely to attract full grant funding. Due to the significant cost to the City, the need to relocate services, and the requirement to purchase land from neighbouring residential properties the alternative option of raised speed plateaus was progressed.



3.3. Mr Chris Thickett

We welcome improvements that make roads safer, but do not believe these planned works will do anything other than cause significant noise problems for residents.

Question 1

Review of past expensive failures. Why were Council's street history records not reviewed prior to survey? They would have shown speed bump installation ~20 years ago was an expensive failure; with their subsequent removal due to not reducing speed & creating a huge noise issue. Same as Carrington St, costing ratepayers thousands of dollars.

Answer 1

For Local Area Traffic Management devices to be successful they should be spaced out along a route, not installed in isolation. Research has determined that the appropriate spacing for raised speed plateaus is between 80 m – 120 m which is what is proposed now. Reviewing aerial imagery of the area, it appears two plateaus were installed along Vincent Street, one approximately 300 m south of Melvista Avenue (this is still in place today) and one approximately 230m north of Princess Road which is the one that was subsequently removed. The Local Area Traffic Management was installed in isolation and not as part of a route treatment meaning that it would have a very localised impact on vehicle speeds along Vincent Street. At the time it was installed Vincent Street had priority from Stirling Highway to the roundabout at Princess Road, this represents a 700 m straight stretch of road with only a single isolated treatment, it's likely that this is why there are assertions that the "speed bumps" did not reduce the speed of vehicle traffic on Vincent Street in 2001.

Question 2

Basis of Blackspot classification. What analysis of the problem was undertaken prior to/after survey? While crashes have occurred at intersections with Princess Rd & Melvista Ave, we are not aware of any incidents on Vincent St itself over last 35 years to warrant black spot classification & give weight to installation of any speed bumps.

Answer 2

Projects are eligible for Black Spot funding when they meeting certain criteria including a minimum number of crashes and a minimum benefit-cost-ratio. In this instance, the criteria for federal Black Spot funding are:

1. Average of 0.2 casualty crashes per km per year over five years (the Vincent Street average is 1.1)
2. The project has a benefit-cost-ratio (BCR) greater than or equal to two. (the Vincent Street project has a BCR of 8.85)

There were two recorded crashes mid-block along Vincent Street between 2017 and 2021, one resulted in a Fatality and the other Hospitalisation.

Question 3

Investigation of alternative options. From working with Main Roads WA, they would start with simplest & most inexpensive option first and review their effect, BEFORE making physical changes to the road. What alternatives were evaluated and reasons for choosing speed bumps over alternatives?



Answer 3

The primary impact of the treatment along Vincent Street was to reduce vehicle speed, thereby reducing the severity of any crashes that may occur in the future. Reducing the speed of a street requires physical changes to the street environment, these can be in the form of Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) devices such as one-way slow points, raised safety plateaus, blister islands etc. Horizontal deflection devices were also considered at the initial stages of the investigation, the estimated cost of the work associated with these devices was just under \$1 million and did not include anticipated service relocations and land acquisition required at the intersections to install the treatments. Due to the cost, the need to relocate services and the requirement to purchase land from neighbouring residential properties the alternative option of raised speed plateaus was progressed.

Question 4

Impact on Emergency Services. What responses have been received from emergency services, e.g. ambulances with critically ill patients onboard & fire engines having to repeatedly slow down when rushing to a fire?

Answer 4

No responses have been received from emergency services; however, the devices do not prohibit the emergency services from attending any properties along Vincent Street and there are several adjacent streets that provide the same direct connection between Stirling Highway and Princess Road should the emergency services feel they need to by-pass the treatment.

Question 5

March 2023 Survey. With respect to Survey, I do not recall receiving mail asking for feedback.

- a. How were directly affected residents contacted for feedback?
- b. How many of these residents were contacted?
- c. How many responded?
- d. Why are the survey questions not still visible on YourVoice? Questions for all surveys should be visible after completion; transparency is important, particularly where ratepayers fund them. Similarly, resultant survey reports with their findings (including numbers of respondents agreeing / disagreeing etc), analyses & summaries should be available on YourVoice.

Answer 5

- a. A letter was sent to the properties with details of the proposal, a feedback form, and a link to the online survey.
- b. 148 letters were sent.
- c. The City received 17 responses to the online survey and two response directly via email.
- d. The surveys page is available within the Nedlands YourVoice archived projects and still includes the brief about the project as well as the plans provided as part of the consultation. The survey itself is no longer available as the consultation period closed in March 2023.



The survey asked residents whether or not they supported the proposed changes. 17 responses were received; 10 answered “yes”, 5 answered “no” and 2 selected “other-please specify”. The two people that selected “Other-please specify” were in support of the project with additional requests for additional signage and street tree planting. Of the five people who responded as not supportive of the project, none lived on Vincent Street.



3.4. Ms Maria Miniello

Question

Have you talked to the residents of Vincent Street who lived through this debacle over 20 years ago?

Answer

The administration was made aware of an installation that occurred sometime prior to 2001. However, were not provided any further information on the subject. The City also sent 148 consultation letters and ran an online consultation during March 2023. None of the submissions received made mention of the previously installed plateaus.



4. Address by Members of the Public

Addresses by members of the public who had completed Public Address Registration Forms were made at this point.

Mr Michael Lindroos, spoke in relation to item 8.1 - TS10.04.24 – Vincent Street Black Spot.

Ms Maria Miniello, spoke in opposition to item 8.1 - TS10.04.24 – Vincent Street Black Spot.



5. Disclosures of Financial Interest

The Presiding Member reminded Council Members 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.

Nil.

6. Disclosures of Interest Affecting Impartiality

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

Nil.

7. Declaration by Members That They Have Not Given Due Consideration to Papers

Members who had not read the business papers made declarations at this point.

Nil.



8. Divisional Reports

8.1. TS10.04.24 – Vincent Street Black Spot

Meeting & Date	Special Council Meeting – 9 th April 2024
Applicant	City of Nedlands
Employee Disclosure under section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995	Nil.
Report Author	Peter Seed, Project Manager
Director	Finn MacLeod, Acting Director Technical Services
Attachments	1. Confidential – RFQ 2023-24.12 Vincent Street Black Spot Evaluation Report

Regulation 11(da) - Council did not endorse the tender as it did not support the proposed Vincent Street Black Spot Project. Instead Council requested the CEO to progress an application for an alternate non-speed plateau traffic treatment.

Moved – Councillor Coghlan

Seconded – Councillor Brackenridge

That Council:

- 1. does not approve the awarding of Tender number RFQ 2023-24.12 for the Vincent Street Road Safety Black Spot Project procurement process;**
- 2. directs the CEO to cancel the Vincent Street Road Safety Black Spot Project as a deliverable Capital Works Project in the 2023-24 financial year and return all grant funding to the Federal Government;**
- 3. request the CEO to apply for an alternate (non-speed plateau) traffic management treatment for Vincent Street in a future blackspot submission, estimated to cost \$968,000 excluding any required land acquisition and service relocation costs; and**
- 4. notes the approximate allocation of \$320,000 of municipal funding for consideration in a future annual budget, which would be required for a non-speed plateau traffic management treatment if awarded under the State Blackspot program.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 7/-



Purpose

The purpose of the report is for Council to accept the evaluation and recommendation of the Contractor WCP CIVIL PTY LTD for RFQ 2023-24.12 Vincent Street Black Spot.

In accordance with Council's amended purchasing policy, Council approval is required where the minimum number of quotes was not received during the procurement process.

The Request for Quotation (RFQ) for the Vincent Street Black Spot procurement process received one (1) submission in the procurement band between \$50,001 and up to \$250,000.

Recommendation

That Council:

- 1. accepts the submission for the Vincent Street Black Spot by WCP CIVIL PTY LTD as the preferred tenderer; and**
- 2. authorises the CEO to enter into a contract in accordance with the City's Request for Tender number RFQ 2023-24.12 and comprising of that request, the City's Conditions of Contract, preferred tender submission, inclusive of the Schedule of Rates, and all post tender clarifications and negotiations, to be executed.**

Voting Requirement

Simple Majority.

Background

The City of Nedlands Procurement of Goods and Services Policy was amended by Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting on 24 May 2022. This amendment requires procurement items to be brought to Council where the minimum number of responses has not been received prior to the RFQ closing.

Administration sought six (6) written quotations for the Vincent Street Blackspot project. The procurement band (\$50,001 to \$250,000) requires that a minimum of three responses to be obtained, however, at the close of the RFQ advertisement period, one response was submitted for consideration.

The Vincent Street Black spot project forms part of the approved 2023/24 Capital Works Program. As the City does not have internal resources appropriate for these types of work it has been decided to seek the services of a skilled and experienced Contractor.

The RFQ was sent directly to six nominated suppliers and was open for submissions from 1st March 2024 to 22nd March 2024.



The City received a total of 1 compliant submission from WCP CIVIL PTY LTD.

Discussion

After the RFQ period ended, an evaluation panel was formed comprising of two (2) City Projects and Programs team members and one Asset Management team member. The evaluation panel assessed the submitted tenders against the following criteria:

- **Relevant experience (40%),**
- **Key personnel skills and experience (20%),**
- **Demonstrated Understanding (40%).**

After the RFQ evaluation panel assessed the submission, WCP CIVIL PTY LTD was nominated as the preferred supplier for this project based on their submitted methodology, program, and schedule of rates.

WCP CIVIL PTY LTD have demonstrated sufficient capability to handle the project and understanding of the requirements by providing a detailed construction methodology process, outlining how they will complete the work.

They have the relevant experience to complete the proposed works on Vincent Street. WCP CIVIL PTY LTD have completed similar works for other local Councils in the Perth Metro region. They have provided key personnel resumes who all have suitable level of experience, and the panel is confident that the team can complete the works.

The Contractor has considered the residential area that they are working in and will be able to complete the works in a short period of time. The works are expected to take one week around mid-May.

Following the due diligence process, the provided information is of a level that officers are confident that the project will be completed on schedule, safely and with minimal disruption to road users, local community, and businesses and that WCP CIVIL PTY LTD offer represents value for money to the City.

The City nominated the Vincent Street project to help reduce the speeding and severity of crashes in this area. The Administration recommends proceeding with the project despite the challenging market. Delaying these works will lead to more accidents, and directly affect the long-term safety of residents and road users alike.

The current speeding on the road warrants:

- **Immediate intervention is necessary to prevent safety risks and further accidents.**
- **Prompt action to prevent further accidents and deaths on Nedlands' roads.**



Consultation

Consultation General consultation with impacted stakeholders has occurred as part of the project planning process but no specific consultation has occurred as part of the tender evaluation process.

Strategic Implications

This item is strategically aligned to the City of Nedlands Council Plan 2023-33 vision and desired outcomes as follows:

- Vision** Sustainable and responsible for a bright future
- Pillar** People
- Outcome** 2. A healthy, active and safe community.
- Pillar** Place
- Outcome** 8. A city that is easy to get around safely and sustainably.
- Pillar** Place
- Outcome** 8. A city that is easy to get around safely and sustainably.

Budget/Financial Implications

The preferred tender’s submission is within the allocated budget for this project.

The costing summary is shown in the table below:

	Project
Budget	\$300,000
Municipal contribution	0
Grant Funding	\$300,000
Tendered Price	\$177,829.08

This project has been allocated \$300,000 in Australian Government Black Spot Funding. If this project is delayed, the City risks losing this grant allocation. The works are required to be completed by 30th June 2024, within the 2023-24 financial year.

Legislative and Policy Implications

[Procurement of Goods and Services Council Policy](#)
[Local Government \(Functions and General\) Regulations 1996](#)



Decision Implications

Approving the Vincent Street Black spot tender is crucial for various reasons:

- **Safety Benefit to Community:** Road users, pedestrians, and homeowners/businesses in the area will benefit from safer roads, with a reduction in crashes, severity and trauma related to road crashes.
- **Preventing Future Crashes:** Swift intervention is needed to prevent further crashes and ensure road user safety. Delaying repairs could lead to further high-risk crashes in this area.
- **Securing Funding:** Timely completion is crucial for future grant funding and prevents negative reputational risks with funding bodies. Not completing the works in this financial year could jeopardise future funding opportunities.

Conclusion

WCP CIVIL PTY LTD have demonstrated that they have the understanding to complete the required works on Vincent Street. They have performed similar projects for both the City, other local governments, and large-scale road construction projects.

As such the evaluation Panel advises, that WCP CIVIL PTY LTD be awarded the package of works for delivery.

Further Information

Nil.



9. Declaration of Closure

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7.30pm.