



Minutes of the General Meeting of Electors held on 13 December 2018 from 6pm at Adam Armstrong Pavilion, Beatrice Road, Dalkeith (David Cruickshank Reserve).

1. Opening and Welcome

His Worship the Mayor declared the meeting open at 6 pm.

(the advertisement calling the meeting was published in the POST Newspaper on 24th November and 1st December 2018, together with notices displayed at the Administration Centre and Libraries, and on the City's Website).

2. Introduction of Elected Members and Staff

3. Procedural Matters

His Worship the Mayor outlined the procedures of the meeting.

4. Records of Attendance / Apologies from Electors, Guests and Members of the Press

Councillors	His Worship the Mayor, R M C Hipkins (Presiding Member)	
	Councillor I S Argyle	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor W R B Hassell	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor A W Mangano	Dalkeith Ward
	Councillor C M de Lacy	Hollywood Ward
	Councillor B G Hodsdon	Hollywood Ward
	Councillor J D Wetherall	Hollywood 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 P L Mickleson	Acting Chief Executive Officer
	Mrs L M Driscoll	Director Corporate & Strategy
	Mrs S C Gibson	PA to Director Corporate & Strategy

Public There were 55 members of the public present.

Press A representative from the Post Newspaper was present.

5. Contents of the Annual Report for the 2017/18 Financial Year to be considered

- Questions submitted on the Annual Report by Electors prior to the meeting.

The Acting Chief Executive Officer will respond to questions that were submitted in writing prior to the meeting.

a) Mr Andrew Mangano, 51 Minora Road, Dalkeith

1. How many FTE (Full Time Equivalent) were employed at the City of Nedlands on 30/06/18?

Response

The number of full time equivalent staff employed at the City of Nedlands on 30th June 2018 was 165.

2. How many part time staff were employed, and how many full-time staff?

Response

There were 130 full time staff and 35 part time staff employed at the City of Nedlands on 30/06/18

3. Why is this information no longer shown in the Financial Report as has been in previous years?

Response

Reporting of FTEs is not a statutory requirement and is therefore not included in the Financial Report

b) Ms Hazel Cole, 45 Langham Street, Nedlands

1. **Page 49 of the Annual Report - Statutory Requirement** it lists 'Elected Member Attendance'. I note that there are Councillors who are elected to subcommittees who have not attended a single subcommittee meeting during the year. Does the Council have any policies in place to address the non-attendance of an elected member at both Council and subcommittee meetings? What is the protocol for recording whether an elected member has attended Council or subcommittee meeting? Is it simply being in attendance at the opening of the meeting?

Response

Councillor attendance at Council Ordinary Council Meetings is covered under the Local Government Act 1995 where under *section 2.25 (4) – A member is absent without obtaining leave of the council, throughout for 3 consecutive ordinary meetings of the council is disqualified from continuing his or her membership of the council, unless all of the meetings are within a 2 month period.*

In regard to sub-committees each sub-committee has it's own Terms of Reference however, non-attendance of an elected member is not covered in these Terms of Reference nor does Council have a policy in place to address the non-attendance of an elected member.

Under the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 *Part 2 11 Minutes, content of – The content of minutes of a meeting of a council or a committee is to include –*

(b) where a member enters or leaves the meeting during the course of the meeting, the time of entry or departure, as the case requires, in the chronological sequence of the business of the meeting.

This is the process we follow as required.

2. **Page 9 of the Annual Report** states 'A number one priority for Council is the delivery of underground power, which will see the completion of the entire network no later than 2030. It's an ambitious target that requires careful planning, ongoing community consultation, responsible financial management and State Government support'

I request this timeline is reviewed ASAP as 12 years is too long to receive what a majority of Nedlands ratepayers have enjoyed for many, many years. We have previously been told that underground power has not been funded under the State Underground Power Program due to the good condition of poles in the network. This excuse does not stack up, as 'good condition' poles are being removed in the current underground power projects in West Hollywood, Claremont triangle and Alfred Road. Additionally, the Council had over \$73 million in Retained surplus and cash backed Reserves (with over \$12million in current assets) at 30 June 2018. How does the Council reconcile its claim that underground power is "A number one priority" when it is still planning to take another 12 years to complete the program despite having substantial reserves?

Response

The delivery of underground power is a priority for the Council and planning for the investment of it and other major capital projects will be considered as part of the review of the long term financial plan early next year.

There are two potential opportunities for the City to complete underground power with support from the State Government and these are either through the State Underground Power Program (SUPP) or the Local Government Client Funded Program (LGCFP). The only other alternative is for the City (ratepayers) to fully fund the project which is currently approximately \$15,000 per single residential property. Should the State Government continue to support SUPP and/or LGCFP the earliest opportunity for this to take place is likely to be 2022/23. The City continues to prepare for this opportunity.

The City has \$6m in cash-backed reserves and \$67m in retained surplus.

Cash reserves have been set up with the approval of the Council for various purposes over the years and in 2018 a reserve for underground power works has also been set up, to be used for that purpose.

Retained surplus is not a cash surplus, but is made up of current assets, non-current assets, less current liabilities and non-current liabilities. It is not a readily available source of funds for use.

The current assets of \$12m include \$6m of cash-backed reserves which are restricted to the approved use. This leaves a balance of \$6m as at 30 June 2018 from which the City has to ensure that total current liabilities of \$7.3m are paid as and when they fall due.

- 3. Page 16 of the Annual Report – Integrated Strategic Planning – Underground Power** it states in paragraph 5 ‘The cost of the project was less than anticipated’. Given twelve years to complete underground power to the whole of Nedlands is unsatisfactory, what are the Council’s plans to bring forward the next stages given it has borrowed less than expected due to the high take up of upfront payments for the current Underground Power projects?

Response

Planning for the next phase of Underground Power and other capital projects will be considered as part of the review of the long term financial plan early next year.

- Other questions on the Annual Report

There were no further questions on the Annual Report.

6. General Business

- Questions submitted by Electors prior to the meeting.

Waste Bins

a) Mr Neville Hills, 3 Jameson Street, Swanbourne

1. There is much confusion regarding rubbish collections and recycling. The only conveniently available information that I am aware of, is the stickers inside the wheelybin lids. I do not think these have been updated since the bins were introduced. The requirements at different councils are varied and inconsistent. Would council review the content of the information provided, and perhaps replace the current lid stickers?

Response

The City will review the condition of the under lid stickers and replace if necessary. The information on the stickers is still valid for the City of Nedlands' waste collection process. It is noted that the City was one of the first Local Governments to provide a three bin collection system.

2. Would Council review the verge waste collection system? Since Brockway tip was closed, the City verges have become an alternative tip. This has at least three adverse impacts.
 - i. At least for a total of four weeks in every year, unsightly rubbish lines the streetscapes on which we expend large amounts of money attending to beautification and safety. This disrespects the efforts of residents and The City of Nedlands to create an attractive environment of which we can be unashamed.
 - ii. The use of the verge reserves as a tip site, conveys the view that verges are everyone's property on which to dump unwanted items and litter at any time. Often we can see the odd fridges or washing machines dumped on a verge in the expectation that someone will shift them eventually. A culture of dumping rubbish in public locations should not become council policy.
 - iii. Items collected in verge clearances are crushed and sent to landfill. Much of the materials can be sorted and reused or recycled.

Response

The City's current verge collection contract has been very successful with the collection period reduced to four weeks with materials only left on the verge for one week if the residents follow the protocols. The contract includes recycling of the verge collection which last year realised 92% diversion from landfill for the service which contributed 4% of the overall 53% recycled by the City of Nedlands.

3. Would Council explore the result of verge skips on demand, as is available at other Perth councils, most recently Cambridge Council?

Response

The City is not currently considering transitioning to skip bins due to the effectiveness with respect to recycling of the current service when compared to the skip bins.

2017 General Electors' Meeting**a) Ms Hazel Cole, 45 Langham Street, Nedlands**

1. Could you please advise why the 2017 Minutes of the General Electors' Meeting have not been attached to the Agenda for the 2018 General Electors' Meeting?

Response

The Minutes of the 2017 Annual Electors Meeting have not been attached to the 2018 Agenda as they were made available to the public via the City's Website on 22 December 2017 and were presented to Council at the first Council meeting in 2018 (February Council meeting).

2. At the 2017 General Electors' Meeting we were requested to complete an attendance register, this attendance register should become part of the Minutes not just a one liner saying PUBLIC – there were 159 members of the public present. This also applies to the Post Newspaper representative. Does the Council have a reason for not including the attendance register in the Minutes?

Response

In the interests of an individual's privacy, Council chooses not to make available to the public the names and addresses of Electors that attend the Electors meeting.

Westside Wolves / Mt Claremont Oval

Overall response regarding Westside Wolves / Mt Claremont Oval

The Council decision in May 2018 required the proposal by the Westside Wolves Hockey Club to be workshopped by Council. The Councillors workshopped the proposal with key stakeholders and resulted in the subsequent decision of Council in October to undertake the recent community consultation process.

This process was to understand the wider community's views (not just Mt Claremont) on the suitability of this location for the proposal and whether to subsequently approve that the hockey club further investigate and develop a detailed proposal and business plan for Council consideration.

The community engagement report considered by the Council at its Committee meeting on 4 December provided full details of the community engagement outcomes including submissions from stakeholders, users of the reserve and the results for each type of engagement activity.

Councillors considered and discussed this report at the Council Committee meeting resulting in a collective recommendation for Council consideration and approval. The engagement report assisted the Council to make a recommendation to the ordinary meeting of Council on 18 December 2018.

The City believes that it is important that its collective response should be the basis for further decision-making by the Council. The engagement outcomes are not just about providing the Council with a number who supported/did not support the proposal or where they came from.

Issues such as environment, parking, traffic, safety and fitness-for-purpose are examples of issues the community have identified during this process, including alternative sites and impacts on state and local government strategies and plans for the area. These issues will only become relevant if the proposal progresses.

- Mt Claremont Reserve is zoned recreation in accordance with Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and is considered a regional sport oval/facility. Any sport activity including hockey is consistent with this zoning.
- Council has previously made enquiries with the State Government about the availability of the old waste site land (Brockway tip) for various recreational activities but were all rejected due to the cost of refurbishment. This land is not controlled by Council.

b) Mr Dmitry Kazanov, 2 Milyarm Rise, Swanbourne

This is a follow up to questions raised at December 4th Council committee meeting with regard to details of Mt Claremont Oval community engagement results, specifically geographic spread and people's interests for respondents in support and against the proposal. As I understood from the response at committee that this detailed information is not readily available for all the survey results. However, these details must be available for online YourVoice Nedlands survey, which accounts for more than 76% of collected responses.

Could you please share the requested information for online survey only?

Response

There is no point in sharing only part of the information. The total story needs to be told. People completed the street field (in the survey) in a variety of ways which reduced the integrity of the data.

c) Carl Brauhart, 48 Lisle Street, Mt Claremont

1. Regarding the Mt Claremont Oval Hockey Pitch Proposal, on the 27th of November I presented maps to all councillors showing that every synthetic hockey turf in Perth has at least 200 parking bays. Does council now acknowledge that Mt Claremont Oval cannot accommodate such parking demand?

Response

The original engagement was to understand the community's views (not just Mt Claremont) on this proposal. Issues arising from the engagement included parking and traffic. When the Council considers the report at its meeting on 18 December it will determine the next steps for this proposal. This may/may not include further detailed analysis where this, and other, issues will be addressed.

2. Can the council please clarify why this proposal went out to community consultation when the council had made a considered decision in May 2018 that Mt Claremont Oval is an inappropriate site and alternatives needed to be investigated?

Response

The workshop in May included the involvement of key stakeholders which resulted in the subsequent decision of Council to undertake the recent community consultation process.

3. Can the council please clarify why it is considered valid in the concluding statements to indicate marginal support for the proposal, but fail to acknowledge strong opposition from 6 oval stakeholder groups with none in support?

Response

This result was in the report and was part of the consideration by the Committee at its 4 December meeting.

4. Can the council clarify the validity of the total numbers presented in the report, if numbers for Mt Claremont cannot be reliably extracted from the data as claimed at council committee meeting on 4th of December?

Response

The Council considered all submissions presented in the report and was able to give whatever weight it thought appropriate to where (geographically) the submissions came from.

5. Can the council advise what percentage of the 675 residents of Mt Claremont who submitted a response to the Community Consultation Survey were opposed to the proposal?

Response

Councillors have access to all submissions. It is broad community engagement and not just from residents from Mt Claremont. Councillors can do their own weighting, but it would be inappropriate for staff to manipulate the data one way or another. Staff presented the report based on the facts. Judgement calls on what weight to place on the various submissions is the role of Council.

6. Is the council aware of their obligation to manage Mt Claremont Oval, as part of an A Class Reserve, in accordance with the Natural Areas Management Plan 2013-2018 and the Mt Claremont Oval Reserve Management Plan 2013-2018, the objectives of which are to "protect, enhance and restore natural areas and biodiversity within the City of Nedlands", and that paving a large part of the oval is contrary to these objectives?

Response

Mt Claremont Reserve is zoned recreation in accordance with Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and is considered a regional sport oval/facility. Any sport activity including hockey is consistent with this zoning.

d) Anne McCrudden, 27 Landon Way, Mt Claremont

1. Can each Councillor please give an explanation to the Annual Electors Meeting as to why they accepted the Allen Park Master Plan were the Westside Wolves proposal was declined, yet they did not want to support the council recommendation to look for another more appropriate location?

Response

Councillors discussed their reasons during deliberations at the relevant Council Committee meetings resulting in a collective recommendation being put forward for Council consideration and approval.

2. What was the intent of the Council in the above resolution? It is ambiguous as it does not exclude the Mt Claremont oval permanently from use by the Westside Wolves Hockey Club?

Response

At this time Council has not determined any action arising from the community consultation. This matter will be considered at the ordinary meeting of Council on 18 December 2018.

3. Given that Westside Wolves have submitted two proposals previously to council for a home ground for their hockey club, why didn't council worked with other western suburbs councils in a collaborative manner to assist the Westside Wolves Hockey Club identify a suitable site?

Response

Council is considering a proposal submitted by Westside Wolves Hockey Club. There has been no requirement to consult with other Western Suburb Councils, however there were opportunities for them to provide feedback on the proposal.

4. Why didn't the Council challenge the Westside Wolves on the plan presented for consultation for the Mt Claremont Oval in that it was reduced to 1 synthetic pitch and 60 parking bays, when all previous proposal had two synthetic pitches and 280 bays? This is a major shift.

Response

Council, at this stage, is only considering the location for the proposal submitted by Westside Wolves Hockey Club being the Mt Claremont reserve.

5. Why the above alternative sites properly investigated by a consultant and a report provided to council? Why were they rejected as a suitable alternative site?

Response

The larger proposal at Allen Park was not supported following community consultation. The smaller proposal at Mt Claremont Reserve is now being considered in this community consultation.

6. Why is it that the Christ Church Grammar School, which has 80,000 square metres of playing fields in the Mt Claremont area feel that the land adjacent to their existing site in Stevenson Avenue Mt Claremont was worth remedial clean up for extra playing fields for them, yet the Council did not recognise that this same land, being the old rubbish dump, could be utilised as a sporting precinct which the Westside Wolves Hockey Club could use?

Response

The City has previously made enquiries with the State Government about the availability of this land for various recreational activities but were all rejected due to the cost of refurbishment. This land is not controlled by Council. The Westside Wolves submission has not been endorsed or a feasibility study undertaken.

e) Guy Churchill, Hardy Road, Nedlands

The Nedlands Electors Association (NEA) does not support the Westside Wolves Hockey Club (WWHC) proposal as presented.

1. Why was the consultation not done in such a way that the Council Administration was able to give meaningful analysis of date such as respondents residential location?

Response

The consultation was carried out to gain a level of understanding as to the support for the proposal at this location. However, due to the varied ways the City received the surveys and feedback, it was unable to accurately obtain valid data due to issues such as multiple responses from the same individuals and the quality of the information provided as feedback and in the survey forms.

2. Why did the UWA Nedlands Football Club (UWANFC), a key stakeholder, not be included by the Council Administration in the original consultation process/survey form?

Response

This was an oversight, but quickly rectified. In addition, the survey had a 'other' field and this field was completed by members of the Club.

Any other General Business questions.

a) John Millard, 52 Lisle Street, Mt Claremont

Question regarding issues with the consultation.

Response

One person identified an issue with their new iPhone7 which had trouble interacting with the City's website. The issue was resolved once it was brought to our attention and the City received no other complaints from people being unable to provide feedback in regard to their iPhone 7. The site also slowed for a short period of time and this related to someone attempting to hack into the software which slowed the system of all users of the software. As always there were multiple options for people to provide feedback on the Hockey proposal and the City's Administration provided assistance where requested.

b) Mark Rosen, 84 Dalkeith Road, Nedlands

Question regarding parking issues and Cycle pathways (Jenkins Ave, Dalkeith Road, Aldi).

Response

Jenkins Ave – there will be no loss of parking spaces as the result of Safe Active Streets project. The traffic engineers involved have confirmed that the project meets all required safety standards

Dalkeith Rd – Rangers will take enforcement action where they become aware that parking restrictions are not being complied with. There is no requirement for the Windsor Cinema to provide additional parking

Aldi – the development was approved by the JDAP in early December. It was a commercial zoned site and therefore allowed as of right. Sufficient parking has been provided for the proposed use.

Motions to be considered regarding the Westside Wolves proposal

1. Motion

Guy Churchill – Spoke in support of the motion.

Anne McCrudden – Spoke in support of the motion.

Bill Hassell, Deputy Mayor – Spoke against the motion.

Moved: Mr James Anderson, 3 Beecham Road, Mt Claremont

Seconded: Suzy Moir, 18 Chessington Gardens, Mt Claremont

“The City to advise the Westside Wolves Hockey Club that Mount Claremont Oval is not a suitable location for a hockey facility because existing users and local residents do not support the proposal and therefore the City will not continue to explore this location as an option”.

CARRIED
(3 against)

2. Motion

Moved: James Anderson, 3 Beecham Road, Mt Claremont
Seconded: Carol Brauhart, 48 Lisle Street, Mt Claremont

“The City establish a working group comprising representatives of the City of Nedlands, Westside Wolves Hockey Club, Suburban Lions Hockey Club, Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, Town of Cambridge, YMCC Hockey Club and community representatives to explore the feasibility of establishing a hockey facility North East Mt Claremont.”

CARRIED

3. Motion

Suzi Mori – Spoke in support of the Motion.
Cilla de Lacy – Advised the Electors that there is a paper out on the State Government Website regarding the review of the Local Government Act, Community Engagement.
Carl Brauhart – Spoke in support of the Motion.

Moved: Mr Guy Churchill (Chair Nedlands Electors Association (NEA)),
Hardy Road, Nedlands
Seconded: Dmitry Kazanov, 2 Milyarm Rise, Swanbourne

“That Council obtains expert external advise on the design, conduct and analysis of all future community consultation surveys”.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Motion

Barry Nunn – Spoke against the Motion.
Anne McCrudden – Spoke in support of the Motion.
Suzi Moir – Spoke in support of the Motion.
Kerry Smyth – Spoke to the Motion.
Cilla de Lacy – Spoke to the Motion.

Moved: Mr Guy Churchill (Chair Nedlands Electors Association (NEA)),
Hardy Road, Nedlands.
Seconded: Anne McCrudden, 27 Landon Way, Mt Claremont

“Community Advisory Group: The City establishes a Community Advisory Group to provide ongoing community input into Council and the City activities and directions.”

CARRIED
(9 against)

7. Closure

Declaration of Closure

There being no further business, His Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 7.02 pm.