

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	ATTENDANCES & APOLOGIES .....	1
2.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	1
3.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
4.	STATEMENTS, PETITIONS, MEMORIALS & DEPUTATIONS.....	3
5.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER .....	4
6.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS .....	4
6.1	Ordinary Council Meeting – 28 <sup>th</sup> May, 2001 .....	4
6.2	Special Council Meeting – 15 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	4
7.	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & OFFICERS.....	5
7.1	Corporate Services Committee Meeting – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	5
C191/06/01	SITTING FEES FOR COUNCILLORS – 2001/2002 (A0023-02).....	5
C193/06/01	FEES & CHARGES – 1 JULY 2001 (A0794) .....	7
C194/06/01	REQUEST FOR DONATION FROM GRAHAM SICILUK FOR BLUEY DAY - PRINCESS MARGARET HOSPITAL CANCER & BURNS UNIT (A0012) .....	9
C195/06/01	CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING FARMLAND CONCESSION APPLICATIONS (A0055).....	10
C196/06/01	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUPPORT PROGRAM (H0031) .....	13
C202/06/01	COUNCILLOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE REQUEST – A0906.....	15
7.2	Asset Services – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001.....	16
AS075/06/01	HERITAGE COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY POWER STUDY (A0065-02).....	16
AS073/06/01	CATTLE HOLDING YARDS LOT 25 LIGHTBODY ROAD – ROAD UPGRADING CONDITION (P00213-02) .....	18
7.3	Community & Recreation Development Meeting – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001.....	21
CRD48/06/01	COMMUNITY SAFETY PROGRAM (A0171-02).....	21
CRD50/06/01	COMMUNITY FUNDING PROGRAM 2001/2002 (A0169-03).....	26

7.4	Strategic Management Committee Meeting – 18 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	27
SM060/06/01	LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 1 – BONDS AND BANK GUARANTEES (A0891).....	27
SM061/06/01	DRAFT LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 3 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE – MOBILE PHONE TOWERS (A0960) .....	29
SM062/06/01	AMENDMENT NO. 116 TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 (A0926) .....	31
SM063/06/01	INFORMATION SYSTEMS PLAN (A0030).....	45
SM064/06/01	PROVISION OF DETAILED URBAN STORMWATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR THE BYFORD URBAN DEVELOPMENT AREA (A0827).....	47
SM065.1/06/01	PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A RURAL INDUSTRIAL AREA AS PART OF THE RURAL STRATEGY REVIEW (A0803).....	54
SM065.2/06/01	TONKIN HIGHWAY WORKING GROUP (A0471) .....	54
SM065.3/06/01	WHITBY FALLS REVIEW COMMITTEE (A0407) .....	55
SM065.4/06/01	JARRAHDAL WEEKEND BUS SERVICE – LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT (A0483).....	55
SM065.5/06/01	SPECIAL CONFERENCES OF LGA, CSCA AND CUCA – 22-23 APRIL 2001 (A0163-04).....	55
SM065.6/06/01	LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNIT MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, 11 MAY 2001 (A0436-03) .....	56
SM065.7/06/01	MEMBER FOR ROLEYSTONE, MARTIN WHITELEY (A0108).....	56
SM066/06/01	EMPLOYMENT OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER – STRATEGIC GRANT FUNDING FOCUS (A0436-03) .....	56
7.5	Planning Development & Environment Meeting – 18 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	58
E028/06/01	LOT 99 SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY, MARDELLA – CONSERVATION COVENANT (P00033) “Confidential” .....	58
P155/06/01	PROPOSED REZONING OF LOT 4 RANDELL ROAD, MUNDIJONG FROM RURAL TO FARMLAND (P00881) .....	59
B33/06/01	PROPOSED OAKFORD COMMUNITY CENTRE (RS0158).....	62
B34/06/01	SCHEDULED BUILDING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM – PAINTING 2000/2001 (A0751) .....	65
B36/06/01	PROPOSED SERPENTINE SPORTS RESERVE ABLUTION FACILITY (A0369, RS0115-04).....	66

H25/06/01	VACANCY – WAMA MEMBER – WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW HEALTH (TREATMENT OF SEWAGE & DISPOSAL OF EFFLUENT AND LIQUID WASTE) REGULATIONS 1974 (A0163-02).....	68
H26/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT .....	69
8.	MOTION OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	71
9.	ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDING MEMBER.....	71
10.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING: .....	71
10.1	INCLUDING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER/OFFICER REPORTS .....	71
CRD52/06/01	PROPOSED SHIRE SPORT, LEISURE & RECREATION CENTRE, BYFORD (A0195 & P00420).....	71
C206/06/01	DIFFERENTIAL RATE ADVERTISEMENT 2001/2002 (A0128).....	76
10.2	COUNCILLORS QUESTIONS .....	79
11.	INFORMATION REPORT – COMMITTEE DELEGATED AUTHORITY .....	80
11.1	Corporate Services – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	80
C189/06/01	COUNCILLOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM/S (A0906)	80
C190/06/01	COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDING (A0957) .....	80
C192/06/01	DIFFERENTIAL RATE ADVERTISEMENT 2001/2002 (A0128).....	81
C197/06/01	CONFIRMATION OF PAYMENT OF CREDITORS (A0917).....	81
C198/06/01	DEBTOR ACCOUNTS WITH A BALANCE IN EXCESS OF \$1,000 (A0917)	81
C199/06/01	SUNDRY DEBTOR OUTSTANDING ACCOUNTS (A0917).....	82
C200/06/01	RATE DEBTORS REPORT (A0917).....	82
C201/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT .....	82
C203/06/01	WESTERN POWER REQUEST FOR NATURAL POWER TESTIMONIAL (A0572).....	83
C204/06/01	MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY-STYLE GUIDE (A0033).....	83
C205/06/01	JARRAHDALÉ HERITAGE PARK PEEL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION 2001-220 FUNDING REQUEST,(P00509-03).....	84

11.2	Asset Services – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	84
AS072/06/01	MASTERS ROAD SPEED ZONE (R0154).....	84
AS074/06/01	PROPOSED JAMES POINT PORT AND LIVESTOCK HOLDING FACILITY KWINANA – TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS (A0512-02) .....	85
AS076/06/01	FIRE CONTROL OFFICERS' APPOINTMENTS (A0183) .....	85
AS077/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT .....	86
11.3	Community & Recreation Development – 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	86
CRD47/06/01	FUNDING: PURPOSE BUILT FACILITY (A0173) .....	86
CRD49/06/01	REGIONAL FUNDING REQUESTS (A0168) .....	86
CRD51/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT .....	87
11.4	Building Services – 18 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	87
B35/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT .....	87
11.5	Health Services – 18 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	87
H27/06/01	PRINCIPAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER'S RETIREMENT .....	87
11.6	Planning Development & Environment – 18 <sup>th</sup> June, 2001 .....	88
P154/06/01	PROPOSED SCHEME AMENDMENT – COMMERCIAL VEHICLE PARKING – PT LOT 12 SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY, BYFORD (A0763- 02) .....	88
P148/06/01	LAND ACQUISITION FOR TONKIN HIGHWAY EXTENSION (A0471) ....	89
P149/06/01	PROPOSED WHOLESALE PLANT NURSERY – LOT 381 KARNUP ROAD, HOPELAND (P00150) .....	89
P150/06/01	PROPOSED BED AND BREAKFAST ACCOMMODATION AND TWO HORSE HOLDING YARDS – LOT 22 (NO. 148) NETTLETON ROAD, BYFORD (P00053) .....	90
P151/06/01	LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 2 – SUBDIVISIONS WITHIN THE BYFORD STRUCTURE PLAN AREA (A0975) .....	91
P152/06/01	PROPOSED SUBDIVISION – LOT 1 THOMAS ROAD, BYFORD (S116602).....	92
P153/06/01	PROPOSED SUBDIVISION – LOT 51 LARSEN ROAD, BYFORD (S116654).....	92

P156/06/01	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 – PROHIBIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES AND USE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS (A0347).....	94
------------	---	----

P158/06/01	ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THROUGH WAMA (A0163-04).....	95
------------	--	----

12.	CLOSE .....	95
-----	-------------	----

**NOTE:** a) The Council Committee Minutes Item numbers may be out of sequence. Please refer to Section 10 of the Agenda – Information Report - Committee Decisions Under Delegated Authority for these items.

b) Declaration of Councillors and Officers Interest is made at the time the item is discussed.

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 6 PATERSON STREET, MUNDIJONG ON MONDAY, 25<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2001 - COMMENCING AT 7.00PM.

---

1. **ATTENDANCES & APOLOGIES**

**PRESENT:**        Crs. J C Star  
                         D Buttfield  
                         D L Needham  
                         I J Richards  
                         J E Price  
                         A J Simpson  
                         T H J Hoyer  
                         K R Murphy  
                         (North Ward vacancy to be filled via Extra Ordinary Election 5 September 2001 as per Council Decision C153/03/01)

**APOLOGIES:**        W J Kirkpatrick (leave of absence)  
                         Mr R Harris ..... Director Asset Services

**IN ATTENDANCE:**    Mr. D E Price ..... Chief Executive Officer  
                         Mr A Watson ..... Director Sustainable Development  
                         Mr G Dougall ..... Director Corporate Services  
                         Mrs S E Langmair ..... Minute Secretary

**GALLERY:**        26

2. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Ian Blackburn, 5 Ray Place, Byford

Q        Wishes to obtain a copy of legal opinion for Lot 99 South West Highway, Mardella  
A        The Chief Executive Officer advised that it is confidential and is therefore not available to the public.

Q        Further to a newsletter received advising of Rate projection for the next few years. When is Council going to finish 98/99 works program? ie. Footpath on Walters Road (south side) – still incomplete.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that he would take this matter on notice.

Mr P Nield, Lot 1 Boomerang Road, Oldbury

Q        He understands that action is being taken against the Shire by the Examiner, if the Shire's lawyers were consulted prior to placing the advertisement, will Council be taking action against the Shire's lawyers, if not, why not?

Cr Price wished to make public at this meeting that Mr Nield in asking the question is closely involved in a legal action and is very concerned questions that he is asking is purely and simply putting pressure on Councillors and officers of this Council and this question should be made in another place.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that as the matter was in the hands of lawyers it was not reasonable to comment on this matter at all.

Q.        Regarding Lot 1 Jackson Road, that the DEP claimed that A Watson gave verbal permission for fill to be expanded into that area and wished to know what the official

position is? Did A Watson give the CEO or the DEP permission to grant a licence or some sort approval?

The Shire President made the following statement in relation to this matter:  
“Indications are that the applicant deleted Lot 1 on its application, Council treated it as such, this raises questions over the validity of the Ministers approval over Lot 1 given that it would appear the applicant had withdrawn his application for planning consent over Lot 1. The Shire has been involved in correspondence with McLean Industries and the Department of Environmental Protection to obtain their comments on the matter and will take this into account in formulating a formal position on this matter”.

Mr Ehwald, Lot 4 Thomas Road.

Further to the May Ordinary Council Meeting:

Q Extension of development permit (permit approval).

A Director Sustainable Development advised that he had written to Mr Ehwald clearly setting out what was required and inviting Mr Ehwald to make contact to meet at his property if he had any further questions.

Mr Ehwald advised that he received a letter, however this letter did not answer his question.

Q Is it true that Council put a stop work order on Cumming Road where the person has planning approval or is this just rumour?

A Director Sustainable Development advised that Mr Salsman has planning approval, and as far as he knows Mr Salsman has lodged a building application and is not sure if approval has been given but as far as he aware there is no difficulties with Mr Salsman's application.

The Chief Executive Officer advised Mr Ehwald that he would be contacted following this meeting.

Mrs C Nield, Boomerang Road, Oldbury

Q When Council prepares the Annual Report for the financial year, will Council please provide a full disclosure in relation to self-supporting loans.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that Council will take these comments into consideration.

Mrs Bond, Stockmans Close

Q Has or is Colleen Rankin been or being paid to write Council news for the Weekend Examiner? If so, how much and why?

A The Chief Executive Officer advised that Mrs Rankin is doing the Examiner column for Council and receives a small sum of money not a large sum of money, in the order of \$40 (to be confirmed).

Mrs Bond asked why this is not being done within Council and why Council was paying Mrs Rankin to do it when she was a Councillor.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that this arrangement was not in place when Mrs Rankin was a Councillor.

Mrs Bond asked for the answers to these question in writing together with the answers to the questions from last months meeting.

### **3. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE (HANDED TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER) FROM MR PAUL NIELD AT THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 28 MAY 2001

#### Question 1

*Did Councillor Star make the statement to you or did you concoct your claim yourself?*

*Tom Hoyer you as the Ratepayers President visited our property with an offer that you urged us to consider and accept. That was to sell our property to the pollutor of the property, the pollutors plan you claimed, was to turn our property into a landfill site, this, it was understood to be, a plan that the Councillors had given some form of approval to, although the plan hadn't apparently been formally put to Council or the Planning Committee, the Shire Officers, or our ratepaying neighbours.*

#### Question 2

*Who provided you with the information that you conveyed to us regarding that deal or offer?*

*Regarding the Serpentine Tearooms and what I may be misconstruing as an apparently fraudulent or otherwise negligent application for funding from the Council regarding good that may not be owned by the applicant.*

#### Response to Questions 1 and 2

This question relates to matters prior to Councillor Hoyer being elected as a Councillor to the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale, and do not relate to a matter affecting the local government as contemplated by Regulations 7(4)(a) of the Local Government Act.

#### Question 3

*Is Councillor Jan Star related to the intended beneficiary of the application or the tenant or lease holder of the property?*

*Does Councillor Star or any other Councillor have any association/relationship with the applicant that should be declared.*

#### Response to Question 3

Cr Star stated she was not related.

### **4. STATEMENTS, PETITIONS, MEMORIALS & DEPUTATIONS**

Nigel McAndrew, Development Planning Strategies appointed by West Serpentine Action Group to prepare a strategy on the local rural strategy to be publicly released in the next couple of months.

Purpose for deputation to put forward their opposition to the inclusion a portion of their area being that area north of Henderson Road within the poultry farm special control area.



- Feeling is that the overlay is a sizeable area, given intensions of what Council wants to achieve, quite sure that this can be done south of Henderson Road. The areas south of Henderson Road are large land holdings that would lend themselves better than the areas north of Henderson Road which in comparison are smaller.
- Question on the overlay – are the poultry operation buffers that are proposed 300 metres, are they contained within the overlay area or are they allowed to extend outside the area?
- Understands that Council has received 14 objections in relation to this proposal and asks that the overlay area north of Henderson Road be removed.

The Director of Sustainable Development advised that if a poultry farm was on the boundary of that poultry policy overlay then the buffer may be imposed on the properties outside, however is still within the ambit of that policy that poultry farms can still be considered outside the poultry policy overlay anyway.

## **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER**

## **6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

### **6.1 Ordinary Council Meeting – 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2001**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Needham  
The minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2001 be confirmed.  
CARRIED 8/0

### **6.2 Special Council Meeting – 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2001**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Murphy  
The minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2001 be confirmed.  
CARRIED 8/0

## 7. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & OFFICERS

### 7.1 Corporate Services Committee Meeting – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Price  
The minutes of the Corporate Services Committee Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001  
be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

C191/06/01 SITTING FEES FOR COUNCILLORS – 2001/2002 (A0023-02)			
Proponent	Local Government Act 1995		
Officer	G R Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	28/05/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

#### **Preamble**

Review the sitting fees provided to Councillors' for the 2001/2002 draft budget.

#### **Background**

Section 5.98 of the Local Government Act 1995 provides that "*A Council member who attends a Council or Committee meeting is entitled to be paid...*".

Each year with the adoption of the annual budget local governments are required to adopt this sitting fee for the coming year. The Act provides that the fee may be set per attended meeting or an annual fee may be adopted in lieu of the per meeting fee. The Act prescribes the maximum and minimum amounts that the fees may be.

During the current financial year the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale adopted a per meeting fee of \$60.00 per Council meeting and \$30.00 per Committee meeting. The Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 currently set these fees between \$50.00 and \$120.00 for the Shire President and \$25.00 and \$60.00 for Councillors' per meeting or between \$5,000.00 and \$12,000.00 for the Shire President and \$2,000.00 and \$6,000.00 for Councillors' as an annual fee.

#### **Comments**

On average each Councillor is paid approximately \$1,500.00 in meeting fees per year. This will vary depending on the number of meetings attended and the number of committees each Councillor is on. The President receives approximately \$2,000.00 per year. The total paid for the period 1<sup>st</sup> May 2000 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2001 was \$13,330.

A comparison of sitting fees in surrounding local governments is presented below:

<b><u>Local Government</u></b>	<b><u>Councillor</u></b>	<b><u>President</u></b>
Murray	\$5,000.00 pa	\$5,000.00 pa
Kwinana	\$6,000.00 pa	\$12,000.00 pa
Armadale	\$6,000.00 pa	\$12,000.00 pa

\$12,000.00 pa

C193/06/01 FEES & CHARGES – 1 JULY 2001 (A0794)			
Proponent	Local Government Act 1995		
Officer	Mr G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	30/05/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### **Preamble**

To provide an indication of fees and charges for the 2001/2002 draft budget.

### **Background**

The Local Government Act 1995 requires Council to adopt its fees and charges when adopting the annual budget. Each year prior to the budget Council reviews all fees and charges to assist with the development of the draft.

### **Comments**

***The schedule of fees and charges from the 2000/2001 budget is included with the attachments and marked C193/06/01.*** This schedule includes the provision of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) which came into effect from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2000. Division 81 of the Goods and Services Act provides details of local government services that are GST free. Those services that include GST are marked with an asterisk.

As all fees and charges were reviewed for the last two financial years as a result of the implementation of the GST it is recommended that these charges generally remain unchanged except for a reduction in the annual fee for the Serpentine Badminton Club in line with resolution CRC 176 from the May Corporate Services Committee meeting.

The Principal Activities Plan also provided for an increase in the rubbish service charge by \$15.00 per annum to \$120.00 per GST free service and \$132.00 per GST service. This will allow for the first full year of operation of the transfer station. The contract for rubbish collection is due to be renewed next year and with the possible inclusion of recycling it is expected the cost of this service will increase. By increasing the service charge this year Council may avoid the requirement for a large increase in the following year.

At the April Corporate Services Committee meeting Council resolved to adopt an interest charge on debts outstanding for a period of greater than 37 days. This interest charge was set in line with the prescribed amount for outstanding rates – eleven percent. It is suggested that Council maintain this interest charge as the prescribed amount for rates will remain unchanged.

**Statutory Environment:** Section 6.16 of the Local Government Act 1995

**Policy Implications:** Nil

**Financial Implications:** Will directly effect income generation for the budget

**Strategic Implications:** Nil

**Community Consultation:** No Community Consultation required

**Voting Requirements:** **ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. The Schedule of Fees and Charges for the 2001/2002 budget remain unchanged from the adopted schedule for the 2000/2001 financial year except for the following modifications:
  - a) Annual fee for the Serpentine Badminton Club which is to be reduced to \$1,800 per annum.
  - b) Rubbish services charges be increased to \$120.00 pa for non GST services and \$132.00 pa for GST services.
  - c) Halls and pavilions hire charges for casual users are charged at the following hourly rates:

Hire Rate	Main Hall	Meeting Room	Kitchen	Bar
Day Rate Casual Hire (Before 6:00pm)	\$20.00/hr	\$10.00/hr	\$7.00/hr	\$7.00/hr
Evening Rate Casual Hire (After 6:00pm)	\$25.00/hr	\$12.50/hr	\$8.75/hr	\$8.75/hr

2. That an interest charge of 11% per annum be applied to debts outstanding for a period greater than 37 days from the date of invoice.

### **CRC193 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Murphy:

1. The Schedule of Fees and Charges for the 2001/2002 budget remain unchanged from the adopted schedule for the 2000/2001 financial year except for the following modifications:
  - a) Annual fee for the Serpentine Badminton Club which is to be reduced to \$1,800 per annum.
  - b) Rubbish services charges be increased to \$120.00 pa for non GST services and \$132.00 pa for GST services to remain in line with actual cost of the service.
  - c) Halls and pavilions hire charges for casual users are charged at the following hourly rates:

Hire Rate	Main Hall	Meeting Room	Kitchen	Bar
Day Rate Casual Hire (Before 6:00pm)	\$20.00/hr	\$10.00/hr	\$7.00/hr	\$7.00/hr
Evening Rate Casual Hire (After 6:00pm)	\$25.00/hr	\$12.50/hr	\$8.75/hr	\$8.75/hr

2. That an interest charge of 11% per annum be applied to debts outstanding for a period greater than 37 days from the date of invoice.
3. That the fee for Extractive Industries be reviewed in the draft 2001/2002 budget.

**CARRIED 8/0 ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

Note: The committee changed the Officer's Recommendation to include a request for extractive industry charges to be reviewed in the draft budget.

C194/06/01 REQUEST FOR DONATION FROM GRAHAM SICILUK FOR BLUEY DAY - PRINCESS MARGARET HOSPITAL CANCER & BURNS UNIT (A0012)			
Proponent	GRAHAM SICILUK		
Officer	Fire & Emergency Services Officer - D. Gossage	Date of Report	31.05.2001
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### **Preamble**

Contribution towards the fundraising effort for the Princess Margaret Hospital Cancer and Burns unit via the "Bluey Day" promotions.

### **Background**

A letter has been received from Mr G. Siciluk as follows:

*My name is Graham Siciluk, I am a volunteer firefighter with the Byford Brigade. I give my time freely to this essential emergency service and, with others from the Police and Emergency Services, I have volunteered to have my head shaved on the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2001 at the Morley Galleria Shopping Centre.*

*However, in order to do this, I have to raise by donations, at least \$1,000.00. All of the money raised will go to the Cancer and Burns Unit at P.M.H. which, as I'm sure you would agree, is a very worthy cause. Tax receipts are available, if required, for all donations.*

*All of us involved in Bluey Day thank you for taking the time to read this letter. If you have any questions about the fundraiser I will happily answer them if you care to contact me at either of the above numbers.*

*The children of P.M.H. thank you for your generosity.*

### **Comments**

Along with Graham, Damon Wilkinson from the Serpentine Brigade is undertaking the challenge and head shaving. At the Emergency Services night held this year, the Chief Bush Fire Control Officer was challenged to have his head shaved along with the two (2) other gentlemen. It was agreed that if all the emergency services and community of the Shire were able to raise in excess of \$3,000 for these two (2) people, then the volunteers can have a ceremonial shaving of the Fire and Emergency Services Officer's head.

This is a worthwhile cause and with that in mind, it is recommended that Council support this activity. There will be a local newspaper article promoting this and if the funds are raised it will be a good PR and promotional activity for the volunteer emergency services of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.

**Statutory Environment:** Nil

**Policy Implications:** Nil

**Financial Implications:** \$300.00 from Members Donations

**Strategic Implications:** Nil

**Community Consultation:** Not required

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**Officer Recommended Resolution**

That Council donates \$300.00 to the Bluey Day fundraising for Princess Margaret Hospital activities via Mr G. Siciluk.

**CRC194 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Murphy:  
If the Emergency Services can raise \$2,700 Council will donate \$500 which will provide the required \$3,000.  
CARRIED 8/0

C195/06/01 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING FARMLAND CONCESSION APPLICATIONS (A0055)			
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G R Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	31/05/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

**Preamble**

To review the criteria for Farmland Concession rating as a result of the new tax system.

**Background**

In November 1996 Council resolved that a differential rate for Farmland Concession be introduced to replace the removal of the Urban Farmland Concession provided under the previous Local Government Act 1960.

At that time the following guidelines for farmland concession were adopted :

To Qualify for Farmland Concession:

- (a) the property must be zoned Rural,
- (b) the owner/occupier must produce/possess Taxation Department primary producer status,
- (c) the rural pursuit must be one of the following – grazing, agistment, dairying, pig farming, fish farming, viticulture, horticulture, fruit growing, the growing of crops; and
- (d) the owner/occupier must live on the land or be farming it in association with the home farm.

These criteria were derived from the section 531A of the previous Act. ***A copy of this section is included with the attachments and marked C195/06/01.***

In March 1998, Council resolved that piggeries and poultry would no longer be included in this criteria as a separate differential rate was to be established for intensive farming activities. The criteria was to remain as adopted in 1996 with supporting documentation required from the applicants accountant, Sales Tax exemption Certificate and any other relevant documentation.

As a result of the changes to the Australian Taxation system and the abolishment of Sales Tax this office undertook a review of the Farmland Concession Register asking all current recipients to reapply for the Farmland Concession based on the following criteria:

- (a) The property must be zoned Rural (except for those previously zoned Rural prior to the Urban Development Zone).
- (b) Minimum property size of: 10 acres or 4.047 hectares.
- (c) The property must be used for: Grazing, Agistment, Dairy Farming, Aquaculture, Viticulture, Horticulture, Fruit Growing or Crop Growing.

To support the application, property owners/occupiers were asked to supply a letter from their accountant to confirm that they declare primary production income, copy of documentation stating that they are GST Registered and in the case of tenants a copy of their lease that states that they are required to pay the Council Rates. Those not registered for the GST were then asked to supply a letter from their accountant confirming that their principal income is derived from the primary production activities carried out on the property.

Of the 289 properties currently receiving Farmland Concession 206 have re-qualified, 8 properties have been added, 28 properties have been rejected or not allowed for the following reasons:

- Tenant is the primary producer but not responsible for the rates (4 properties);
  - not registered for the GST/principal income is not from the property (16 properties);
  - no documentation or no letter from the accountant has been forwarded (8 properties);
- and

57 properties have not re-applied. A letter has been sent to these properties requesting the new application to be submitted or their concession may be withdrawn from 1 July 2001.

### **Comments**

With the review nearing completion and as a result of the number of concessions that may be withdrawn, it is considered appropriate that Council reconsider the intention of the concession to ensure that it is consistently applied and available to those intended by Council.

One criteria not taken from the previous Act was the provision that the owner or occupier derive the whole or a substantial part of their livelihood from the activity. Council did make a conscious decision in 1996 that Special Rural properties not be eligible for Farmland Concession as it was considered that they were "hobby farms". It could be argued that this is also the case for larger properties that are not using the land to derive the majority of their livelihood.

Another criteria to be considered is the registration of the business for the new Goods and Services Tax. Many of the applicants that have been rejected at this point claim they were advised not to register for GST by their Accountant as their business does not generate more than \$50,000 income each year. In some instances they also choose not to provide a letter from their Accountant that the majority of their livelihood is derived from the activity. This would indicate that the property is being used as more a "hobby" activity and should not be considered for this concession.

A further issue to consider is that for those properties that do not qualify for the adopted criteria there is a 33.3% concession that may be withdrawn. This is a considerable increase in rates in one year. It is proposed, therefore, that for those properties not complying with the concession requirements that currently receive the concession the return to rural rates be phased in over three years, providing for an increase in their rates of approximately 11% per year until they reach the rural rate.



<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Section 6.33 of the Local Government Act 1995.
<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	This recommendation will form Council policy for Farmland Concession.
<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Will directly effect Council's rating revenue.
<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	The current Strategic Plan indicated under Economic Development to retain the rural and natural atmosphere that is a reflection of our heritage and agricultural activities, to support a choice of lifestyles and develop vibrant and dynamic new communities.
<b><u>Community Consultation:</u></b>	Consultation on this issue is may be provided under the current adopted framework through community meeting or a survey of affected landholders.
<b><u>Voting Requirements:</u></b>	Normal

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. A Farmland Concession differential rate be offered to residents where the following criteria is satisfied:
  - The property must be zoned Rural (except for those previously zoned Rural prior to the Urban Development Zone adopted in 2001).
  - Minimum property size of: 10 acres or 4.047 hectares.
  - The property must be used for: Grazing, Agistment, Dairy Farming, Aquaculture, Viticulture, Horticulture, Fruit Growing or Crop Growing.
  - The business should be registered for the Goods and Services Tax, however where not a declaration that the applicant derives the whole or a substantial part of their livelihood from the activity **must** be provided.
  - The applicant ordinarily resides on the property or is farming the property in conjunction with a home property.
  - Where the applicant is a tenant of the property a copy of their lease that states that they are required to pay the Council Rates.
2. The Farmland Concession differential rate be maintained at a 33% concession to the Rural rate.

### **CRC195 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Murphy:

1. A Farmland Concession differential rate be offered to residents where the following criteria is satisfied:
  - The property must be zoned Rural (except for those previously zoned Rural prior to the Urban Development Zone adopted in 2001).
  - Minimum property size of: 10 acres or 4.047 hectares.
  - The property must be used for: Grazing, Agistment, Dairy Farming, Aquaculture, Viticulture, Horticulture, Fruit Growing or Crop Growing.
  - The business should be registered for the Goods and Services Tax, if not they provide a declaration that they are claiming primary production on their tax return for this property.
  - The applicant ordinarily resides on the property or is farming the property in conjunction with a home property.
  - Where the applicant is a tenant of the property a copy of their lease that states that they are required to pay the Council Rates.
2. The Farmland Concession differential rate be maintained at a 33% concession to the Rural rate.

**CARRIED 8/0**

Note: The Committee changed the Officer's Recommendation to allow property owners not registered for GST to still be considered for this differential rate if primary production income is being claimed in their tax return.

C196/06/01 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUPPORT PROGRAM (H0031)			
Proponent	Department of Local Government		
Officer	Shire President	Date of Report	31-05-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### **Preamble**

Report to Council following a review on the performance of the Chief Executive Officer by the Department of Local Government under the Chief Executive Officer Support Program.

### **Background**

Following his appointment in April 2000 the Chief Executive Officer was invited by the Local Government Managers Australia (previously IMM), and the Department of Local Government to participate in the Chief Executive Officers Support Program.

The program aims to provide participants with the opportunity to discuss a wide range of issues which confront the Chief Executive Officer in managing a complex organisation in today's ever changing world, including identification and adoption of best management practices.

In addition the program enables the Shire President, Deputy Shire President, Councillors' and senior staff the opportunity to have input on whether the Chief Executive Officer is, in their opinion, performing up to expectations and fulfilling undertakings given at the time of appointment.

### **Comments**

The Chief Executive Officer agreed to accept the invitation to participate in the Chief Executive Officer Support Program.

The program was undertaken by Mr Stephen Goode (Chief Executive Officer, City of Mandurah) representing Local Government Managers Australia, and Ms Jenni Law (Senior Compliance Officer, Monitoring and Investigation) representing the Department of Local Government.

The conclusion to the 12-month program involved two days of interviews at the Shire in March 2001. Interviews were conducted by Mr Goode and Ms Law with the Chief Executive Officer, Shire President, Deputy Shire President, two (2) Councillors' and the three (3) Directors.

A final report on the program has been written by Ms Law, (Senior Compliance Officer, Monitoring and Investigation, Department of Local Government) which has been finalised and copies have been forwarded to the Shire President and the Chief Executive Officer in May 2001. The Shire President and Deputy Shire President have since met with the Chief Executive Officer and reviewed the report. The report is available for discussion with the Shire President

In the report, Ms Law concludes the following in relation to the first 12 months performance of the Chief Executive Officer;

### **Concluding Comments**

*“Overall, it appears that David has had very few problems in accepting the responsibilities of the Chief Executive Officer’s position. The interviews with councillors indicated there is a very strong degree of mutual respect and support between him, the Council and individual councillors and the executive managers.*

*In summarising David’s overall performance, the councillors interviewed expressed quite clearly very high levels of satisfaction with his performance to date. They believe he has a good grasp of the issues, has a positive outlook, and a genuine interest in the needs of the Shire and community. Additionally, he displays dedication to his role, he is enthusiastic, a willing learner, prepared to listen to advice and take on board suggestions which may improve the operations of Council as a whole.*

*David is conscientious, committed to the Shire and keen to ensure that the Shire of Serpentine/Jarrahdale will continue to progress. We feel confident that within a fairly short time, with continuing good will and understanding, David will have strengthened the foundations of a very good administration and will make a significant difference for the good of Serpentine/Jarrahdale. Further development of the “People in Partnerships” program has the ability to see the Shire of Serpentine/Jarrahdale become recognised as a leader of innovative change amongst small local governments within the state.*

*David’s future in local government only appears limited by his professional ambitions.*

*The Shire of Serpentine/Jarrahdale is to be commended on its involvement in this program and its support of the proceedings. Appreciation is also extended to the President, elected members and executive managers who participated in the program.”*

**Statutory Environment:** Local Government Act

**Policy Implications:** Not applicable

**Financial Implications:** Not applicable

**Strategic Implications:** Not applicable

**Community Consultation:** Not applicable

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

### **CRC196 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Murphy:  
Council commends the Chief Executive Officer, Mr Price for taking part in the program and the favourable conclusion.  
CARRIED 8/0

C202/06/01 COUNCILLOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE REQUEST – A0906			
Proponent	Cr Thomas Hoyer		
Officer	G R Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	06/06/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### **Preamble**

To consider an application for leave of absence by Councillor Thomas Hoyer.

### **Background**

Under section 2.25 of the Local Government Act 1995 states “A Council may, by resolution, grant leave of absence, to a member...for not more than 6 consecutive ordinary meetings...”

The reason for this provision is that a member who is absent throughout 3 consecutive ordinary meetings without first obtaining leave, is disqualified from continuing his or her membership of the Council.

### **Comments**

Councillor Hoyer has forwarded a request to Council seeking leave between 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 to mid October 2001, this will result in his non attendance at the September Ordinary meeting.

He has also advised he will be away for the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2001 Corporate Services meeting and will therefore be an apology.

**Statutory Environment:** Local Government Act 1995

**Policy Implications:** No policy implications

**Financial Implications:** No financial implications

**Strategic Implications:** No strategic implications

**Community Consultation:** No consultation required

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

### **CRC202 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Murphy:  
Councillor Hoyer be granted leave of absence for the period 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 to 15<sup>th</sup> October 2001.  
CARRIED 8/0

## 7.2 Asset Services – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

### Council Decision

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham  
The minutes of the Asset Services Committee Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001 be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

AS075/06/01 HERITAGE COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY POWER STUDY (A0065-02)			
Proponent	Director Asset Services		
Officer	Robert Harris	Date of Report	31.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee in accordance with resolution SM049/05/01		

### Preamble

Council to consider the Heritage Country Development Agency Power Study Report and subsequent improvement works underway and planned by Western Power.

### Background

In 1999 in response to widespread concern at power quality issues in the south-east Metropolitan area the City of Armadale and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale commissioned the Heritage Country Development Agency to undertake a study on the areas power supply reliability and quality and its adequacy for current and future requirements.

The study was finalized by the Heritage Country Development Agency in January 2001 and officers of the City of Armadale and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale have subsequently held a number of meetings with Western Power representatives on a response and action plan to address the issues identified by the report.

***A copy of the Heritage Country Development Agency Power Study Report is included in the attachments at AS075.1/06/01.***

Western Power has subsequently announced and is currently undertaking improvements at the Byford substation and constructing additional feeder lines to provide ring circuits to improve the service to the area.

***Western Power Corporation representatives will attend the Asset Services Committee meeting to make a presentation on its upgrade plans. Presentation notes are included in the attachments at AS075.2/06/01.***

### Comments

The report concludes that the area suffers power outages three (3) times more often than the metropolitan average and has voltage fluctuations exceeding acceptable limits. Some of the problems are attributed to the susceptibility of infrastructure in the rural/hills environment (eg lightning strikes, trees falling/touch power lines) whilst others are attributable to an inadequate distribution system).

Western Powers acknowledgement of the inadequacy of some of the main distribution circuits, and current action to upgrade the Byford feeder lines will have a significant effect on the service, however the impact will be greatest along the spine from Byford to Serpentine and immediately adjacent areas, with less benefit to more outlying areas such as Keysbrook

and Jarrahdale where a more substantial capital investment would be required to achieve high quality power supply.

Whilst the short term action by Western Power is a positive step in improving power supply for the area, it is necessary that further improvements be undertaken to provide a satisfactory level of service across the Shire for current ratepayers and to meet the expected load growth to result from planned development in the Shire.

<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Local Government Act
<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	Nil
<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Nil
<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	Power infrastructure improvement accord with Council's Strategic Plan
<b><u>Community Consultation:</u></b>	Joint release of study report outcomes and Western Power consequential improvement program proposed.
<b><u>Voting Requirements:</u></b>	Normal

#### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. The Heritage Country Development Agency Power Infrastructure Study Report be received and noted.
2. The Western Power Byford substation and feeder services improvement program be noted.
3. A joint statement by the Council, City of Armadale and Western Power be developed and released on the study and subsequent Western Power improvement program.
4. Western Power be requested to initiate further power supply infrastructure improvement works to meet the requirements of an acceptable power supply for all consumers in the Shire and for planned development in the Shire.

The Director Asset Services welcomed the deputation from Western Power and invited them to make their presentation.

The following discussion points were raised.

- Byford Substation on Thomas Road served most of Shire.
- Keysbrook – fed from Pinjarra substation for past 2 years redirected from Mandurah.
- Byford substation improvement works in place – completion date not known at this time.
- Reinforcement cable connection (still in progress) into Nettleton Road – from substation to Thomas Road and line in Robertson Road there are easement problems with Westrail delaying completion.
- George Road east and west feeder.
- Two independent feeders into Jarrahdale via Nettleton Road and Jarrahdale Road.
- Interruptions to services. In event of a fault, say in Jarrahdale Road they can isolate the fault and direct supply from alternate direction to minimize affected properties.
- Thrust of project is to reduce single path connection – now multi and divided feeders - fault finders on lines so faults can be found faster.
- 240 volts versus 260 volts discussed – specification is 240 volt +/- 5%.
- Improvements to Keysbrook area have occurred. If continuing problems exist they should be referred back to Western Power.
- Heritage Country Development Agency Power Study has been a catalyst for expediting the Byford substation upgrade works which will significantly enhance reliability and quality of power across the shire.

**CRAS075 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Buttfield :-

1. The Heritage Country Development Agency Power Infrastructure Study Report be received and noted.
2. The Western Power Byford substation and feeder services improvement program be noted.
3. A joint statement by the Council, City of Armadale and Western Power be developed and released on the study and subsequent Western Power improvement program.
4. Western Power be requested to initiate further power supply infrastructure improvement works to meet the requirements of an acceptable power supply for all consumers in particular for the Keysbrook area in the Shire and for planned development in the Shire.

CARRIED 8/0

Note: The recommendation was changed to specifically identify the supply issues remaining in Keysbrook area.

AS073/06/01 CATTLE HOLDING YARDS LOT 25 LIGHTBODY ROAD – ROAD UPGRADING CONDITION (P00213-02)			
Proponent	Serpentine Jarrahdale Holding Yards Pty Ltd		
Officer	Robert Harris Director Asset Services	Date of Report	29.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer		
Previously	P095/10/98, P028/09/00, AS026/10/00		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee in accordance with resolution SM049/05/01		

**Preamble**

Council is to consider how the Development Approval condition for requiring the Cattle Holding Yards at Lot 25 Lightbody Road upgrading of Lightbody Road might be satisfied.

**Background**

At its meeting on 28 October 1998 Council granted conditional approval for the development of Cattle Holding Yards at Lot 25 Lightbody Road, Mardella. One of the development conditions was "Removal of the traffic island in Lightbody Road if necessary and the sealing of Lightbody Road to the access to Lot 25 at the applicants expense and to the satisfaction of the Operations Engineer."

In March 1999 the Operations Engineer advised Mr Roger Spencer for the developer that the estimated cost of upgrading of Lightbody Road to the access to Lot 25 including modification of the Mundijong Road – Lightbody Road was \$22,000, and that upon payment of that sum the works would be included on Councils works program.

Subsequently a number of conditions of the Development Approval, including the road upgrading requirement, were not complied with and at its meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2000 Council resolved to initiate prosecution procedures for non-compliance with specified conditions.

Action has subsequently been progressed on initiating the prosecution and the developer has taken steps to remedy the outstanding conditions.

The developer has sought to take up the March 1999 offer made that Council undertake the road upgrading at a cost of \$22,000, and has been advised the offer has been withdrawn.

The passage of time and lack of detail on the scope of works proposal to be carried out for the \$22,000 have led to the offer no longer being considered valid. The developer has been advised that as Council resources are committed elsewhere the road upgrading works may be carried out by him using other contractors to meet Councils requirements.

The minimum requirements to satisfy the road upgrading condition have been assessed as a 300mm pavement thickening to support traffic loading and a 6.2m wide two coat bitumen seal with 1.5m wide shoulders, together with removal of the traffic island at the Mundijong Road – Lightbody Road intersection and asphalt surfacing of the road seal at the entry point to Lot 25. The current estimated value of these works is \$45,000.

At its meeting on 23 October 2000 Council resolved to impose a 12 tonne load limit on Lightbody Road with provision that abutting property access by vehicles exceeding the load limit be permitted subject to the road not being unduly damaged by the traffic. As heavy vehicle access to the cattle yards on Lot 25 Lightbody Road will impose road damage over the winter period without the road upgrading unrestricted access to the cattle yards is jeopardized.

The developers have sought advice on what action they may take to satisfy the road upgrading requirement and have the 12 tonne load limit lifted on the section of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25.

Having regard to the onset of seasonal weather conditions which may preclude the completion of road upgrading works until the latter part of the year, the Council may wish to accept responsibility for the road upgrading at a later time upon payment to it of an amount equal to its estimated cost to perform the upgrading works, and lift the load limit on that section of the road. This may necessitate some pavement improvement works in the short term as an initial stage of the upgrading.

The current Principal Activity Plan foreshadows provision being made in the 2001/2002 budget to improve the drainage, road formation and gravel pavement of a section of Lightbody Road south of the access to Lot 25. If the required improvements to the section of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25 were concurrently undertaken, the additional cost to the Council of this work is estimated at \$35,000.

***A copy of correspondence from Mrs Liz Winter, consultant, on behalf of the developer dated 25<sup>th</sup> May 2001 related to this matter is included in the attachments at AS073/06/01.***

### **Comments**

Whilst there has been reticence by the developer in complying with the Development Approval conditions there now appears to be genuine attempt to address deficiencies.

It is reasonable that the Council offer the option of assuming responsibility for the Lightbody Road upgrading works required subject to the Council receiving payment of its estimated cost to perform the works.

**Statutory Environment:** Town Planning and Development Act  
Local Government Act

**Policy Implications:** Nil

**Budget Implications:** Nil

**Strategic Plan Implications:** Nil

**Community Consultation:** Not Required



**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. That Condition 5 on development approval of 28 October 1998 for Cattle Holding Yards at Lot 25 Lightbody Road will be satisfied by either;
  - Upgrading of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25 in accordance with Councils road construction specifications; or
  - Payment of the sum of \$35,000 to the Council within 30 days for Council upgrading of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25.
2. That upon Condition 5 of the development approval being satisfied the 12 tonne load limit on Lightbody Road be lifted on that section of the road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25.

**CRAS073 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Buttfield:-

1. That Condition 5 on development approval of 28 October 1998 for Cattle Holding Yards at Lot 25 Lightbody Road will be satisfied by either;
  - Upgrading of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25 in accordance with Councils road construction specifications; or
  - Payment of the sum of \$35,000 to the Council within 30 days of Council agreeing to its upgrading of Lightbody Road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25.
2. That upon Condition 5 of the development approval being satisfied the 12 tonne load limit on Lightbody Road be lifted on that section of the road between Mundijong Road and the access point to Lot 25.

CARRIED 8/0

Note: The recommendation was changed to clarify payment of \$35,000 was required to be made prior to Council commencing any works.

7.3 Community & Recreation Development Meeting – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

**COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham  
The minutes of the Community & Recreation Development Committee Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001 be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

CRD48/06/01 COMMUNITY SAFETY PROGRAM (A0171-02)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	David Henderson – Acting Community Development Officer	Date of Report	24.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P165/03/00, P114/12/99		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

**Preamble**

Council to receive a review of the strategies within the Community Safety Program.

**Background**

It is a requirement of the Community Safety Program report that it be reviewed and monitored prior to budget each year.

It is recommended that the Shire responds to the community safety and security audit with a program of practical strategies that, as far as possible, encourage self responsibility in the community and link with or extend existing Shire functions and planning. For the purposes of this report, the recommendations are contained in a proposal called a *Community Safety Program*. This program is designed to meet the current needs of the community. It should be updated each year at the same time as the Shire's Strategic Plan. The idea is that community safety and security should become integrated into mainstream Council activities and not just be regarded as a problem for the Rangers.

The following explains the recommended Community Safety Program in greater detail.

**Aims**

The aims of the program are to:

- Improve feelings of wellbeing and security
- Plan for safer communities
- Reduce the opportunities for crime

**Objectives**

Objectives of the program are to:

- 1 Encourage individual and community responsibility for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour
- 2 Increase communication between all sectors of the community on responses to community security and safety
- 3 Improve the physical environment
- 4 Support the local police

**Timeframe**

It is recommended that the Shire take a strategic approach to this program. Some strategies must be seen in a long-term context – others should not be undertaken without further research and vetting to ensure that they are appropriate. One of the strategies refers to the

need for the Stakeholders Committee to draw up a realistic timetable for implementation of the recommendations. This is because detailed local knowledge is needed for this task. Each strategy carries a suggested priority rating that may be helpful with this.

The suggested priority rating (SPR) should be read within a 5-year timeline as follows:

- Within 1 year      SPR = short term
- Within 3 years     SPR = medium term
- Within 5 years     SPR = long term

## **Comments**

### **Recommended Strategies**

#### **Strategy 1**

##### **Improve Home Security**

The Shire to liaise with Neighbourhood Watch and WAPD to seek information on home security in order to incorporate this into existing community information distributed by the Shire.

*Ongoing action via Community Development within budgeted programs*

#### **Strategy 2**

##### **Encourage schools to share resources on improving security**

At the next Shire/School Principals Meeting the suggestion of the schools forming a 'Safer Schools Group' be put forward. Suggestions for the Safer Schools Group to investigate in response to survey issues are:

- Pilot study into potential of 'Walking Buses' where adults escort children on agreed routes – possibly incorporated into the Safe Houses program. An honorarium could be considered for the adult escorts similar to payment for cross walk attendants. Radiating safer pathways leading out from primary schools could also be identified for walkers and cyclists. Grants for the pilot program could be available through the Community Security program next round, Healthway, Lotteries Commission, etc.
- Develop strategies for children who wander aimlessly when going home to empty houses. Strategies to be based on promoting self-responsibility such as encouraging working parents to phone home at set times.
- Consider the cost/benefits of decreasing opportunities for vandalism and theft using territorial reinforcement measures with fencing, landscaping and signage. These would more clearly identify the school grounds to encourage legitimate users and discourage others.
- Consider security of property such as bike sheds, computer rooms.

| SPR = short term strategy to host a meeting

*Actioned through Community Development – not relevant to Ranger Services*

#### **Strategy 3**

##### **Improve road safety and address heavy haulage issues**

3.1 The Shire and Main Roads to address the issues relating to safety and heavy haulage within the Shire.

*Currently being actioned. Resolved at present by new State Government*

3.2 In consultation with equestrian interests the Shire to facilitate a review of the bridle paths and plans for future bridle paths to ensure that safety issues are a priority.

| SPR = medium term

*Currently being actioned (2000/2001 budget) through Strategic Planning. Further budget allocation being suggested for 2001/2002.*

- 3.3 Shire staff to review and prioritise maintenance issues relating to engineering infrastructure raised by members of the community during the survey.
- | SPR = short term (some may be urgent)  
*All works completed*

Strategy 4

Improve Lighting

- 4.1a The Shire to develop a street lighting plan.
- | SPR = short term  
*All actions completed*
- 4.1b The Shire to liaise with Western Power to suggest methods of improving the reporting of street lighting problems by residents (eg stickers on lamp posts)
- | SPR = short term  
*All actions completed*
- 4.2 The Shire to incorporate into its annual building maintenance program an audit of the external lighting of public buildings resulting in recommendations for improvement.
- | SPR = short term  
*Action planned through Building Services with suggested budget allocation for 2001/2002*

Strategy 5

Improve planning and design of subdivisions, car parks and other community infrastructure

Future planning will take into consideration all aspects of safer cities.  
*Ongoing action through DCU. No budget allocation required.*

Strategy 6

Support Activities for Youth

- 6.1 Shire to continue giving encouragement to the existing activities for youth such as scouts, guides, fire brigade cadets, junior sport, road safety committee by recognising the contribution of volunteer leaders and the achievements of young people.
- | SPR = short term  
*Action ongoing, both through Community Development and through the proposed expansion of the Emergency Services annual event to recognise a wider cross section of volunteers. Budget allocation 2001/2002.*
- 6.2 When the Shire is planning facilities for youth, consideration should be given to locating them in central recreation areas to increase acceptance that young people are an important sector of the community.
- | SPR = long term  
*Action being considered through the Recreation Planning process.*
- 6.3 The Shire to seek assistance from the Cannington Police District and service organisations to support an extension to the excellent Serpentine PCYC so that youth activities can be organised in other town sites on a rotational basis. Transport such as the community bus would need to be arranged to take young people to and from each venue.
- | SPR = medium term  
*Action being considered through the Recreation Planning process.*
- 6.4 The Shire to seek funding assistance through Safer WA and other agencies to engage a part time youth officer. This could possibly be a shared resource with neighbouring Shires.  
*Action to source funding for Youth Officer is ongoing. Proposed budget allocation 2001/2002 highlights external funding required.*
- 6.5 The Shire to arrange location workshops involving young people to identify the service needs of youth.

- | SPR = short term  
*Actioned through Recreation Surveys and Youth Providers workshop as part of Recreation Planning process.*

Strategy 7      Address fire prevention and other forest issues

Shire to continue liaising with LEMAC with regard to emergency management issues.

*Action is ongoing/current through Fire and Emergency Services/Asset Services. Budget allocation and sourcing of external funding to be considered in 2001/2002 budget.*

Strategy 8      Respond to perceptions about lack of some services and building maintenance issues

Shire staff to facilitate, where possible, improvements to services highlighted as a need in the survey such as public telephone boxes, signage and provision of ATMs in safer locations. Shire staff to also address building maintenance issues raised.

- | SPR = medium term  
*Investigation into lack of transport service to take people to activity group in Byford was piloted through Armadale Home Help 2000/2001 and a budget allocation in 2001/2002 will support future initiatives (Appendix 1 Ref 51)*

Strategy 9      Respond to incidences of crime

9.1 Distribution of crime and safety information to residents. The Shire suggests that the WAPD initiate a program to distribute important safety information to Shire residents. Because the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale is a rural district, many of the basic rules for protecting oneself from crime do not apply due to the fact that they were developed for residents of urban centres. As such, it would be beneficial to produce a short informational booklet for residents regarding crime and safety in rural districts. The booklet should review some of the basic safety procedures that promote a safer residence with regard to crime and should also include tips for dealing with rural crime.

The information communicated and distributed to residents should be designed to paint a realistic picture of residents' safety in Serpentine-Jarrahdale and therefore improve overall perceptions of safety.

- | SPR = medium term  
*Currently being actioned through Neighbourhood/Rural Watch Program*

9.2 Interaction with Police. The Shire to continue to invite a member of the WAPD to regular meetings of the community which would allow officers to inform residents about what they can do to protect themselves from criminal activity. Second, these meetings allow residents to establish a connection with officers – something that is often difficult to do in relatively sparsely populated rural areas. Finally, these meetings would allow residents to inform the local police officers about their concerns regarding safety and crime in a rural district. This is especially important given the fact that most officers tend to live in urban areas and are trained to deal with urban-type crimes.

- | SPR = short term  
*Action is ongoing*

9.3 Police Liaison. The Shire continues to liaise with the local police sub-district office on police issues.

*Action is ongoing*

9.4 The Shire continues to liaise with the Canning Police District canvassing the possibility of volunteers being used to assist at

Mundijong with non core police functions to release the local police for other duties related to crime.

| SPR = short term

*Area now under the Peel Police District. Liaison is ongoing.*

**Strategy 10**      **Enhance regional networks**

It is recommended that the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale maintain strong links within their regional Safer WA district and Regional Community Safety Programs.

*Ongoing within existing programs. No budget allocation necessary.*

**Strategy 11**      **Establish a timetable for implementation and evaluation**

There are no quick fixes for community security – this is a long term program of intervention. It is recommended that the maintenance issues raised in the survey should be addressed as part of the Shire's day to day operations. However, other strategies can be implemented progressively. It is recommended that the Stakeholders Committee should meet to consider the strategies recommended in this report to draw up a realistic timetable for implementation and evaluation after an agreed period.

| SPR = short term

| General strategy

*Actioned*

**Statutory Environment:**                      Nil

**Policy Implications:**                      Nil

**Financial Implications:**                      Requires budget allocation

**Strategic Implications:**                      To improve the quality of life and encourage social commitment of people who live in the Shire

**Community Consultation:**                      Original survey 1999

**Voting Requirements:**                      Normal

**CRCRD48 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Simpson that the report on the Community Safety Program be noted.

CARRIED 8/0

CRD50/06/01 COMMUNITY FUNDING PROGRAM 2001/2002 (A0169-03)			
Proponent	Council		
Officer	David Henderson – Acting Community Development Officer	Date of Report	30.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	CRD19/01/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

### **Preamble**

Council is requested to accept the recommendations of the Community Funding Working Party.

### **Background**

Ten (10) applications were received for the 2001/2002 Funding Program and assessed by the Working Party on 18 May 2001 according to the assessment criteria.

### **Comments**

Nine of the ten applications were recommended for approval. The Rotary Club of Byford submission was declined due to 'low priority' assessment as well as equity with other local community fairs (Serpentine Fair and Jarrahdale Log Chop) and the issue of entry fees being charged. ***The list of applicants is with the attachments marked CRD50/06/01.***

### **Statutory Environment:**

N/A

### **Policy Implications:**

CSP8 Financial Assistance – requests for

### **Financial Implications:**

Up to \$20,000 to be included in the 2001/2002 budget

### **Strategic Implications:**

1.5 Strengthen community groups

### **Community Consultation:**

N/A

### **Voting Requirements:**

Normal

### **CRCRD50 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Simpson that subject to adoption of the 2001/2002 budget, Council endorses the recommendations of the Community Funding Working Party as follows:

Organisation	Project	Funding
Serpentine Tennis Club	Security fence	\$1,000
Byford Friendly Club	Kitchen equipment	\$289
S-J Toy Library	Kids Expo	\$975
Serpentine Playgroup	Playground equipment	\$660
Byford Progress Association	Carols by Candlelight	\$100
S-J Junior Basketball	Upgrade of courts and lights	\$1,941
S-J Neighbourhood/Rural Watch	N H/Watch	\$1,200
S-J Youth Activity Group	Bicycle invention	\$2,000
Armadale High School	Year 10 Scholarship	\$150
Total		<b>\$8,315</b>

CARRIED 8/0

7.4 Strategic Management Committee Meeting – 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

**COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Price  
The minutes of the Strategic Management Committee Meeting held on 18th June, 2001 be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

SM060/06/01 LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 1 – BONDS AND BANK GUARANTEES (A0891)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Strategic Planner	Date of Report	25/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	SM044/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			

**Preamble**

Council to adopt Local Planning Policy No.1 – Bonds and Bank Guarantees.

**Background**

At its meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2001 Council, under Part 9 of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2 adopted draft Local Planning Policy No.1 – Bonds and Bank Guarantees. Following this resolution the draft Policy was advertised for a period of 21 days. No submissions have been received.

**Comments**

As a result of no submission being received the Strategic Planning Team recommends that Council pursuant to Part 9 of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, resolves to adopt Local Planning Policy No.1 – Bonds and Bank Guarantees.

**Statutory Environment:** Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2

**Policy Implications:** Adoption of a new policy dealing with bonds/bank guarantees.

**Financial Implications:** Greater control on the acceptance and release of bonds and bank guarantees.

**Strategic Implications:** Greater compliance with development conditions as a result of Council having more control of accepting and acting upon bonds and bank guarantees.

**Community Consultation:** The draft policy was advertised for a period of 21 days. No submission were received.

**Voting Requirements:** Normal



### **CRSM060 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Buttfield that

1. Council pursuant to Part 9 of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, resolves to adopt Local Planning Policy No.1 – Bonds and Bank Guarantees as follows:

## **LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 1 – BONDS AND BANK GUARANTEES**

### **Policy Objective**

To outline circumstances whereby Council may elect to require bonds or bank guarantees to secure compliance with planning approvals, subdivision approvals, extractive industry licences, and the arrangements associated with the bond.

### **The Policy**

Where Council issues planning approval and/or extractive industry licence approval, and that approval is acted upon, the developer is obligated to comply with the approved application, along with any attendant conditions.

As a general rule, the Council will utilise powers available under respective legislation to enforce terms of any approval. Notwithstanding those powers, the Council reserves the right to require, by way of condition of approval, a performance bond in order to ensure compliance with an approval, or for Council to undertake works if required to do so.

### **Criteria for/Bank Guarantees**

The primary obligation is on the developer to do the works required by the relevant conditions. Circumstances that may warrant a bond include, but are not limited to where:

1. The developer demonstrates that special circumstances exist that justify an early clearance of a development of subdivision conditions in exchange for a bond or bank guarantee.
2. The Council believes it is in the interest of good government of the district to accept a bond or bank guarantee in the circumstances.
3. Significant work where there is a doubt as to whether the enforcement powers of Council are sufficient to enable it to ensure compliance with the condition.
4. The failure to comply with a condition may detrimentally affect the public.
5. The condition requires work to be done on an item which involves an aspect of use by the public.
6. The condition requires expenditure on conservation or rehabilitation works, where non-compliance will detrimentally affect the public.
7. The condition requires expenditure on public land in proximity to the development site (eg tree planting) or on private land used by the public (eg landscaping), where non compliance will for amenity reasons detrimentally affect the public.

### **Administration**

The terms of a performance bond are to be identified in each instance and applied as a condition of approval, along with explanatory footnotes as may be necessary. In each instance, the approval notice is to identify the following:

- A deed between the Developer and the Shire will be required, which deed shall provide for the implementation and administration of the security. In appropriate cases the Shire may require an absolute caveat to be lodged pursuant to the deed. This deed is to detail the following;

- the nature and extent of work being secured by the bond;
- the amount of the bond (to be closely related to the cost of the works being secured);
- form of security to be cash bond or suitable bank guarantee;
- whether Council will undertake works in the case of default leading to forfeiture of the bond, or whether the bond will be forfeited without Council undertaking the works and in that case how to apply the funds;
- arrangements in respect to power of entry onto private land where the Council intends to remedy non compliance by completing the work.

**Any bank guarantees lodged with Council are to be irrevocable and unrestricted (until returned by the Shire); ie. an expiry date is not to be placed on the guarantee, and it may be called upon in whatever circumstances the Shire sees fit where a breach of undertaking by the Developer has occurred without the need to justify the decision to call upon the guarantee to the bank.**

**A bank guarantee will not be accepted unless the value of the works being secured is estimated to be \$5,000 or more. Security for any works estimated to be worth less than \$5,000 may be provided by way of cash bond.**

2. Council forwards a copy of the new Policy to developers and consultants within the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale, so that they are aware of Councils position.  
CARRIED 8/0

Note: Officers to investigate advantages and disadvantages of the possibilities of mortgaging properties as an option in addition to receiving bonds and bank guarantees.

SM061/06/01 DRAFT LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 3 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE – MOBILE PHONE TOWERS (A0960)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	30/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	SM045/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			

### **Preamble**

Council after advertising to consider adopting local planning policy: Telecommunications Infrastructure – Mobile Phone Towers, is asked to adopt the policy with modification(s).

### **Background**

At its meeting of 23 April 2001 Council resolved to advertise the Draft Local Planning Policy No.3 – Telecommunications Infrastructure – Mobile Phone Towers in accordance with Part 9.3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2.

***A copy of the Policy is with the attachments marked SM061.1/06/01.***

The Policy was duly advertised by way of notification in the Serpentine Jarrahdale Examiner newspaper. Comments were invited to be received up to and including 24 May 2001.

### **Comments**

As an outcome of advertising the Policy only one submission was received, that being from the planning consultancy firm Greg Rowe and Associates.

The submission is lodged on behalf of the Mobile Carriers Forum (MCF) which is stated to be a strategic body established by the Carriers to improve communication with, and provide a single point of representation to, Local and State Government. Optus, Telstra, Vodafone, One Tel, AAPT and Orange are members of the MCF.

***A full copy of the submission is with the attachments marked SM061.2/06/01.***

The submission provides extensive comment and rationale for modifying the draft policy. In response to the submission, the Assessments Team suggested changes to the Policy as listed in the recommended resolution presented hereunder.

It is recommended that the Landscape Protection Policy Area as identified by Council's Rural Strategy remain an unsuitable location for the siting of mobile phone towers/monopoles in the Shire for reasons of likely adverse visual/landscape amenity impacts to nearby community. It is considered that the Policy provides sufficient flexibility (range of areas) to Carriers to enable the siting of such infrastructure away from publicly visible corridors.

<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Town Planning and Development Act 1928
<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	Draft Policy
<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Nil
<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	To provide guidance for the siting of Mobile Phone Towers in the Shire.
<b><u>Community Consultation:</u></b>	Advertised as required prior to formal adoption
<b><u>Voting Requirements:</u></b>	Normal

#### **CRSM061 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Needham that Council adopts "Local Planning Policy No.3 – Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy – Mobile Phone Towers" after advertising, subject to the following modifications:

- The Policy be called: "Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy – Mobile Phone Towers/**Monopoles**";
- Where the Policy refers to "towers" this be replaced by "towers/**monopoles**";
- In the background section of the Policy, the list of some examples of Low Impact facilities, after the word "Public payphones" and before the word "Overhead" be expanded to include:
  - Equipment cabinets and;
  - Minor incidental facilities satisfactory to Council required to ensure the safety of a facility (i.e fencing)
- A separate (additional) Objective to Part 2, Objectives be added which reads:

**"(e) To facilitate the establishment of an effective mobile telecommunications network in the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale, which meets the needs and expectations of mobile phone users in the community – including residents, visitors and employees."**

- "General Industry" be included as an appropriate zone for location of telecommunications infrastructure under Part 2 - Policy Provisions Location (a);
- Under Part 2 – Policy Provisions Location (b) this be reworded to read:

**"(b) Towers/**monopoles** should not be located within 200 metres of land zoned Urban or Urban Deferred in the Metropolitan Region Scheme (**other than in special circumstances accepted by Council i.e presence of a physical****

**buffer between a mobile base station and residential area).** Council may, however, consider the use of existing structures for the attachment of antennas and other equipment which does not require the construction of a tower/**monopole** and does not adversely impact on the visual amenity of an area”

- Under Part 2 – Policy Provisions Location (c) this be reworded to read:  
“(c) Towers/**monopoles** should not be located closer than **500m** of each other, (other than in special circumstances accepted by Council).”;
- Under Part 2 – Policy Provisions Location (d) deletion of the words:  
“**in areas of concave topography and at the base and below prominent ridges**”
- Under Part 2 – Policy Provisions Co-location (a) deletion of the words:  
“**including equipment sheds**”

CARRIED 8/0

SM062/06/01 AMENDMENT NO. 116 TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 (A0926)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Strategic Planner	Date of Report	25/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	SM022/01/01, P132/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			

### **Preamble**

The purpose of this report is to consider final adoption of Amendment No. 116 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 which seeks to introduce the Poultry Policy Overlay as a Special Control Area. The Strategic Planning Team recommends that Council adopt Amendment No. 116

### **Background**

At its meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2001 Council resolved the following:

“Moved Cr Needham seconded Cr Price that Council, pursuant to Section 7 of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928 (as amended), resolves to initiate an amendment to the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2, based on the Poultry Policy.  
review by:

#### **1. Insert a new Part X:**

### **PART X SPECIAL CONTROL AREAS**

#### **10.1 Operation of Special Control Areas**

##### **10.1.1 The following Special Control Areas are shown on the Scheme Maps:**

##### **Poultry Farm Special Control Area**

**10.1.2 In respect of the Special Control Area(s) shown on the Scheme map, the provisions of the Special Control Area apply in addition to the provisions of the underlying zone(s), reserve(s) and any general provisions of the Scheme.**

#### **10.2 Poultry Special Control Area**

<b>Poultry Development Special Control Area</b>	<p><i>The Poultry Farm Special Control Area is delineated on the Scheme map as PF.</i></p>
<b>Purpose</b>	<p><i>The general objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. To implement the Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</i></li> <li><i>2. To implement Council's 2000 Rural Strategy Review, Poultry Policy Overlay, being Council's response to Statement of Planning Policy No. 5.</i></li> <li><i>3. To provide Council with a policy framework acceptable to the broader community that will allow the poultry industry to relocate to within the Shire in an environmentally suitable manner.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>The specific objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. To ensure that new poultry farms are established in locations suitable to their operational requirements.</i></li> <li><i>2. To minimise the impact of poultry farms on residential, rural-residential and other potentially incompatible uses.</i></li> <li><i>3. To protect the interests of existing poultry farms in the face of encroaching development.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Application requirements</b>	<p><b><i>Planning approval is required to develop or expand a poultry farm.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Rezoning, subdivision, and development applications for new poultry farms and expansion of existing poultry farms should be accompanied by the following information:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Site plan showing the location and extent of the site, the location and size of all existing and proposed buildings, a contour plan showing any significant drainage features.</i></li> <li><i>2. Profile and materials of construction for all buildings.</i></li> <li><i>3. Development in the vicinity of the site and, where the proposed development is within 300 metres of existing/proposed rural-residential development and 500 metres of existing/proposed residential development, an assessment of the likely environmental impacts (odour, noise, dust, traffic movement and visual impact) of the proposed development.</i></li> <li><i>4. Separation from existing or proposed residential, rural-residential and other incompatible development and zones.</i></li> <li><i>5. Vehicular access to the site and circulation within the site.</i></li> <li><i>6. A description of the type of farm operation including the maximum number of birds, effluent management and disposal methods, types of machinery and whether regular sales to the public will be made.</i></li> <li><i>1. Hours of operation and information on whether any night-time activities will be carried out.</i></li> </ol>

	<p>2. <i>Proposed landscaping and screening including significant vegetation to be retained.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Soil conditions.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Existing uses on the site.</i></p>
--	--

<b>Relevant Considerations</b>	<p><i>General</i></p> <p>1. <i>In consideration of any development application for poultry development Council will have regard to:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Notwithstanding Table 1-Zoning Table, all applications for poultry development within the Poultry Special Control Area and on lot sizes of 40 hectares or more will be determined by Council as “P” uses under the provisions of the Scheme.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Notwithstanding Table 1-Zoning Table, all applications for poultry development outside the Poultry Special Control Area and/or on lot sizes less than 40 hectares will be determined by Council as “AA” uses under the provisions of the Scheme.</i></p> <p>c) <i>All applications for poultry development are to be accompanied by a noise modelling assessment report and include any noise attenuation measures recommended in such report.</i></p> <p>d) <i>All applications for new poultry developments to include details of preferred truck routes using Kargotich, Lowlands, Rapids (north of Karnup), Hopelands and Karnup Roads where appropriate.</i></p> <p>e) <i>All applications for poultry development to be based on controlled environment sheds or other (more superior) best practice controlled environmental technology.</i></p> <p>f) <i>All applications for new poultry farms to incorporate a minimum 100 metre internal buffer.</i></p> <p>g) <i>All applications for poultry development to incorporate an internal loop road to allow articulated vehicles and truck and dog configurations to enter and leave the site, and service the facility, in a forward direction.</i></p> <p>h) <i>All poultry shall comply with the Standards for Revegetation on New Poultry Farms in the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.</i></p> <p>i) <i>All litter material and dead birds will continue to be disposed of off the site of the poultry farms and in accordance with best practice.</i></p> <p>j) <i>All poultry farm developments to provide a sign/s indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas as specified in schedules 1 and 2 of the Commission’s Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</i></p> <p><i>New Poultry Farms</i></p> <p>2. <i>New poultry sheds will only be permitted in accordance with the following general buffer guidelines:</i></p>
--------------------------------	--

- 500 metres from any existing or future residential zone;
- 300 metres from any existing or future rural-residential zone.

#### *Expansion of Existing Poultry Farms*

3. *New sheds on an existing poultry farm should be no closer than 100 metres from the poultry farm boundary (unless the nearby land does not contain an existing or proposed use sensitive to poultry farm operations. In cases where there is an existing shed located closer than 100 metres from a poultry farm boundary a new shed should generally be no closer than the existing should from that particular boundary.*

#### *Approval by the WA Planning Commission Separate to Council Planning Approval Under The Scheme*

4. *All applications for the development of poultry farms or extensions or additions (in excess of 100m<sup>2</sup>) to the improvements of existing farms in Urban, Urban Deferred and Rural zones shall be referred to the Western Australian Planning Commission for separate determination under clause 32 of the Metropolitan Region Scheme.*

Changes have been made to the above resolved amendment in accordance with the requirements from the Ministry for Planning. These changes were reported to Council in April 2001.

#### **Comments**

The amendment has been advertised in accordance with the Ministry for Planning requirements. All property owners within the proposed Special Control Area were also notified and four signs were erected at the entry points to the Area.

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not formally assess the amendment, they however provided the following comments on the amendment:

*“The DEP supports the introduction of a Special Control Area in the Town Planning Scheme to allow for poultry farming within a designated area. The DEP considers this should assist in reducing incompatibility and conflict between neighbouring land uses, however, there may be environmental issues associated with future poultry developments, which the Shire should consider.*

*The DEP notes there is a Bush Forever Site, remnant vegetation, gas pipelines, conservation category wetlands which are protected under the Environmental Protection (Swan Coastal Plan Lakes) Policy 1992, within the proposed Planning Control Area. The area also forms part of the Environmental Protection (Peel Inlet – Harvey Estuary) Policy 1992. The DEP would expect the Shire to refer any future poultry development proposals to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for consideration if the proposal is likely, if implemented, to have a significant impact on the environment.*

*The DEP also notes that the Amendment has adopted the buffer distances recommended in the draft Code of Practice for Poultry Farms and the Statement of Planning Policy No.5 Poultry Farms Policy. Buffers, or separation distances, are used to protect residential areas from emissions such as odour, dust and noise from adjoining land uses.*

*There may be instances where the buffers can be varied and either increased or decreased. For example, the use of extensive tree planting between incompatible land uses may allow for the reduction of the buffer distances. Where the land is very flat, an increase in the buffer distance may be required because emissions may travel further. Best management practices and new technology may also permit reductions in buffer distances.*

*The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale should therefore use the recommended buffer distances as a guide and allow for some variations depending on the individual site considerations.*

The DEP notes that provisions for non-compatible uses such as tourist development and residential subdivision have not been considered in the Special Control Area. It is recommended that a provision be included to either prohibit this type of development or ensure it can occur without compromising the intent of the Amendment.”

At the request of the Ministry for Planning, Council also notified the Water and Rivers Commission, who made the following comments:

*“The Water and Rivers Commission (WRC) has no objection to the proposed amendment but have the following advice to offer, which may be incorporated into the Town Planning Scheme:*

*Parts of the area are within the Karnup-Dandalup Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA), which is a designated Priority 2 Public Drinking Water Supply Area. Priority 2 (P2) source protection areas are defined to ensure that there is no increased risk of pollution to the water source. P2 areas are declared over land where low intensity development (such as rural) already exists. Protection of public water supply sources is a high priority in these areas.*

*P2 areas are managed in accordance with the principle of risk minimisation and so some development is allowed under specific guidelines. Poultry farms are a conditional land use in P2 areas and all development should be compatible with the WRC” Water Quality Protection Notes on Poultry Farms in Public Drinking Water Source Areas.*

*When a poultry farm is proposed within 200 metres of a Conservation Category or Resource Enhancement wetland, or a waterway, the proposal should be referred to the WRC for advice. A 200 metre buffer is usually required from the edge of the wetland dependant vegetation to the start of the development, however the WRC may support a poultry farm with only a 50 metre buffer provided suitable design and management measures are used to effectively minimise pollution risks.”*

Fourteen objections to the proposed amendment were received with the following points being the main areas of concern:

- Impact special control area will have on potential rezoning and development within the area
- Amendment will only benefit ‘a handful of landowners’ and will be detrimental to the considerable majority of landowners
- Affect on land values
- Noise, odour, traffic and degradation of roads caused by poultry farms

***A copy of the Schedule of Submissions received inclusive of officers comments is with the attachments marked SM062.1/06/01.***

In February 2000 during a regular briefing session, Councillor’s and senior staff discussed the various expectations of the local community and the poultry industry regarding the future of the industry in the Shire. Following this meeting, Council at its Ordinary Meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> February 2000 considered a broad report on the poultry industry within the Shire. At that meeting, Council resolved the following *inter alia*:



1. *That Council invites representatives of the WA Broiler Growers Association, Bartter and up to two community members to help develop a protocol for expansion of the poultry industry in the Shire; such protocol is to address the circumstances and locations in which Council would look favourably at applications for new poultry farm development, and the types of landscaping and operational regime which best addresses community concerns about such development.*
3. *That Council acknowledges the importance of an economically viable agricultural sector based on the principles of sustainable development and further, that in some cases the expectations of the community with respect to lifestyle may have occasional conflicts with regard to development within the Shire."*

Council then increased the number of community representatives on the Committee from two to five. The community representatives were nominated following a series of meetings of concerned residents of Council's south ward. The Poultry - Community Liaison Committee met on four occasions. There was also a Technical Sub - Committee which discussed various issues including transport routes, landscape requirements, a preferred area for poultry farms and noise issues.

Council carried out extensive community consultation during the Poultry Policy Overlay process. Council formally advertised the Poultry Policy Overlay for a period of almost five weeks. Only two submissions were received. Council then at its meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2000 resolved the following:

*"Council adopts the 2000 Rural Strategy Review Discussion Paper No.1 Poultry Policy Overlay, Version 6 (October 2000) as a limited review of the Rural Strategy and refers it to the WA Planning Commission for final endorsement."*

The initiation of this amendment results from the Ministry for Planning refusing to forward the Poultry Policy Overlay to the WA Planning Commission for final endorsement. As a way to progress this matter, and as Council has accepted and adopted the Policy Overlay which is being used by Council officers on new/extensions to poultry farm developments, Council resolved that it was appropriate to initiate an amendment to the Town Planning Scheme to introduce the Policy Overlay as a Special Control Area.

Amendment No. 116 introduces the requirement for any new and expanding poultry farms to comply with "Standards of Revegetation on New Poultry Farms". These standards relate to the amount of revegetation, species, revegetation methods, timing of planting, revegetation plans and management of revegetation.

<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Town Planning and Development Act 1928 (as amended), State Planning Policy No.5 – Poultry Farms
<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	Amendment to Town Planning Scheme
<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Nil
<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	Improved dialogue between Council, the poultry industry and the community and a framework for addressing conflicting expectations of stakeholders in the decision making process.
<b><u>Community Consultation:</u></b>	<p>Poultry Policy Overlay advertised for a period of almost five weeks.</p> <p>Amendment No. 116 advertised in accordance with Ministry for Planning requirements. Fourteen submissions received objecting to the amendment.</p>
<b><u>Voting Requirements:</u></b>	Normal

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. Council in pursuance to Clause 17 of the Town planning Regulations 1967, resolves to adopt for final approval Amendment No.116 as follows:

1. Insert a new Part X:

#### **PART X - SPECIAL CONTROL AREAS**

##### 10.1 Operation of Special Control Areas

- 10.1.1 The following Special Control Areas are shown on the Scheme Maps:

##### Poultry Farm Special Control Area

- 10.1.2 In respect of a special control area shown on the Scheme Map, the provisions applying to the special control area apply in addition to the provisions of the underlying zone or reserve and any general provisions of the Scheme.

##### 10.2 Poultry Farm Special Control Area

<b>Poultry Development Special Control Area</b>	The Poultry Farm Special Control Area is delineated on the Scheme Map as PF.
<b>Purpose</b>	<p>The general objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To implement the Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</li><li>2. To implement Council's 2000 Rural Strategy Review, Poultry Policy Overlay, being Council's response to Statement of Planning Policy No. 5.</li><li>3. <i>To provide Council with a policy framework acceptable to the broader community that will allow the poultry industry to relocate to within the Shire in an environmentally suitable manner.</i></li></ol> <p>The specific objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To ensure that new poultry farms are established in locations suitable to their operational requirements.</li><li>2. To minimise the impact of poultry farms on residential, rural-residential and other potentially incompatible uses.</li><li>3. To protect the interests of existing poultry farms in the face of encroaching development.</li></ol>
<b>Application requirements</b>	<p>Planning consent is required to develop or expand a poultry farm.</p> <p>Development applications for new poultry farms and expansion of existing poultry farms shall be accompanied by the following information:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site plan showing the location and extent of the site, the location and size of all existing and proposed buildings, a contour plan showing any significant drainage features.</li> <li>2. Profile and materials of construction for all buildings.</li> <li>3. Development in the vicinity of the site and, where the proposed development is within 300 metres of existing/proposed rural-residential development and 500 metres of existing/proposed residential development, an assessment of the likely environmental impacts (odour, noise, dust, traffic movement and visual impact) of the proposed development, and how the impacts are to be managed.</li> <li>4. Separation from existing or proposed residential, rural-residential and other incompatible development and zones.</li> <li>5. Vehicular access to the site and circulation within the site, including details of the preferred truck routes using Kargotich, Lowlands, Rapids (north of Karnup), Hopelands and Karnup Roads.</li> <li>6. A description of the type of farm operation including the maximum number of birds, effluent and drainage management and disposal methods, types of machinery and whether regular sales to the public will be made.</li> <li>7. Hours of operation and information on whether any night-time activities will be carried out.</li> <li>8. Proposed landscaping and screening including significant vegetation to be retained.</li> <li>9. A description of the soil conditions relative to their capability and suitability to sustain the proposed development.</li> <li>10. A description of the existing uses on the site and their relationship with the proposed development.</li> </ol>
--	--

<b>Determination of Applications</b>	<p>Notwithstanding Table 1-Zoning Table, an application for a new poultry farm or expansion of an existing poultry farm within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area will be determined by Council as a “P” use under the provisions of the Scheme, provided the application satisfies the following requirements. All other applications will be determined as a “AA” use under the provisions of the Scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Controlled environment sheds or other (more superior) best practice controlled environmental technology, will be used to house the poultry.</li> <li>2. There will be an internal loop road to allow articulated vehicles and truck and dog configurations to enter and leave the site, and service the facility, in a forward direction.</li> <li>3. Landscaping and screening of the poultry sheds and surrounds accords with the “Standards for Revegetation on New Poultry Farms”.</li> <li>4. All litter material and dead birds will be disposed of off the site and in accordance with best practice.</li> <li>5. A sign/s is placed on the site in a visible location to the satisfaction of</li> </ol>
--------------------------------------	--

	<p>the Council indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas as specified in schedules 1 and 2 of the Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</p> <p>6. In respect of New Poultry Farms the sheds are at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 500 metres from any existing or future residential zone;</li><li>• 300 metres from any existing or future rural-residential zone;</li><li>• 100 metres from the boundary of the Poultry Farm.</li></ul> <p>7. In respect of the expansion of Existing Poultry Farms the new shed(s) shall be no closer than 100 metres from the poultry farm boundary (unless the nearby land does not contain an existing or proposed use sensitive to poultry farm operations in which case a lesser setback distance may be supported). In cases where there is an existing shed located closer than 100 metres from a poultry farm boundary a new shed shall be no closer than the existing shed from that particular boundary.</p> <p>8. All the application requirements have been provided and the Council is satisfied with the establishment, operations and management and the impacts of the proposed development on the local environs.</p>
--	--

2. Amend the Scheme Maps by inserting the relevant Legend reference and depicting the land identified on Attachment "A" within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area.
3. The Chief Executive Officer and Shire President be authorised to execute the amendment documentation for final approval upon changes being effected.
4. Council confirms the officer's comments in the Schedule of Submissions circulated as an attachment to the report – Schedule of Submissions to Amendment No. 116.

#### **Committee Recommended Resolution**

1. Council in pursuance to Clause 17 of the Town planning Regulations 1967, resolves to adopt for final approval Amendment No.116 as follows:
  1. Insert a new Part X:

#### **PART X - SPECIAL CONTROL AREAS**

##### **10.1 Operation of Special Control Areas**

##### **10.1.1 The following Special Control Areas are shown on the Scheme Maps:**

##### **Poultry Farm Special Control Area**

##### **10.1.2 In respect of a special control area shown on the Scheme Map, the provisions applying to the special control area apply in addition to the provisions of the underlying zone or reserve and any general provisions of the Scheme.**

##### **10.2 Poultry Farm Special Control Area**

<b>Poultry Development Special Control Area</b>	The Poultry Farm Special Control Area is delineated on the Scheme Map as PF.
<b>Purpose</b>	<p>The general objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To implement the Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</li> <li>2. To implement Council's 2000 Rural Strategy Review, Poultry Policy Overlay, being Council's response to Statement of Planning Policy No. 5.</li> <li>3. To provide Council with a policy framework acceptable to the broader community that will allow the poultry industry to relocate to within the Shire in an environmentally suitable manner.</li> </ol> <p>The specific objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure that new poultry farms are established in locations suitable to their operational requirements.</li> <li>2. To minimise the impact of poultry farms on residential, rural-residential and other potentially incompatible uses.</li> <li>3. To protect the interests of existing poultry farms in the face of encroaching development.</li> </ol>
<b>Application requirements</b>	<p>Planning consent is required to develop or expand a poultry farm.</p> <p>Development applications for new poultry farms and expansion of existing poultry farms shall be accompanied by the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site plan showing the location and extent of the site, the location and size of all existing and proposed buildings, a contour plan showing any significant drainage features.</li> <li>2. Profile and materials of construction for all buildings.</li> <li>3. Development in the vicinity of the site and, where the proposed development is within 300 metres of existing/proposed rural-residential development and 500 metres of existing/proposed residential development, an assessment of the likely environmental impacts (odour, noise, dust, traffic movement and visual impact) of the proposed development, and how the impacts are to be managed.</li> <li>4. Separation from existing or proposed residential, rural-residential and other incompatible development and zones.</li> <li>5. Vehicular access to the site and circulation within the site, including details of the preferred truck routes using Kargotich, Lowlands, Rapids (north of Karnup), Hopelands and Karnup Roads.</li> <li>6. A description of the type of farm operation including the maximum number of birds, effluent and drainage management and disposal methods, types of machinery and whether regular sales to the public will be made.</li> </ol>

	<p>7. Hours of operation and information on whether any night-time activities will be carried out.</p> <p>8. Proposed landscaping and screening including significant vegetation to be retained.</p> <p>9. A description of the soil conditions relative to their capability and suitability to sustain the proposed development.</p> <p>10. A description of the existing uses on the site and their relationship with the proposed development.</p>
--	---

<b>Determination of Applications</b>	<p>Notwithstanding Table 1-Zoning Table, an application for a new poultry farm or expansion of an existing poultry farm within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area will be determined by Council as a “P” use under the provisions of the Scheme, provided the application satisfies the following requirements. All other applications will be determined as a “AA” use under the provisions of the Scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled environment sheds or other (more superior) best practice controlled environmental technology, will be used to house the poultry.</li> <li>There will be an internal loop road to allow articulated vehicles and truck and dog configurations to enter and leave the site, and service the facility, in a forward direction.</li> <li>Landscaping and screening of the poultry sheds and surrounds accords with the “Standards for Revegetation on New Poultry Farms”.</li> <li>All litter material and dead birds will be disposed of off the site and in accordance with best practice.</li> <li>A sign/s is placed on the site in a visible location to the satisfaction of the Council indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas as specified in schedules 1 and 2 of the Commission’s Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</li> <li>In respect of New Poultry Farms the sheds are at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>500 metres from any existing or future residential zone;</li> <li>300 metres from any existing or future rural-residential zone;</li> <li>200 metres from any wetland subject to Water and Rivers Commission advice;</li> <li>100 metres from the boundary of the Poultry Farm.</li> </ul> </li> <li>In respect of the expansion of Existing Poultry Farms the new shed(s) shall be no closer than 100 metres from the poultry farm boundary (unless the nearby land does not contain an existing or proposed use sensitive to poultry farm operations in which case a lesser setback distance may be supported). In cases where there is an existing shed located closer than 100 metres from a poultry farm boundary a new shed shall be no closer than the existing shed from that particular boundary.</li> <li>All the application requirements have been provided and the Council is satisfied with the establishment, operations and management and the impacts of the proposed development on the local environs.</li> </ol>
--------------------------------------	---

2. Amend the Scheme Maps by inserting the relevant Legend reference and depicting the land identified on Attachment “A” within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area.
3. The Chief Executive Officer and Shire President be authorised to execute the amendment documentation for final approval upon changes being effected.
4. Council confirms the officer’s comments in the Schedule of Submissions circulated as an attachment to the report – Schedule of Submissions to Amendment No. 116.
5. The objector locations be identified on a map to be documented on Councils file A0926.
6. A mechanism for a possible inclusion of Mr Ellery’s property at Lot 400 Henderson Road, Hopeland be investigated.

### **CRSM062 COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Hoyer seconded Cr Richards that

1. Council in pursuance to Clause 17 of the Town planning Regulations 1967, resolves to adopt for final approval Amendment No.116 as follows:

1. Insert a new Part X:

### **PART X - SPECIAL CONTROL AREAS**

#### **10.1 Operation of Special Control Areas**

- 10.1.1 The following Special Control Areas are shown on the Scheme Maps:

Poultry Farm Special Control Area

- 10.1.2 In respect of a special control area shown on the Scheme Map, the provisions applying to the special control area apply in addition to the provisions of the underlying zone or reserve and any general provisions of the Scheme.

#### **10.2 Poultry Farm Special Control Area**

<b>Poultry Development Special Control Area</b>	The Poultry Farm Special Control Area is delineated on the Scheme Map as PF.
<b>Purpose</b>	<p>The general objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To implement the Commission’s Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.</li> <li>2. To implement Council’s 2000 Rural Strategy Review, Poultry Policy Overlay, being Council’s response to Statement of Planning Policy No. 5.</li> <li>3. To provide Council with a policy framework acceptable to the broader community that will allow the poultry industry to relocate to within the Shire in an environmentally suitable manner.</li> </ol> <p>The specific objectives of the Poultry Farm Special Control Area are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure that new poultry farms are established in locations suitable to</li> </ol>

	<p>their operational requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. To minimise the impact of poultry farms on residential, rural-residential and other potentially incompatible uses.</li> <li>3. To protect the interests of existing poultry farms in the face of encroaching development.</li> </ol>
<b>Application requirements</b>	<p>Planning consent is required to develop or expand a poultry farm.</p> <p>Development applications for new poultry farms and expansion of existing poultry farms shall be accompanied by the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site plan showing the location and extent of the site, the location and size of all existing and proposed buildings, a contour plan showing any significant drainage features.</li> <li>2. Profile and materials of construction for all buildings.</li> <li>3. Development in the vicinity of the site and, where the proposed development is within 300 metres of existing/proposed rural-residential development and 500 metres of existing/proposed residential development, an assessment of the likely environmental impacts (odour, noise, dust, traffic movement and visual impact) of the proposed development, and how the impacts are to be managed.</li> <li>4. Separation from existing or proposed residential, rural-residential and other incompatible development and zones.</li> <li>5. Vehicular access to the site and circulation within the site, including details of the preferred truck routes using Kargotich, Lowlands, Rapids (north of Karnup), Hopelands and Karnup Roads.</li> <li>6. A description of the type of farm operation including the maximum number of birds, effluent and drainage management and disposal methods, types of machinery and whether regular sales to the public will be made.</li> <li>7. Hours of operation and information on whether any night-time activities will be carried out.</li> <li>8. Proposed landscaping and screening including significant vegetation to be retained.</li> <li>9. A description of the soil conditions relative to their capability and suitability to sustain the proposed development.</li> <li>10. A description of the existing uses on the site and their relationship with the proposed development.</li> </ol>
<b>Determination of Applications</b>	<p>Notwithstanding Table 1-Zoning Table, an application for a new poultry farm or expansion of an existing poultry farm within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area will be determined by Council as a “P” use under the provisions of the Scheme, provided the application satisfies the following requirements. All other applications will be determined as a “AA” use under the provisions of the Scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Controlled environment sheds or other (more superior) best practice controlled environmental technology, will be used to house the poultry.</li> </ol>



2. There will be an internal loop road to allow articulated vehicles and truck and dog configurations to enter and leave the site, and service the facility, in a forward direction.
3. Landscaping and screening of the poultry sheds and surrounds accords with the “Standards for Revegetation on New Poultry Farms”.
4. All litter material and dead birds will be disposed of off the site and in accordance with best practice.
5. A sign/s is placed on the site in a visible location to the satisfaction of the Council indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas as specified in schedules 1 and 2 of the Commission’s Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.
6. In respect of New Poultry Farms the sheds are at least:
  - 500 metres from any existing or future residential zone;
  - 300 metres from any existing or future rural-residential zone;
  - 200 metres from any wetland subject to Water and Rivers Commission advice;
  - 100 metres from the boundary of the Poultry Farm.
7. In respect of the expansion of Existing Poultry Farms the new shed(s) shall be no closer than 100 metres from the poultry farm boundary (unless the nearby land does not contain an existing or proposed use sensitive to poultry farm operations in which case a lesser setback distance may be supported). In cases where there is an existing shed located closer than 100 metres from a poultry farm boundary a new shed shall be no closer than the existing shed from that particular boundary.
8. All the application requirements have been provided and the Council is satisfied with the establishment, operations and management and the impacts of the proposed development on the local environs.

2. Amend the Scheme Maps by inserting the relevant Legend reference and depicting the land identified on Attachment “A” within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area.
3. The Chief Executive Officer and Shire President be authorised to execute the amendment documentation for final approval upon changes being effected.
4. Council confirms the officer’s comments in the Schedule of Submissions circulated as an attachment to the report – Schedule of Submissions to Amendment No. 116.
5. The objector locations be identified on a map to be documented on Councils file A0926.
6. A mechanism for a possible inclusion of Mr Ellery’s property at Lot 400 Henderson Road, Hopeland be investigated.
7. The proposed changes to the Town Planning Scheme No 2, amendment No 116 is not intended to inhibit or stall any other current or future development proposals or planning opportunities.

CARRIED 8/0

SM063/06/01 INFORMATION SYSTEMS PLAN (A0030)			
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	Glen Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	07/06/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest	<b>Council</b>		

### **Preamble**

Adopt the Information Systems Plan proposed by Management Technology Solutions.

### **Background**

With the development of the Plan of Principal Activities this year executive management noted the need to update the information technology of Council in the first year and the need to develop a plan for how this would take place. Mr Wayne Wright from Management Technology Solutions was engaged to undertake a review of our IT needs and also our management of all information in general.

An audit was undertaken of our current IT system network and our current information systems to determine what information we are storing, how it is being stored and how we use this information. This audit provided the basis for determining the requirements of an upgrade.

The Executive Team requested that the review be conducted based on the following criteria,

1. Improve access to corporate information through the introduction of an integrated electronic document environment for the internal and external customers.
2. Automate and standardised key processes through the introduction of workflow technology linked to an electronic document management system.
3. Improve efficiencies in the operations of Council by adopting industry standard practice information management.

### **Comments**

***A copy of the final report is with the attachments marked SM063.1/06/01.***

The report indicates the major processes of Council with the operating processes linked and current system.

Recommendations start from part 9 of the report. The recommendations provide for the following:

1. *Electronic information management system using the Trim Document Management Software currently used by Council.* This will require an upgrade of the version of the software currently used to allow all staff concurrent access and an upgrade of the server running this software. The anticipated per annum costs of these changes will be approximately \$6,000 to lease the new server over three years and a one off cost of \$16,000 to upgrade the version of Trim.
2. *Develop specification for the upgrade of the current local government system.* The current system will no longer be maintained by the supplier as it is an old version approximately 13 years old. The information inventory has provided details of what programs are currently being used, it is from this that a specification document will be developed. The current system supplier does have an updated program that is windows based with a graphical user interface (GUI) front end. The quote for this upgrade is approximately \$40,000 which is inclusive of installation, training,

- conversion of the database and two new reporting programs that allows microsoft excel integration and microsoft word integration. This will significantly improve the efficiency of reporting and corresponding.
3. *Implement a standard microsoft environment.* Council currently operates a novell environment. This is not standard to other organisations and at times causes some difficulty in getting adequate technical support and functionality with training and application of the system. The server operating this system is also old and requires upgrading. The cost per annum of this change will be approximately \$6,000 per year to Council.
  4. *Implement a geographical information system (GIS).* This will allow Council to improve the property related process such as customer requests, development applications etc. it is anticipated that GIS would sit on the Trim software or the local government software. At this point in time the preference is to integrate GIS into Trim, costs are unknown at this time and it is expected that this will be the final step in the information plan.
  5. *Install a Citrix metaframe network to provide remote access.* This is the installation of a third server that will allow remote access to Councils system. This will allow Councillors to get access to the system and senior officers. It is anticipated that the development of the upgrade will provide for Councillors to dial into the network and be able to get internet access and email access through the Council network. The per annum cost of this server will be approximately \$6,000.
  6. *Acquire laptop computers for all elected members.* All councillors will receive a laptop and be given access to the network. This will provide email and internet access for councillors and allow them to receive documents such as agendas, correspondence and diary bookings. The per annum cost for this will be approximately \$18,000.
  7. *Implement A3 colour network printing.* This will allow Council to receive subdivision plans electronically and print our own copies. It will also allow Council to print its own letter heads and documents. The per annum cost is approximately \$2,500.

The report is based on the assumption that all hardware will be provided through a three year lease arrangement. This will allow Council to amortise the cost of operating the network each year rather than providing a lump sum amount every few years to upgrade. Dependant on the cost of the hardware a four year lease arrangement may be chosen. The timeline to implement the plan will be twelve months. By leasing the hardware requirements Council will maintain current equipment that will cope with software development and improvements. By the end of 2001/2002 all upgrading should be completed and progress towards electronic data management commenced.

Correspondence will be scanned into the management system and distributed to staff and Council electronically reducing the time lost in searching and using manual files. The full benefit of electronic data management will not be realised for about three to **five years, after which time there should be little requirement to search a hard file for information.**

The development of GIS will allow residents to enter our system and view information for themselves through the internet. This will not occur immediately however the foundation will be provided for a customer request system and mapping system that will allow residents of subdivisions undertaken from next year to view the services provided to their properties or track a building/development or action request application.

The approximate first year cost to establish this system is \$140,000. The Principal Activities Plan 2001-2005 provides \$100,000 in year one. The ongoing cost of this upgrade will be approximately \$45,000 inclusive of Councillor laptops. There will be additional costs for licences and support however these are generally provided for already. A reserve fund of \$60,000 will contribute towards the upgrade costs and is included in the PAP document as a source of income.

**Statutory Environment:** No statutory environment

**Policy Implications:** No policy implications

**Financial Implications:** The upgrade of the IT network is included in the PAP at a cost of \$100,000 of which \$57,000 is provided from a Reserve account. The estimated upper end cost of this plan is approximately \$140,000. Costs will be confirmed when quotes are received.

**Strategic Implications:** This Plan will directly influence how services are provided to the community in the future.

**Community Consultation:** No consultation is required under the framework

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**CRSM063 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Hoyer that Council adopts the Information Systems Plan as provided by Management Technology Solutions Pty Ltd and provides for the implementations of the recommendations contained within the draft 2001/2002 Budget.  
CARRIED 8/0

SM064/06/01 PROVISION OF DETAILED URBAN STORMWATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR THE BYFORD URBAN DEVELOPMENT AREA (A0827)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Strategic Planner	Date of Report	12/6/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P051/10/00, SM048/05/01		
Disclosure of Interest	Council		

**Preamble**

Council is to appoint a consultant to carry out the Detailed Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development area. It is recommended that Council appoint HGM and J Cavies Consultants to carry out the Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development area.

**Background**

At its meeting of the 28<sup>th</sup> May 2001 Council considered a proposal from the Water Corporation in relation to the Byford Urban Storm Water Management Strategy. Water Corporation presented a delegation to the Planning Committee at its meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> May 2001. The following is an overview of the Water Corporations proposal:

- Council and the Water Corporation work in alliance to develop the best options for service delivery in relation to urban water quality and quantity management in the Byford area. Both organisations would work together to develop an Urban Storm Water Management Strategy
- Water Corporation proposes to carry out a whole of catchment approach incorporating ground water and nutrient modelling for the area, what types of multi-use corridors (bushland versus grasslands) high flows, sediment loads in Beenyup and Cardup Brooks and so on

Council has not received a formal proposal in writing from the Water Corporation as yet and expects that a formal proposal will be made in writing by Friday, 15<sup>th</sup> June 2001.

Following the delegation from the Water Corporation Council resolved the following:

*“2. The Byford Storm Water Management Strategy be referred to a Working Group of the Planning Development and Environment Committee.”*

From this resolution a workshop was held on the 8<sup>th</sup> June 2001. Representatives from the Water and Rivers Commission made a presentation to the Committee at this workshop. The main points of this presentation were:

- The Water and Rivers Commission are currently carrying out an Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Southern Rivers area. This Strategy is being prepared by J Davies. The Water and Rivers Commission stated that they considered either PPK Consultants or HGM & J Davies could carry out the brief to a very high standard

#### Water sensitive design

- Focus on the future management of stormwater as a whole of catchment approach from a quality and quantity aspect
- Vision is to protect water resources
- Ensure better living environment
- Protection from flooding in storm events, which used to be the only objective of drainage but it has now been established that there are benefits to a water sensitive urban design approach
- Utilising water as a resource rather than a waste product. This can best be done by retaining natural water courses, wetlands and natural features and by integrating public open space and recreation facilities which in turn ultimately reduces overall lifecycle costs

#### Arrangement of Responsibilities

Regulatory bodies include:

- Department of Environmental Protection
- Water and Rivers
- Ministry for Planning
- Local Government
- Office of Water Regulation

Planning bodies include:-

- Water and Rivers
- Ministry for Planning
- Local Government

Service delivery is via the local government primarily. The Water Corporation delivers some services although mainly in Perth.

Difficulties with the current drainage system include:-

- The dual control aspect - Water Corporation are only part of the total service
- Limited integration

Challenge we now face is balancing the competing objectives:-

- Removing water and;
- Retaining water

Opportunities include:-

- Increase land cost
- Integrate water resources together so as to provide community benefits

Three major factors Council must consider:-

- Aims
- Environmental constraints

- Cost of water management

### Aims

Quality versus quantity – whether Council wants a development similar to Mandurah where traditional drainage means are used or Ascot Waters/Ellenbrook where urban sensitive design measures have been implemented.

### Constraints

- Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale falls within the Peel EPP and SPP No. 2
- Municipality consists of both bush and wetland, therefore land has to be drained to some degree through Water Corporation main drains

### Potential Costs

- Water Corporation estimated over \$41 million including earthworks and detention ponds - an alternative system may be investigated.
- Work with environmental constraints rather than against them. Wetlands are best not used as drainage basins, other areas can be incorporated. Water management into public open space can be accommodated at a lot less cost. This results in a better quality environment overall.

### Tenders Before Council

Council is now at the stage where a decision must be made on the tender document and the future direction of the Byford Urban Storm Water Management Strategy.

Tenders have been invited and closed for the preparation of the Strategy. Six tenders were received, as follows:

PPK	\$104 527
URS	\$ 87 275
Brown & Root (formally Kinhill)	\$ 89 550
BSD	\$ 97 500
Sinclair Knight Merz	\$ 92 015
HGM & J Davies	\$ 94 967

The following selection criteria have been applied to the tenders:

Description of Qualitative Criteria	Weighting
a) Composition and qualifications of the Study Team proposed, identifying the Principal Consultant and the sub-consultants and including a breakdown of the responsibilities of each team member (ie. the area in which their particular expertise will be required and estimated time each team member will spend on the project). Curriculum vitae's of each member including relevant referees must be included;	<b>15%</b>
b) Previous experience of the Consultant, including description of projects that demonstrate work of a similar nature to the proposed study with information on the project types, scale and total value. Relevant experience should be highlighted, as well as those projects where all members included in the proposed study team have previously worked together, noting the type and success of those particular projects;	<b>25%</b>

c) A statement of the methodology to be employed by the Consultant for the study, indicating how the project will be undertaken so as to ensure that the objectives of the study will be achieved and an effective urban stormwater management plan produced. The methodology will follow the required information and consultation needs outlined in the Consultant's brief;	<b>20%</b>
d) A proposed time frame for the project with commencement and completion dates for the whole project and all its stages, as well as a statement on the availability of all members of the study team to meet the proposed time – frame;	<b>15%</b>
e) A statement on ability of Consultant to meet all deliverables required as outlined in the Consultant's Brief (ie. progress, draft and final reports and presentations);	<b>10%</b>
f) Total costing of the study will need to be included.	<b>15%</b>

The tender documents have been assessed by Council's Strategic Planner, Council's Design Engineer and Council's Environmental Officer. The Water and Rivers Commission and the Water Corporation have also assessed the documents.

### **Comments**

The following marks were given to each tender:

Consultant	Price Estimate	Total marks given by Council Officer's out of 100	Officers ranking	Rank given by Water & Rivers	Total mark given by the Water Corp. out of 85	Rank given by Water Corp.	Final ranking
PPK	\$104,527	72	6	1	46	2	3
URS	\$87,275	79.6	2	3	32	6	2
Brown & Root	\$89,550	78.5	3	6	40	4	4
BSD	\$97,500	77.7	4	4	40	4	5
Sinclair Knight Merz	\$92,015	75.3	5	5	42	3	6
HGM & J Davies	\$94,967	86.9	1	2	51	1	1

As a result of time restraints the Water and Rivers Commission were unable to give the submissions a mark out of 85 and therefore the submissions have been scored in their order of preference. Please note that Water and Rivers Commission and the Water Corporation did not have access to the pricing schedules contained in the tenders and therefore did not score the submissions for this section. This explains why there is a marked difference in total scores given between the Water Corporation and the Council's officers scores.

Water Corporation and Council's Officers selected HGM & J Davies as being the best consultants to carry out the Plan with Water and Rivers Commission selecting PPK as being the best consultants to carry out the Plan and HGM & J Davies being their second preference.

The Water & Rivers Commission provide the following comments on the tenders:

- *The PPK, URS and HGM proposals demonstrated the greatest understanding of the 'new paradigm' of integrated stormwater management with the primary goal of protection of water resources and the environment and achieving this by good land use planning and management.*
- *The BSD, SKM and Brown and Root proposals were more hydraulic and engineering oriented and consequently proposing a drainage outcome based on the 'old paradigm'. Further consideration of these three proposals is not recommended.*

- *Of the three preferred proposals the submission by PPK offered the best balance of team combined with previous experience in the project area.*
- *The submissions by URS and HGM demonstrated good understanding of the objectives and deliverables and their ability to perform the work, if selected.*

*The Water Corporation provided the following comments on the tenders:*

*The Water Corporation has analysed the tenders for the Urban Stormwater Management Strategy (USMS), however a number of important issues have not been adequately addressed. These issues are detailed below.*

#### *Drainage*

*The Byford Structure Plan cannot be considered in isolation in any drainage study for this area. The Water Corporation has prepared the Byford Drainage Review 2000, based on a whole of catchment analysis. In addition to the Structure Plan area, the Review also investigated the Byford Trotting complex, the former armaments depot, Cardup Brook and Beenyup Brook upper catchments and the existing rural area north of Thomas Road.*

*The Review used the RAFTS model to carry out a hydrological study of the area and a number of drainage issues were identified as requiring further investigation. These issues included the drainage role within the Multiple Use Corridor (MUC's), staging of the development and the need for very large storage volumes to cater for additional runoff due to the low capacity of the existing rural drainage system downstream of Hopkinson Road/Tonkin Highway Extension.*

*Approval of the Water Corporation's Byford Drainage Review 2000 would still have to be obtained from the Water and Rivers Commission if it were to be implemented. However it would save time and money if the recommended tendered used this Review as the basis of future investigation*

#### *Groundwater*

*The tenders indicate limited groundwater investigation will only be carried out. The Water Corporation suggests that groundwater modelling should be carried out to predict pre-development and post development groundwater contours.*

*Groundwater modelling would determine if infiltration basins could be used in the upper catchment which may help reduce the amount of land required for drainage use in MUC's. In addition, modelling would indicate the areas requiring sub soil drainage use in MUC's. In addition, modelling would indicate the areas requiring sub soil drainage especially at the lower end of the catchment adjacent to the future Tonkin Highway Extension as well as giving an indication of the increase in groundwater flows as a result of urbanisation.*

*Groundwater flows, determined under seasonal conditions over the full year, are required for the design of stormwater quality treatment infrastructure.*

#### *Nutrient Modelling*

*The tenders generally identify the lack of water quality monitoring data available in this area and yet it is proposed to carry out nutrient modelling. It would seem more appropriate to set up a monitoring program immediately to gather some base line data for both groundwater and surface water to determine the extent of the problem (if any) before doing any modelling. It would seem prudent to try and capture data from the 2001 winter rains if possible.*

*It can be reasonably expected that the DEP would request base line water quality data when they come to consider any USMS for the Byford Structure Plan area. Otherwise in the absence of available data it is likely the stormwater quality treatment infrastructure will be designed too conservatively and at a much higher cost than is necessary.*



### Planning

*MUC's as proposed in the Byford Structure Plan is a new concept that has not been used in the Metropolitan area to date. The tenders do not make clear if issues associated with this concept (such as ownership/maintenance of MUC's) will be resolved to enable implementation of the Byford Structure Plan. This would require negotiation with the Ministry for Planning and local authority to ensure that the issue of MUC's is integrated into the planning process.*

*The Water Corporation is concerned that the USMS may not fully address water resource management issues as listed above and further work may have to be undertaken at additional cost to the Shire.*

*Accepting the considerations the Corporation has assessed the tenders with the results indicated in the table above.*

Council's Strategic Planner and Design Engineer make the following comments in relation to the tenders:

- All of the consultants covered most of if not all of the deliverables requested in the brief.
- As the Water and Rivers Commission states PPK, URS and HGM proposal demonstrated the greatest understanding of the MUC concept with the primary goal of protection of water resources and environment and achieving this by good land use planning and management.
- HGM's proposal puts forward the argument that nutrient control should be an important issue that is dealt with at the land management stage
- PPK have carried out a number of storm water modelling projects for Council in the past, in particular for Mundijong and Byford. This consultant states that a lot of this previous work will be used and therefore there it is believed by Council's Strategic Planning Team that the quote put in by PPK is much too high for the amount of work that will be carried out
- SKM indicate that they would be interested in forming a partnership with the Water Corporation to use their existing information to formulate a USMS. The consultants have also indicated that they would include the Byford Trotting complex within their study
- BSD, SKM and Brown and Root proposals are as Water and Rivers Commission states are more hydraulic and engineering oriented and consequently proposing drainage outcomes are based on the "old paradigm"
- All of the submissions appear not to have addressed the issue of landscaping and aesthetics of the proposed multiple use corridors to the extent preferred by Council Officers. However, it is thought by the Strategic Planning Team that this is a minor issue that can be dealt with once a consultant has been appointed to carry out the tender.

*Whilst HGM is not the cheapest of the proposals it is believed by Council's Strategic Planner and Design Engineer that their proposal is the best option for Council. This recommendation is also in agreement with the preferred consultants put forward by the Water Corporation and the Water and Rivers Commission has suggested that either PPK or HGM & J Davies could carry out the Study to a high standard.*

All tenders exceed the \$50,000 budget set aside for this project in the 2000/2001 budget. Therefore there is a need to set aside money in the 2001/2002 budget to allow for the finalisation of this project.

Based on the selection criteria and in accordance with the Tender Regulations, it is recommended by the Strategic Planning Team and endorsed by the Director Sustainable Development and Director Asset Services that Council appoints HGM & J Davies to carry out the Byford Urban Storm Water Management Strategy as the highest ranking tenderer and that Council informs the Water Corporation of its decision.

Note: At the workshop session on 8 June 2001, the Shire President suggested the Water and Rivers Commission may like to make a contribution to the project, particularly given that

the completion of the project would obviate the need for the Commission to carry out arterial drainage planning for the Byford Urban Cell. The Commission has suggested that they may be able to make \$10 000 available to the project.

**Statutory Environment:** Local Government (Functions in General) Regulations 1996

**Policy Implications:** Development of an Urban Storm Water Management Strategy is a key initial step in the implementation of Byford Structure Plan.

**Financial Implications:** PPP525 sets aside \$50,000 for the carrying out of the project in the 2000/2001 budget.

**Strategic Implications:** Nil

**Community Consultation:** The Strategy will be advertised once the draft has been received and endorsed by Council.

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

1. Council awards contract No. RFT No. 2 to HGM and J Davies Consultants to carry out the Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area for the tendered sum of \$94 987.
2. An amount of \$50 000 be carried forward from PPP525 to carry out the Urban Stormwater Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area.
3. Council allocates \$35,000 for the completion of the Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area in the 2001/2002 budget with a \$10 000 additional contribution from the Water and Rivers Commission.
4. Council thanks the Water and Rivers Commission for its \$10 000 contribution towards the Urban Stormwater Management Strategy.
5. Council informs the Water Corporation and Water and Rivers Commission of its decision.
6. Council approaches the WA Planning Commission for a \$10 000 contribution towards the Urban Stormwater Water Management Strategy for the Byford urban Development Area.

### **Discussion**

Cr Star stated that she has concerns about the proposals submitted by the tenderers in regard their completeness and demonstration of the ability to deliver the outcomes required in the brief to the Councils requirements.

Acting Director Sustainable Development stated that it could be resolved to not accept tender, shortlist to those considered potentially capable of completing the works to Councils satisfaction for further evaluation and consideration, or appoint a consultant on the basis of the information in the tenders and refine the scope of works and Council requirements in consultation with the appointed consultant as a variation to the contract.

The options were discussed and the committee considered that having regard to the importance of ensuring the appointment consultant had a full and complete understanding of Councils expectations and that Council had a full and complete understanding of the intended approach and methodology to be adopted by the consultant it was preferable to shortlist the tenderers and invite those considered more suited to the consultancy on the basis of their proposals to make a presentation to Council at which time the areas of concern can be addressed.

Following the presentations a review of the proposals could be conducted in conformity with the tender selection criteria and the most advantageous tenderer appointed.

Moved Cr Buttfield, seconded Cr Richards that

1. Council awards contract No. RFT No. 2 to HGM and J Davies Consultants to carry out the Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area for the tendered sum of \$94 987.
2. An amount of \$50 000 be carried forward from PPP525 to carry out the Urban Stormwater Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area.
3. Council allocates \$35,000 for the completion of the Urban Storm Water Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area in the 2001/2002 budget with a \$10 000 additional contribution from the Water and Rivers Commission.
4. Council thanks the Water and Rivers Commission for its \$10 000 contribution towards the Urban Stormwater Management Strategy.
5. Council informs the Water Corporation and Water and Rivers Commission of its decision.
6. Council approaches the WA Planning Commission for a \$10 000 contribution towards the Urban Stormwater Water Management Strategy for the Byford urban Development Area.

Note: During debate Cr Star foreshadowed that she would move a motion that Council shortlists tenders submitted by URS, PPK and HGM & J Davies and invites them to make a presentation on their submission to Council prior to further consideration of appointment of a consultant to Contract No. RFT2 – Urban Stormwater Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area.

LOST 2/3

#### **CRSM064 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham that Council shortlists tenders submitted by URS, PPK and HGM & J Davies and invites them to make a presentation on their submission to Council prior to further consideration of appointment of a consultant to Contract No. RFT2 – Urban Stormwater Management Strategy for the Byford Urban Development Area.

CARRIED 7/1

SM065/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	David Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	1/6/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			

SM065.1/06/01 PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A RURAL INDUSTRIAL AREA AS PART OF THE RURAL STRATEGY REVIEW (A0803)

At its May meeting the Local Economic Development Unit recommended that *"the Director Sustainable Development to undertake a Pre-feasibility Study for a suitable industrial area within the Shire. It was also suggested that the proposal be reported to Council."*

Dykstra and Associates have been appointed to prepare a submission to the Rural Strategy Review for the Jackson Road area on King Road which was favoured by the Local Economic Development Unit.

SM065.2/06/01 TONKIN HIGHWAY WORKING GROUP (A0471)

***A copy of the minutes of the meeting of Pre-Construction Activities held on Monday, 27 May 2001 and the Agenda for the next meeting to be held on Monday, 18 June 2001 is with the attachments marked SM065.2/06/01.***

SM065.3/06/01 WHITBY FALLS REVIEW COMMITTEE (A0407)

***A copy of the draft minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 25 May 2001 are with the attachments marked SM065.3/06/01.***

SM065.4/06/01 JARRAHDAL WEEKEND BUS SERVICE – LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT (A0483)

***A copy of the correspondence dated 22 May 2001 from Mr Gary Merritt, Acting Service Development Manager, Department of Transport outlining reasons why the weekend bus service to and from Jarrahdale has been changed is with the attachments marked SM065.4/06/01.***

SM065.5/06/01 SPECIAL CONFERENCES OF LGA, CSCA AND CUCA – 22-23 APRIL 2001 (A0163-04)

Council is in receipt of correspondence dated 1 June 2001 from the WA Municipal Association as follows:-

***“DELEGATES’ VOTING ENTITLEMENT – 2001 CSCA, CUCA AND LGA AGMS***

I refer to the article which appeared in the WAMA Week on 8 June 2001 regarding this matter.

The article sought to advise Chief Executive Officers of the processes which will be implemented by WAMA to ensure that the voting entitlements of Members’ delegates to the 2001 CSCA, CUCA and LGA AGMs are accurately recorded.

This is particularly important given that the number of voting delegates for each Member Local Government is determined by the Constitutions of the CSCA, CUCA and LGA.

The article contained in the WAMA Week also highlighted the fact that assistance of Member Local Governments would be sought to facilitate the compilation of records covering delegates’ voting entitlements, with a fax back form to be provided for this purpose.

The information provided by the Member Local Government will be applied to determine the entitlement of delegates to participate in business sessions during the AGMs. This information will also form the basis of the production of rolls which are to be used during the course of any electoral processes conducted during the AGMs.

Accordingly, it would be appreciated if you could assist WAMA in compiling this information by completing the attached form and returning it as soon as possible.”

***A copy of the Data Sheet for Local Governments is with the attachments marked SM065.5/06/01.***

***An email relating to these special conferences and the minutes of the special conferences of LGA, CSCA and CUCA held on 22 and 23 April is with the attachments marked SM065.5a/06/01.***

It is intended to nominate the following Council representatives:-

Country Shire Councils’ Association  
Councillors Hoyer and Needham

SM065.6/06/01 LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNIT MEETING HELD ON  
FRIDAY, 11 MAY 2001 (A0436-03)

***A copy of the minutes of the LEDU meeting held on Friday, 11 May 2001 is with the attachments marked SM065.6/06/01.***

SM065.7/06/01 MEMBER FOR ROLEYSTONE, MARTIN WHITELY (A0108)

***A copy of the response to issues raised by Councillors and senior staff at a meeting on the 6 March 2001 is with the attachments marked SM065.7/06/01.***

Moved Cr Hoyer seconded Cr Price that the Information Report to 8 June be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

SM066/06/01 EMPLOYMENT OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER – STRATEGIC GRANT FUNDING FOCUS (A0436-03)			
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	David Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	18/6/01
Signatures	Author:	Senior Officer:	
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			

Council to consider employing a dedicated Executive Officer focused on attracting additional grants funds to assist major Council projects.

A number of Councillors (Star, Buttfield, Hoyer, Simpson, Murphy and Price), the Chief Executive Officer, and Mr Murray Jorgensen, (consultant to the Local Economic Development Unit (LEDU)), were given a presentation on Friday 15 June 2001 by representatives from the Western Australian government agency, Commerce and Trade.

It was apparent from the types of funds available through just this one state government agency, that Council, even though is now quite successful in attracting larger sums of money through grants, could be achieving even more funding.

There are a number of state and federal government agencies, which offer a variety of funding opportunities to local government.

Following the presentation the representatives of LEDU and the Councillors in attendance discussed with the Chief Executive Officer and Mr Jorgensen the opportunities which, if resourced, Council could be attracting to assist the major projects which are on the horizon for the Shire.

Such projects included the Jarrahdale Heritage Park, townscape projects in each of the four major towns, renewable energy opportunities, shire recreation facility in Byford, co-location opportunities for Police, Emergency Services and Council etc. The position would be expected to liaise with key Government Agencies and give professional presentations on behalf of Council to attract maximum funding opportunities for the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.

The position could, when established, be self funding, however, given there would be a gap between the time an officer was appointed and funds began to be realised in the first year, Council would need to “under write” the cost of the position in year one by at least 50%.

Therefore it is proposed that Council give consideration to the appointment of a person to the position of Executive Officer initially for a two (2) year (with an option of a 12 month) to three (3) year contract term at a salary of \$60,000 per annum, which is considered consummate with the role and responsibilities that are associated with this position. The position should be able to attract additional funding to sustain itself after the first year. However in 2001-2002 Council should budget at least 50% of salaries for the position based upon timing given the earliest a person could be appointed following the adoption of the 2001-2002 budget may be August 2001.

The Chief Executive Officer has delegated authority to employ staff approved in the 1999 Gerard Daniels Australia (GDA), Organisational Review under delegation – AF 22 Staff Matters;

**AF-22. Staff Matters:**

*Delegated authority be granted to the Chief Executive Officer to re-appraise, re-categorise, remunerate and employ permanent and casual staff within appropriate awards and budget constraints (s 5.41 (g) Local Government Act 1995).*

*The exception being designated senior staff on contract, which will require Chief Executive Officer and Council input (s5.37 (2) Local Government Act 1995).*

*Note: Any additional positions, other than those endorsed in the GDA Organisational Review 1999 by Council, which are unable to be accommodated within budget constraints, are to be referred to Council for approval.*

As this is an additional position, which has not been approved by Council in the GDA Organisational Review 1999, and therefore will be an additional staff position to those identified in the GDA Organisational Review to be included the 2001-2002 budget considerations, Council endorsement is required.

**Statutory Environment:**

In accordance with Council delegation AF-22, Local Government Officers Award, 2-3 year Contract Position. Consideration will be given to the position be offered as a part-time arrangement if it is more suitable to achieving the best candidate for the position.

**Policy Implications:**

No policy implications

**Financial Implications:**

Council will need to “underwrite” the position by at least 50% of cost until position is established. However, it is intended that the position will attract additional funding and “leverage-up” current program funding well in excess of the proposed salary.

**Strategic Implications:**

The position will initially report to the Chief Executive Officer and be dedicated to achieving additional resources to achieve the outcomes identified in Council Strategic Plan 2001-2005, and Principal Activities Plan

2001-2005. This position is not intended to become responsible for “low level” grants, or a resource to community group seeking grant funding. This responsibility will remain at the Community Development Officer and Service Team level.

**Community Consultation:** Not applicable

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**CRSM066 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Hoyer seconded Cr Price that the position of Executive Officer, as outlined within the above item SM066/06/01, is approved by Council to be included the 2001/2002 budget considerations and is in addition to any staff positions identified in the GDA Organisational Review 1999.  
CARRIED 8/0

7.5 Planning Development & Environment Meeting – 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

**COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Needham seconded Cr Hoyer  
The minutes of the Planning Development & Environment Committee Meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001 be received.  
CARRIED 8/0

**ENVIRONMENT**

E028/06/01	LOT 99 SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY, MARDELLA – CONSERVATION COVENANT (P00033) “ <b>Confidential</b> ”			
Proponent	Mr Robert Blackburn & Ms Jacqueline Bowen			
Officer	Andrew Del Marco – Environmental Officer	Date of Report	11/6/01	
Signatures	Author:	Senior Officer:		
Previously	E016/03/01			
Disclosure of Interest				
Delegation	Council			

**CRE028 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Simpson that

1. Council receives and notes the legal advice from McLeod and Co Barristers and Solicitors dated 18 May 2001.
2. Council not pursue legal proceedings on the applicant of Lot 99 South Western Highway with respect to non-compliance of condition 4 on the planning approval for a wholesale nursery issued 5 July 1999.
3. Council informs the applicant of Lot 99 South Western Highway, Mardella and the Ministry for Planning Bush Forever Office of its decision.
4. Council requests the Ministry for Planning to acquire the Bush Forever site because the covenant cannot be obtained and this would be the only way to assure its retention, in conjunction with that part of the road reserve which is also in the Bush Forever plan.
5. Council draws to the applicant's attention Councils Amendment No. 61 and the Commonwealths Biodiversity Act 2000.

CARRIED 8/0

## PLANNING

P155/06/01 PROPOSED REZONING OF LOT 4 RANDELL ROAD, MUNDIJONG FROM RURAL TO FARMLET (P00881)			
Proponent	Dykstra and Associates		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	18/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Council</b>		

Owner:	P Purich
Applicant:	Dykstra and Associates
Lot Area:	17.7095ha
L.A. Zoning:	Rural
MRS Zoning:	Rural
Rural Strategy Policy Area:	Farmlet
Rural Strategy Overlay:	N/A
Bush Forever:	N/A
Date of Inspection:	18 May 2001

### **Preamble**

Council to consider an amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.2 to rezone the subject land from Rural to Farmlet. It is recommended that an amendment be initiated accordingly.

### **Background**

The applicant's amendment report provides the following information:

#### **"Soils"**

*The site is predominantly covered by duplex soils of grey/cream or brown sands over clay. In the north western corner soils are primarily sandy clays of alluvial origin and to the south east, soils become more sandy in nature, and are of eolian origin. Overall, the soils on site are poorly drained in nature, especially to the north and west of the subject site.*

#### **Hydrology**

*The site drains gently west through a drainage system which takes water south of Randell Road and then eventually west to the Serpentine River.*

*The site is prone to waterlogging, especially on the north western side of the lot. Drainage flows west to join the Serpentine River and thus the site is included in the Peel Harvey Catchment.*

*Shallow groundwater is available and there is water storage on site.*

#### **Vegetation**

*The land is totally cleared apart from remnant eucalyptus in the south east corner of the site around the horse track, dwelling, and turkey shed.*

#### **Visual Attributes**

*The subject land is gently undulating, and with the planting of trees on the boundaries of individual lots, the internal exposure of the proposed subdivision will be very minimal. The presence of vegetation along the eastern side of the front boundary will help to negate the need for any extensive revegetation along this external boundary. The design of large lots*



*with building envelopes and no frontage to a major road improves the discrete nature of the proposed subdivision from a visual perspective.*

#### Servicing

*Electricity and telecommunication services are available to the subject land. Domestic water supply will be via site domestic rainwater tanks.*

*Given the natural drainage capabilities of the land, stormwater management is to occur on site through the use of soakwells for roof water.*

#### Land Capability

*Alternative waste water systems will be required on all lots and are sustainable because the lot sizes are 4.0ha. The grey-brown sand/clay duplex soils on the southern part of the site have between 200mm and 300mm thickness of natural sand with shallow perched water tables.*

#### Bushfire Control

*It is proposed that in accordance with normal local fire regulations, a firebreak system be implemented internally around the perimeter of individual lots.*

It is understood that specific bush fire requirements will need to be negotiated with the local Bush Fire Board as required, and that limited clearing around building sites will be encouraged to assist fire control.”

#### Comments

##### Current Use

The land has been cleared for many years and is currently used for horse grazing and a turkey farm.

##### Rural Strategy

The subject land is within the Farmlet Policy Area recommending a minimum lot size of 4.0ha. The application complies with the Strategy.

##### Subdivision Design

The Subdivision Guide Plan reflects the proposal to create four (4) farmlet lots of approximately 4ha. All lots are to be accessed via Randell Road, the applicant advises so as to capitalise on an existing structure and reducing run off from additional impervious surfaces. Further, with all lots having frontage to Randell Road it will be possible to ensure that each lot has a higher developable area and a lower area at the rear.

The applicant considers building envelopes have been positioned to take into account:

- The topography of the land;
- Proximity to the access road;
- Location of existing buildings;
- Land capability; and
- Existing vegetation

The applicant advises that individual lots are to be landscaped with appropriate native species in accordance with an agreed landscape plan that is to be submitted and approved

by Council prior to works commencing. The general areas of planting are indicated on the Subdivision Guide Plan and will be further detailed through the Landscape Plan.

***A copy of the Subdivision Guide Plan is with the attachments marked P155.1/06/01.***

The Development Control Unit support an amendment being initiated subject to requirements listed below.

**Statutory Environment:** Town Planning and Development Act 1928

**Policy Implications:** Rural Strategy

**Financial Implications:** Nil

**Strategic Implications:** Nil

**Community Consultation:** Not applicable at this time

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

### **Discussion**

Cr Murphy explained that there are trails that Council wishes to develop in the area proposed for rezoning to allow people to access facilities at the top end of Webb Road.

A trails study recently undertaken recommended that Webb Road be reduced in width to accommodate a bridle trail/multi use path. A slight change in the location of the rezoning area would be required.

This proponent agreed to liaise with Council in the near future with regard to a bridle trail in the area.

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

Council, pursuant to Section 7 of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928 (as amended), resolves to initiate an amendment to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2 by rezoning Lot 4 Randell Road, Mundijong from "Rural" to "Farmlet" in accordance with application dated 20 February 2001 and associated subdivision guide plan subject to submission of five copies of suitably prepared amending documents and subject to:

1. Provisions to be based on Councils other existing Farmlet estates;
2. Nomination of revegetation areas (local species) on subdivision guide plan at rate of 25% on each proposed lot at 600 stems per hectare and planted prior to clearance of subdivision in accordance with Council's Planning Guidelines for Nutrient Management;
3. Strategic firebreak arrangements/emergency access ways and provisions with respect to static water supply and fire management issues are to be provided to the satisfaction/specification of Council's Fire and Emergency Services Officer as part of the Fire Management Plan which is to be completed prior to subdivision clearance;
4. Alternative effluent disposal systems are required;
5. Bridle path to be constructed within the Webb Road reserve fronting the subdivision in accordance with Council's Bridle Path Construction Policy;
6. Revegetation areas to be altered to consolidate the revegetation into the northern end of the lots;
7. Upgrade of Randell Road is required to Council's satisfaction;
8. Revegetation that is planted on site by the subdivider shall be fenced prior to the introduction of stock onto the property (to be Special Provision);
9. Install fencing in accordance with Council's fencing local law.

### **CRP155 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Simpson that Council, pursuant to Section 7 of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928 (as amended), resolves to initiate an amendment to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2 by rezoning Lot 4 Randell Road, Mundijong from “Rural” to “Farmlet” in accordance with application dated 20 February 2001 and associated subdivision guide plan subject to submission of five copies of suitably prepared amending documents and subject to:

1. Provisions to be based on Councils other existing Farmlet estates;
2. Nomination of revegetation areas (local species) on subdivision guide plan at rate of 25% on each proposed lot at 600 stems per hectare and planted prior to clearance of subdivision in accordance with Council's Planning Guidelines for Nutrient Management;
3. Strategic firebreak arrangements/emergency access ways and provisions with respect to static water supply and fire management issues are to be provided to the satisfaction/specification of Council's Fire and Emergency Services Officer as part of the Fire Management Plan which is to be completed prior to subdivision clearance;
4. Alternative effluent disposal systems are required;
5. Bridle path to be constructed in accordance with Councils bridle path construction policy and a suitable road reserve to be decided in consultation with Council;
6. Revegetation areas to be altered to consolidate the revegetation into the northern end of the lots;
7. Upgrade of Randell Road is required to Council's satisfaction;
8. Revegetation that is planted on site by the subdivider shall be fenced prior to the introduction of stock onto the property (to be Special Provision);
9. Install fencing in accordance with Council's fencing local law.

CARRIED 8/0

### **BUILDING**

B33/06/01 PROPOSED OAKFORD COMMUNITY CENTRE (RS0158)			
Proponent	Council		
Officer	Andrew Watson - Director Sustainable Development	Date of Report	08.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P123/03/01, CRD26/02/01		
Disclosure of Interest	Cr KR Murphy (Oakford/Oldbury Community Association member)		
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

### **Preamble**

The purpose of this report is to provide a status report on the proposed Oakford Community Centre prior to Council setting its 2001/2002 budget.

### **Background**

At its meeting of 19 March 2001, Council's Planning Development and Environment Committee, in accordance with delegated authority under Resolution C061/10/00 resolved:

*Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Needham that*

- 1 *Council receives and notes the report on the results of public advertising of the proposal to construct a community hall on Reserve 41485, Foxton Drive, Oakford.*
- 2 *Council commences construction of the community hall on Reserve 41485, Foxton Drive, Oakford with the \$10 000 included in the 2000/2001 budget and makes provision for completion of the project in the 2001/2002 budget.*

*Carried 4/0*

Council's adopted Principal Activities Plan relies on a one third contribution (\$30,000) cash or in-kind from the community (Oakford Oldbury Association Inc.) towards the 2001/2002 proposed budget allocation of \$90,000.

The Oakford Oldbury Association were advised by way of letter dated 23 February 2001 of the need for a one third contribution. On 18 May and 5 June the Association was requested to specify exactly which components of the project the Association would be responsible for as part of their contribution. At the time of writing, no detailed response had been received. By way of facsimile dated 8 June 2001, however, the Association advises they intend seeking a Lotteries Commission grant for \$30,000 or, alternatively, will conduct a fund raising campaign to secure funds. **A copy of the Association's facsimile is with the attachments marked B33/06/01.1.**

At its meeting of 26 February 2001 Council resolved, inter alia:

- 3 Council endorses the floor layout for the proposed community hall at Reserve 41485, Oakford, with elevations adapted from the Keysbrook Hall and Fire Station.

At that time detailed elevations for the Oakford site had not been prepared. **Plans for the Oakford site have now been prepared and are with the attachments marked B33/06/01.2.**

### **Comments**

At the time of writing, the following works have been carried out:

- Design and documentation;
  - Site works and sand pad; and
  - Supply and lay concrete pad
- Expenditure to date is \$11,850.45.

The Department of Land Administration has advised that management order documents are currently with Crown Land Titling, and although they have given consent to the works carried out thus far, further works should not be carried out until the management order is finalised.

In the absence of a firm commitment from the Oakford Oldbury Association, commencement of the project upon adoption of the budget is not recommended.

**Statutory Environment:** Local Government Act 1995, Land Administration Act

**Policy Implications:** Nil

**Financial Implications:** The Oakford community facility is included in the 2001-2005 Principal Activities Plan under the Recreation and Culture section for the year 2001/2002. The project has an estimated cost in the Principal Activities Plan for that year of \$90,000

The 2000/2001 budget includes an allocation of \$10,000 primarily for design, documentation and investigation (BOR902). These monies are over-expended and the 2001/2002 allocation should be reduced accordingly

**Strategic Implications:** Construction of a new community facility at Oakford

**Community Consultation:** Consultation in accordance with Council Community Consultation Policy has been carried out

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

- 1 That Council makes provision for \$58,150 in the 2001/2002 budget for completion of the Oakford Community facility with a further \$30,000 in-kind/cash from the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc.
- 2 That Council endorses the revised building elevations and floor plans for the proposed Oakford Community facility.
- 3 That Council endorses the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc's intention to apply for Lotteries funding as part of their one third contribution towards the proposed Oakford Community Centre.
- 4 That commencement of the Oakford Community facility in 2001/2002 financial year occurs when Council receives a detailed financial plan of the community contribution to the project from the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc or confirmation is provided by the Association that the Lotteries Commission has agreed to grant \$30,000 to the project.

**CRB33 COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Richards

- 1 That Council makes provision for \$58,150 in the 2001/2002 budget for completion of the Oakford Community facility with a further \$30,000 in-kind/cash from the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc.
- 2 That Council endorses the revised building elevations and floor plans for the proposed Oakford Community facility.
- 3 That Council endorses the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc's intention to apply for Lotteries funding as part of their one third contribution towards the proposed Oakford Community Centre.
- 4 That commencement of the Oakford Community facility in 2001/2002 financial year occurs when Council receives a detailed financial plan of the community contribution to the project from the Oakford Oldbury Association Inc or confirmation is provided by the Association that the Lotteries Commission has agreed to grant \$30,000 to the project.
5. If the Oakford Community facility is to be completed in the year 2001-2002 that the Council contribution of \$70,000 be financed by raising a loan.

CARRIED 8/0

B34/06/01 SCHEDULED BUILDING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM – PAINTING 2000/2001 (A0751)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Wayne Chant - Principal Building Surveyor	Date of Report	11.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	N/A		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### **Preamble**

Council is requested to endorse the Principal Building Surveyor's actions in carrying out the scheduled painting works this financial year.

### **Background**

The Scheduled Building Maintenance Program contained an extensive painting component to be completed this financial year. For ease of administration and in an effort to obtain the most competitive prices, all painting works were advertised as a package.

### **Comments**

Quotations were received from three painting contractors. Jobs were awarded to two contractors on the basis of price, with Pedrini Painting & Decorating being awarded the buildings in Mundijong and Byford, and local contractor M Jeffs was awarded the Serpentine and Jarrahdale buildings.

The table below provides a comparison of allocated funds compared with actual costs for the buildings scheduled to be painted. The actual cost includes GST.

Building	Schedule Allocation	Budget Allocation	Actual Cost
Mundijong Netball Change Rooms	\$1,320.00	\$1,320.00	\$608.30
Mundijong Meeting Place	\$11,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$12,334.60
Mundijong Pavilion	\$1,650.00	\$1,650.00	\$908.60
House - 7 Anstey Street, Mundijong	\$880.00	\$880.00	\$798.60
Ivan Elliott Pavilion	\$880.00	\$880.00	\$620.00
Serpentine Public Toilets	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$320.00
Byford Hall	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00	\$1,170.40
Briggs Park BMX Toilets	\$330.00	\$880.00	\$437.80
Briggs Park Change Rooms	\$4,840.00	\$3,440.00	\$4,590.00
Briggs Park Pavilion	\$3,300.00	\$3,300.00	\$798.60
Bruno Gianatti Hall	\$1,650.00	\$1,650.00	\$630.00
Old Jarrahdale Post Office	\$4,400.00	\$3,000.00	\$1,100.00
Mundijong Hall	\$10,340.00	\$10,340.00	\$4,679.40
Mundijong Public Toilet	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$1,144.00
Mundijong Depot	\$4,000.00	\$3,600.00	\$4,431.00
Mundijong Railway Station			\$1,133.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$48,000.00</b>	<b>\$38,340.00</b>	<b>\$35,904.30</b>

Purchase orders have been raised and the painting program is mostly completed.

### **Statutory Environment:**

Local Government Act 1995

**Policy Implications:** Painting works scheduled for completion this financial year in accordance with the Scheduled Building Maintenance Program have been carried out

**Financial Implications:** Individual building maintenance accounts may be over-expended in some instances, however, the total actual cost is less than the total budgeted amount contained within the 2000/2001 budget

**Strategic Implications:** All Council owned community buildings are to be maintained in a satisfactory state and suitable for user groups

**Community Consultation:** N/A

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**CRB34 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham that Council endorses the Principal Building Surveyor's actions scheduled in completing painting works scheduled for this financial year given that the total cost of all painting works is less than the total funds allocated in the 2000/2001 budget for painting of buildings.  
CARRIED 8/0

B36/06/01 PROPOSED SERPENTINE SPORTS RESERVE ABLUTION FACILITY (A0369, RS0115-04)			
Proponent	Principal Building Surveyor		
Officer	Wayne Chant - Principal Building Surveyor	Date of Report	15.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	B14/11/00, B24/02/01		
Disclosure of Interest	Cr J Star		
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

**Preamble**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a progress report on the ablution facility and to request Council to carry forward unspent funds to next financial year to permit completion of the building.

**Background**

Council obtained a grant of up to \$40,000 from the Ministry of Sport and Recreation for construction of an ablution facility at the Serpentine Sports Reserve. This grant was provided for building works on the basis that Council would contribute an equal amount with a further cash or in kind contribution coming from community groups.

Since this grant approval, the proposed building has undergone some design modifications to incorporate additional facilities. There has also been some difficulty in obtaining and then quantifying community group contributions.

At its meeting of 19 February 2001 the Planning Development & Environment Committee resolved under delegation:

*Moved Cr Star seconded Cr Rankin*

- 1 That Council endorses the revised location for the ablution facility at the Serpentine Sports Reserve.
- 2 That Council endorses the floor layout for the pavilion (including ablution facility) at the Serpentine Sports Reserve (mirror image to the plan with the attachments).
- 3 That Council commences site works for the ablution facility at the Serpentine Sports Reserve immediately, with a further report to be submitted to Council confirming that the one third contribution can be achieved to satisfy the Ministry of Sport and Recreation grant requirements, before works beyond this are commenced.

CARRIED 4/0

### **Comments**

Contributions from community groups are continuing to be negotiated. To date the commitments made are sufficient to warrant the project's continuation.

Works undertaken so far include design and documentation, site works, relocation of the BioMax treatment system and plumbing prelay. Prison labour has been arranged for placing the concrete to footings and floor slab.

Unfortunately, the project will not be able to be completed this financial year and funds will therefore need to be carried over for inclusion in the 2001/2002 budget. A deferral request has been submitted to the Ministry of Sport and Recreation so that the grant may be acquitted next financial year.

**Statutory Environment:** N/A

**Policy Implications:** N/A

**Financial Implications:** Of the \$50,000 committed in the 2000/2001 budget \$22,940 has been spent on the project to date. It is proposed to carry forward the remaining \$27,060 plus allocating an additional \$10,000 to cover the costs of an effluent disposal system larger than that originally proposed.

**Strategic Implications:** Completion of an ablution facility at Serpentine Sports Reserve as listed in the Principal Activities Plan.

**Community Consultation:** Serpentine Sports Reserve Groups consulted.

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

### **CRB36 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham

- 1 That Council carries forward the unexpended amount contained within account BOR900 to permit completion of the Serpentine Sports Reserve Ablution Facility next financial year.
- 2 That Council allocates an additional \$10,000 in the 2001/2002 for the upgraded effluent disposal system.

CARRIED 8/0



## HEALTH

H25/06/01	VACANCY – WAMA MEMBER – WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW HEALTH (TREATMENT OF SEWAGE & DISPOSAL OF EFFLUENT AND LIQUID WASTE) REGULATIONS 1974 (A0163-02)		
Proponent	Western Australian Municipal Association		
Officer	H Hunter - Principal Environmental Health Officer	Date of Report	11.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	N/A		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

### Preamble

Member Councils are invited to submit nominations for a Western Australian Municipal Association member to be part of the working group to review Health (Treatment of Sewage & Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974.

### Background

Qualifications:	Elected member or serving officer experienced in or with a knowledge/interest in providing input in regards to the issue of self certification of plumbing work on unsewered properties, and the creation of a technical standard for wastewater system manufacture and approval.
Term:	Two years
Commences:	Upon appointment
Reason for Vacancy:	Current member resigned
Meetings:	Monthly/bi-monthly
Location:	Grace Vaughan House, 227 Stubbs Terrace, Shenton Park
	Day/time: To be advised
	Duration: 1 – 2 hours
	Meeting fee: Nil
Terms of reference:	The Committee will input to creation of a technical standard for wastewater systems

### Comments

Nominations close on 13 July 2001. The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale has been, until the provision of a reticulated sewerage system in Byford, dependent on on-site effluent disposal. This dependency will continue for some years in the Rural Living type developments in the Shire and it would seem to be advantageous for representation from the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale to be on this working party. It is suggested that the Manager Assessments/Principal Environmental Health Officer, with her hands-on technical knowledge of effluent disposal and contact with plumbers and drainers, would be a suitable person to represent the Western Australian Municipal Association on this working group.

<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Health Act 1911; Health (Treatment of Sewage & Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974
--------------------------------------	--

<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	Nil
------------------------------------	-----

<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Unknown at this stage
---------------------------------------	-----------------------

<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	Nil
---------------------------------------	-----

**Community Consultation:** N/A

**Voting Requirements:** Normal

**Officer Recommended Resolution**

That Council not make a nomination for the position of Western Australian Municipal Association member – working group to review Health (Treatment of Sewage & Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974.

**CRH25 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham that subject to the Manager Assessments' agreement, the Manager Assessments be nominated for the position of Western Australian Municipal Association member – working group to review Health (Treatment of Sewage & Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974.

The Officer's Recommendation was changed because of the strategic importance to Council of having a representative on the working group  
CARRIED 8/0

H26/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	N/A		
Officer	H Hunter – Principal Environmental Health Officer	Date of Report	11.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	N/A		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Council</b>		

H26.1/06/01 Delegated Authority – May 2001 (A0039)

CS1 – Section 26

Building applications – effluent approvals 12

CS6 – Licence & Registrations

Eating House 2

CS7 – Temporary Accommodation

Lapsed approval 3

H26.2/06/01 WA Bluemetal Quarry – Noise (A0831-02/A0637-02)

The Department of Environmental Protection has asked Ransberg P/L to “show cause” by 25 June 2001 why WA Bluemetal should not be prosecuted for a breach of Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986.

***A copy of the Department of Environmental Protection letter to Ransberg P/L is with the attachments marked H26.2/06/01.***

H26.3/06/01 Jarrahdale Skate Park (RS0129-02/A0637-02)

A number of complaints have been received from residents opposite the skate park which recently opened on one of the tennis courts in Wanliss Street.

In February 2001, Council's Environmental Health Officer (Noise Officer) was asked to record sound levels during a trial. The equipment was of ferro-concrete/steel construction, the ramps being ferro-concrete (borrowed from the Briggs Park facility).

The equipment installed in Jarrahdale was of totally different construction with sheet steel ramps enclosed in sheet steel. It was initially installed without the advertised "sound deadening" material and the first use drew heated complaints. Sight readings of the sound level indicated levels in excess of the assigned noise levels. The sounds were recorded on a DAT recorder.

The equipment manufacturers then installed the noise attenuating material and a further recording was made whilst the equipment was in use. Again the sight readings indicated levels above the assigned noise levels.

It is pointed out that neither tape has been analysed, however, in the opinion of the Principal Environmental Health Officer, sufficient evidence exists to deem the noise produced unreasonable within the meaning of the Act.

On 11 June 2001, the Director Sustainable Development and Council's Noise Officer met on site with skate park committee members and Mr M Fry, Noise Consultant, Australian Acoustical Services. The purpose was to discuss possible solutions. Following are notes of the meeting:

- Suggestions included filling ramps with expanding foam, painting a coating on the ramps and putting up sound barriers
- Mr Fry was given the DAT recordings previously made and he took measurements of the size of the court and the position of the equipment
- Mr Fry was asked to give Council some recommendations on how to get the noise to a reasonable level and also to give an assessment of the Bruno Gianatti Hall car park. He said he would also look at the skate park in Mead Street, Byford
- Mr Fry said that he would listen to the DAT tapes and contact the Shire during the week

The Principal Environmental Health Officer also suggests that rubber matting, similar to the material used for cricket wickets, be placed between the ramps to reduce the noise made by skateboard braking.

### **Officer Recommended Resolution**

That Council accepts the May 2001 Information Report.

### **CRH26 COUNCIL DECISION/Committee Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Price seconded Cr Needham

- 1 That Council accepts the May 2001 Information Report.
- 2 Councillors have received complaints about noise from the WA Bluemetal crusher. A meeting with the community group to be reconvened and Department of Environmental Protection Officers invited to attend.
- 3 Jarrahdale Skate Park working group to be reconvened in order to discuss solutions to the problems currently being experienced after the consultant's report is received.

CARRIED 8/0

**8. MOTION OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

**9. ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDING MEMBER**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Price that the President's Report be dealt with out of order.

CARRIED 7/1

Cr Star made the following announcements:

- On behalf of Council, I would like to congratulate the Endurance Riders Association, led by Murray Dalton on a very successful Quilty Ride. I'm sure that all the riders were very happy with the course and the venue and in fact received good feedback to this effect. 129 riders took part with a high proportion completing the 160 km (100 mile) ride in less than 24 hours.

It was estimated over 4000 people visited the vent with 700 actually camping there. This of course was economically important for the Shire. Tumbulgum Farm proved very suitable and showed its potential for equestrian activities.

- I would also like to congratulate a local high school student, Jamie Summerfield, who took part and completed the Quilty ride. I had the pleasure of presenting Jamie with a Shire sponsored Academic Excellence Award for Year 10 student at Armadale Senior High School this week.

**10. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING:**

**10.1 INCLUDING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER/OFFICER REPORTS**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Hoyer that Item CRD52/06/01 be dealt with as an item of new business of an urgent nature.

CARRIED 8/0

CRD52/06/01	PROPOSED SHIRE SPORT, LEISURE & RECREATION CENTRE, BYFORD (A0195 & P00420)		
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	D.E Price - Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	22-06-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P228/04/99; P252/04/99; P276/06/99; R02/09/99, SM007/11/00, CRD35/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

**Preamble**

Council direction is required regarding the preparation of Community Sport & Recreation Facilities Funding application and associated concept plan.

**Background**

The following was resolved in relation to the above facility at the April 2001 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

- 1 That the facility be progressed in two stages. Stage 1 - BYFORD RECREATION CENTRE: BRIGGS PARK MODEL C (YMCA APRIL 2001) being the dry components in 2002/2003 as per the draft 2001-2005 Principal Activities Plan, and Stage 2 being

- the inclusion of wet components, at a later time taking into account the YMCA March 2001 recommendations.
- 2 That the BYFORD RECREATION CENTRE: BRIGGS PARK MODEL B (YMCA MARCH 2001) is adopted as the Stage 1 and Stage 2 “preferred” concept plan for the Shire’s primary indoor recreation facility.
  - 3 Subject to 2001/2002 budget funding and Council’s purchasing guidelines, the YMCA be requested to provide a quotation to undertake the appointment of preferred architects to prepare a concept design. The concept design is to reflect the Shire’s primary indoor recreation facility (MODEL B), but to be developed in two stages being Stage 1 MODEL C (2002/2003) and Stage 2 (Future Years). The concept plan is to be presented back to Council for endorsement prior to seeking public comment, and any minor amendments to it following Council and public consultation are also required to taken into consideration by the appointed architects.
  - 4 Following a public consultation process, comments are to be referred back to Council for consideration with a report presented to Council seeking approval of the final concept design.
  - 5 Following Council’s approval of the final concept design, tenders for the preparation of construction drawings, reflecting optimum energy efficiency and sustainability principles, are to be called. Council also agrees as part of this process to consider commissioning, or specifying in the contract documentation for the construction drawings, “the YMCA to critique the construction drawings in reference to management operations”.
  - 6 Subject to 2001/2002 budget, Council requests a quotation from the YMCA to prepare a funding plan for Stage 1 of the project.
  - 7 Subject to 2001/2002 budget approval, Council delegates authority to the Chief Executive Officer to appoint appropriate consultants associated with recommendations 3 and 6 above.
  - 8 *Mr Bauchop and Mr Kitchin of the YMCA be thanked for their presentation.*

Council resolved in May 2001 the following in relation to seeking funding to assist in the cost of the proposed Shire Recreation Facility;

1. *Council requests the Chief Executive Officer to commence seeking grant funding within the parameters defined in the Adopted 2001-2005 Principal Activities Plan to assist in the capital and operational costs associated with the proposed Shire Recreation Facility.*

### **Comments**

In accordance with the above, the YMCA have provided budget estimates for the work associated with parts 3 and 6 of the April decision of Council.

The YMCA has provided a quotation dated 29 May 2001 in accordance with Councils April decision. A copy of what is proposed is provided at **Attachment “CRD52.1/06/01”** for Councils information.

Part 6 of the April resolution was to identify a funding plan. One of the key areas of funding for such a project is through the Ministry of Sport and Recreation “Community Sport & Recreation Facilities Funding (CSRFF) program”.

The YMCA has requested some direction in relation to their appointment to prepare the Shires CSRFF funding application and also the appointment of a consultant to develop the concept plan in accordance with Council’s decision of April. The concept planning stage is likely to take between 8 and 12 weeks from start to finish and essential to the Council and community consultation process, as well as a requirement of the CSRFF funding application.

The applications for funding of projects in 2002-2003 close in October 2001. Given, that this is only four (4) months away and a number of tasks have to be completed to meet this

timeline, the YMCA have prepared the following proposal to prepare and submit the Shire of Serpentine grant application for the Shire Recreation Facility on time.

It is proposed, subject to final budget approval, that the YMCA will be appointed to undertake the compilation and submission of a CSRFF grant application for the Shire. However, given the closing date for local government applications is the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2001 and the amount of funding Council has sought to attract to assist in the cost of this facility (up to \$2,000,000 (reference - 2001-2005 S-J Plan of Principal Activities)), timing has become very important.

It is important that the proper Council and community consultation does occur in developing the concept plan and grant submission. To assist the process, the YMCA have suggested that they could seek three (3) quotations, in accordance with Councils "Purchase of Goods and Services" guidelines, for the preparation of a concept plan and then make a recommendation to the Chief Executive Officer on the preferred consultant for final approval (as the cost will be less than \$50,000, Council does not have to call tenders).

The YMCA acknowledges that Council at present is not able to provide absolute certainty regarding the funding of this consultancy. However, given that this project is proposed in the 2001-2005 Plan of Principal Activities, it anticipated that funding would be included in the budget to engage the YMCA and a consultant undertake the concept plan. To address concerns in relation to Councils exposure which may be associated with an early start on the projects, the YMCA suggest the following interim arrangement if agreeable to Council:

Initially, Council would only incur any costs associated with the works undertaken by the YMCA and consultant from the date of appointment. Should the budget for this project not be approved then only the costs associated for the works undertaken by both the YMCA and the appointed consultant (concept planning works) for the period between when they are appointed and Council adopts the budget will be charged to Council.

However if funding for this project be included in the 2001-2002 adopted budget, the accepted quoted lump sum fee will apply. (It is likely that Council would not receive the first invoice for any works undertaken until after the budget was adopted in any case).

A budget estimate from a suitably qualified consultant able to undertake the concept plan is provided as **Attachment "CRD52.2/06/01"** for Council information.

Council 2001-2005 Plan of Principal Activities has funding of \$150,000 in 2001-2002 (Special Purpose Investment fund) to undertake concept planning, funding, plus preparing the design drawings associated with the facility. Discussions with the YMCA and a number of consultants indicate that more innovative ideas plus the added benefit of considerable savings may be achieved by Council calling for tenders from appropriate organisations for the "design and construction" of the facility, rather than separating the design from the construction phase as was costed in the 2001-2005 Plan of Principal Activities. Therefore, the 2001-2002 budget has been framed to enable the following activities. It should be noted that the preparation for Design, Construction and Fit Out phase activities shown in 2001-2002 are dependent on how successful Council is in attracting the targeted amount of grant funding;

## **Shire Recreation Facility - Byford**

2001-2002 Est Costs(22.06.01)

### **Concept Planning & Funding**

**2001-2002**

Develop Concept plan	\$20,000	July-Aug
Community Consultation/Compilation of CSRFF Grant Application	\$25,000	July-Oct
Preparation of Funding Plan	\$9,000	July-Dec
	<u>\$54,000</u>	

### **Design, Construction & Fit Out Phase**

Project Management & Quantity Surveying	\$19,500	Mar-May
Tender Evaluation	\$11,000	May-June
YMCA critique of preferred tender	\$4,000	June
	<u>\$34,500</u>	

Est Total 2001-2002	<u><b>\$88,500</b></u>
---------------------	------------------------

### **Statutory Environment:**

Local Government Act

### **Policy Implications:**

No policy implications

### **Financial Implications:**

In accepting the proposal put before Council, should the budget not be approved with funding in it to meet the costs of work detailed above for 2001-2002, then Council will incur costs associated for the work undertaken by both the YMCA and the appointed consultant (concept planning works) for the period between when they are appointed and Council adopts the budget.

Council has proposed funding from a reserve account of \$150,000 to undertake concept planning, community consultation, funding applications and design work on the Shire Recreation Facility. It is proposed that Council not budget the full \$150,000 in the 2001-2002 budget, but rather leave funds in the Special Purpose Investment account to assist in the contract administration associated with the construction of the facility in 2002-2003, which has been estimated by an experienced consultant to be between \$45,000 and \$50,000 dollars.

### **Strategic Implications:**

Strategy 1.1 – 2001 –2005 Strategic Plan “Establish a strategy for community facilities and needs as population milestones are met”.

### **Community Consultation:**

Will be a requirement of the work to be undertaken by the YMCA

### **Voting Requirements:**

Normal

**CRCRD52 COUNCIL DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson

To ensure proper Council and community consultation to occur in developing the concept plan and funding application given the timelines all concerned have to work within, Council agrees to accept the YMCA offer to:

1. Commence work immediately on the preparation of the Shires CSRFF application so that the 31 October deadline set by the funding body is met. This is conditional upon Council only being charged for the works undertaken between the appointment of the YMCA and the adoption of the 2001-2002 budget, should funding for this project not be included in it, otherwise the quoted lump sum fee of \$21,850 (plus GST) is agreed and to apply.
2. Seek quotations, in accordance with Councils "Purchase of Goods and Services" guidelines, and then make a recommendation to the Chief Executive Officer on the preferred consultant for final approval and the Chief Executive Officer to then appoint. This is conditional upon Council only being charged for the works undertaken between the appointment of the recommended consultant and the adoption of the 2001-2002 budget, should funding for this project not be included in it, otherwise the quoted lump sum fee is to apply.
3. Council agrees to leave surplus funds in the Special Purpose Investment account to assist in the contract administration associated with the construction of the facility in 2002-2003, which has been estimated by an experienced consultant to be between \$45,000 and \$50,000 dollars.

CARRIED 8/0



Moved Cr Needham seconded Cr Simpson that Item C206/06/01 be dealt with as an item of new business of an urgent nature.  
CARRIED 8/0

C206/06/01	DIFFERENTIAL RATE ADVERTISEMENT 2001/2002 (A0128)		
Proponent	Local Government Act 1995		
Officer	G R Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	22/06/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	C192/06/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Council		

### Preamble

The Local Government Act requires local government to advertise its intention to differential rate prior to the adoption of the annual budget.

### Background

Section 6.36 (1) of the Local Government Act 1995 requires that before imposing any differential general rates a local government is to give local public notice of its intention to do so. The notice may be published within a period of two months preceding the commencement of the financial year, to which they are to apply and give details of each rate and minimum to be imposed. An invitation for submissions to be made by electors or ratepayers within a minimum of 21 days, and any further information in relation to those rates.

The local government is required to consider any submissions received from residents prior to imposing the rates when the annual budget is adopted.

### Comments

Over the last week Council has conducted two rate workshops to formulate the differential rating requirements for the forthcoming budget.

At these workshops a consensus of opinion was gained to make adjustments to the minimum rates by \$10.00 for each category, to increase Gross Rental Value (GRV) differential rates by 4% and increase Unimproved Value (UV) differential rates by 2.75%. Minimum rate for Special Use was increased by \$500 and Special Rural minimum rates have been increased by \$50. These changes provide a revenue income of \$3,613,525 compared with an actual income of \$3,511,781 in 2000/2001. This averages to a general 3% increase in rates.

The workshops also provided that the Rural Living AB differential rate category would be amalgamated into the Special Rural differential rate category as these properties have similar land aspects and uses. This has created a new differential rate category called **Rural Living**. This has seen the minimum rate for these properties increase from \$479 to the Special Rural new minimum rate of \$591. This change will affect 216 Rural Living AB properties. The total number of properties in this amalgamated differential rate is 1436 with 591 on the minimum. A further suggestion is that Farmlet properties also be added to this category as their minimum rate has also been increased to \$591, but their differential rate is slightly less. By adding them in an extra \$250 revenue will be raised from 44 properties.

The differential rate category for Caravan Parks has also been reviewed. Council only has one Caravan Park located on the South West Highway in Serpentine. Currently there are 35 Park Homes located on the site. As these Park Homes are not strata titled the rate is

charged only on the Caravan Park as a whole. Last year the Park was charged \$3000 for the whole site. This would provide an average of \$86 per Park Home per year. The workshops considered increasing the rate in the dollar for this rate category to provide \$150 per Park Home site. This would generate \$5250 per year in rates from the site as a whole. The workshops also suggested that a letter be forwarded to the owner of the Caravan Park and Park Home residents advising of the suggested change. If approved at this meeting a letter will be forwarded during the next week.

Provided below is the differential rate categories for last year and the new suggested differential rates for comparison.

2000/2001				PROPOSED 2001/2001			No PROP'S	No MIN
DIFFERENTIAL RATE	GRV RATE IN \$	UV RATE IN \$	MIN RATE	GRV RATE IN \$	UV RATE IN \$	MIN RATE		
Special Rural	0	0.06275	541		0.006283	591	1121	375
Rural	0.05736	0.05736	491		0.005403	501	1158	279
Residential	0.078227	0	439	0.083959		449	1027	229
Residential Vacant	0.204594	0	439	0.212778		449	99	63
Commercial	0.044282	0	517	0.046053		527	70	32
Public Purposes	0	0.06001	536		0.006164	546	3	1
Public/Commercial	0.226134	0	469	0.235179		479	2	1
Historic	0.134865	0	408	0.14026		418	18	0
Special Use - 1B	0.073187	0	1277	0.076114		1287	4	1
Special Residential	0.075212	0	525	0.07822		535	230	19
Special Residential Vacant	0.170459	0.170459	525	0.177277		535	91	7
Showroom/Warehouse	0.082416	0	485	0.085713		495	4	2
Light Industrial	0.136921	0	536	0.142398		546	25	5
Forest Lease	0	0.05358	422		0.00503	432	2	1
Units- Rowley Rd	0.092074	0	358	0.095757		368	16	0
Caravan Parks	0.038462	0	3000	0.067307		5000	1	0
Special Use - 1A	0.153841	0	4500	0.159995		5000	6	3
Intensive Farming Rural	0	0.06735	569		0.006245	579	15	0
Intensive Farming Farmland	0	0.04676	569		0.006245	579	11	0
Farmland	0	0.03848	479		0.003689	489	324	28
Rural Living A/B	0	0.07181	565		0.006283	591	315	216
Farmlet	0	0.0625	479		0.006283	591	44	5
Conservation	0.02798	0.02798	240		0.002798	250	0	0
Mining Tenement	0	0.206007	679		0.00769	689	29	7
Light Industry/Residential Co	0.08232	0.08232	576		0.008458	586	34	29
Specified Area Rate - Chstn	0.011594	0.011594	0		0.0011594	0		

It is intended to review the rating system in the next financial year as new GRV's will be provided by the Valuer General's Office for 1 July 2002.

The advertisement for these differential rates will also provide an explanation that UV properties differential rate have been adjusted for average changes to their valuations this year, however fluctuations within categories will see variations from the general increases. The advertisement will also explain that the rate in the dollar figures should be applied to the valuations for UV and GRV to determine the actual rate for each property and that property owners may contact Council for these values.

The Department of Local Government has advised that this year they will require Local Governments to forward their adopted differential rate categories to the Minister for Local Government for approval before adopting the annual budget. An explanation of the reason for each differential rate will be required. The Department further states that this will be a three week process. To allow sufficient time for Council to follow the statutory requirements and enable the budget to be adopted in July, the Director Corporate Services will forward a request for approval now and advise the Department of any changes made, if any, after the public comment period is completed.

<b><u>Statutory Environment:</u></b>	Section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995
<b><u>Policy Implications:</u></b>	No policy implications
<b><u>Financial Implications:</u></b>	Will affect the rate revenue raised by Council
<b><u>Strategic Implications:</u></b>	Will provide funding to deliver strategic goals
<b><u>Community Consultation:</u></b>	Statutory requirement to consult with the community
<b><u>Voting Requirements:</u></b>	Normal

**Officer Recommended Resolution**

- The following Proposed differential rates be advertised for public comment in accordance with section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995 :

<b>PROPOSED DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2001/2002</b>	<b>GRV RATE IN \$</b>	<b>UV RATE IN \$</b>	<b>MIN RATE</b>
Rural Living - Special Rural		0.006283	591
Rural Living AB Farmlet			
Rural		0.005403	501
Residential	0.083959		449
Residential Vacant	0.212778		449
Commercial	0.046053		527
Public Purposes		0.006164	546
Public/Commercial	0.235179		479
Historic	0.14026		418
Special Use - 1B	0.076114		1287
Special Residential	0.07822		535
Special Residential Vacant	0.177277		535
Showroom/Warehouse	0.085713		495
Light Industrial	0.142398		546
Forest Lease		0.00503	432
Units- Rowley Rd	0.095757		368
Caravan Parks	0.067307		5000
Special Use - 1A	0.159995		5000
Intensive Farming Rural		0.006245	579
Intensive Farming Farmland		0.006245	579
Farmland		0.003689	489
Conservation		0.002798	250
Mining Tenement		0.00769	689
Light Industry/Residential Comp		0.008458	586
Specified Area Rate - Chstnuts Estate		0.0011594	0

- A letter be forwarded to the Minister for Local Government requesting approval to impose differential rates, in accordance with section 6.33 of the Local Government Act 1995, subject to final notification of any changes made at the completion of the public consultation process.

## **CRC206 COUNCIL DECISION**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Richards

1. The following Proposed differential rates be advertised for public comment in accordance with section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995 :

DIFFERENTIAL RATE	GRV RATE IN \$	UV RATE IN \$	MIN RATE
Special Rural		0.006283	591
Rural		0.005403	501
Residential	0.083959		449
Residential Vacant	0.212778		449
Commercial	0.046053		527
Public Purposes		0.006164	546
Public/Commercial	0.235179		479
Historic	0.14026		418
Special Use - 1B	0.076114		1287
Special Residential	0.07822		535
Special Residential Vacant	0.177277		535
Showroom/Warehouse	0.085713		495
Light Industrial	0.142398		546
Forest Lease		0.00503	432
Units- Rowley Rd	0.095757		368
Caravan Parks	0.067307		5000
Special Use - 1A	0.159995		5000
Intensive Farming Rural		0.006245	579
Intensive Farming Farmland		0.006245	579
Farmland		0.003689	489
Rural Living A/B		0.006283	591
Farmlet		0.006283	591
Conservation		0.002798	250
Mining Tenement		0.00769	689
Light Industry/Residential Comp		0.008458	586
Specified Area Rate - Chstnuts Estate		0.0011594	0

2. A letter be forwarded to the Minister for Local Government requesting approval to impose differential rates, in accordance with section 6.33 of the Local Government Act 1995, subject to final notification of any changes made at the completion of the public consultation process.
3. Increase the minimum for Rural to \$550, Farmland to \$550, Residential to \$460, Residential vacant to \$460.
4. That the Valuer General be asked to provide gross rental values for Rural Living Properties for rating purposes from 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2002.

**CARRIED 8/0 ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

## **10.2 COUNCILLORS QUESTIONS**

## 11. INFORMATION REPORT – COMMITTEE DELEGATED AUTHORITY

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Hoyer that the Information Report be received.  
CARRIED: 8/0

### 11.1 Corporate Services – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

C189/06/01 COUNCILLOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM/S (A0906)			
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	D.E Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	22-05-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### CRC189 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

1. Council endorses the attendance at the 2001 Councillor Development Weekend – Friday 22 June 2001 – Monday 25 June 2001 by interested Councillors’.
2. Councillors’ wishing to attend are to provide their completed registration forms to the Chief Executive Officer by no later than Tuesday 12 June 2001, to enable the registrations to be mailed to Western Australia Municipal Association to meet the closing date of 15 June 2001.

CARRIED 4/0

C190/06/01 COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDING (A0957)			
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	D.E Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	28-05-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	C127/02/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### CRC190 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Murphy:

1. Council agrees to refund \$700 toward Mr Nick Garret undertaking a relevant business leadership course under the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Community Leadership Development Program upon demonstration to the satisfaction of the Chief Executive Officer of relevant receipt and results upon completion.
2. The above must be commenced within 3 months of notification to the successful applicant by Council and completed in the same semester it was commenced. If it is not then the funding is no longer to be made available by Council unless negotiated with the Chief Executive Officer.

CARRIED 4/0

C192/06/01 DIFFERENTIAL RATE ADVERTISEMENT 2001/2002 (A0128)			
Proponent	Local Government Act 1995		
Officer	G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	30.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### **CRC192 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

A workshop be held on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> June 2001 at 12:00 noon to review differential rating scenarios to apply to the 2001/2002 draft budget and for advertising the intention to differential rate in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995.

CARRIED 4/0

Note: The Committee changed the Officer's Recommendation to reflect the time of the meeting.

C197/06/01 CONFIRMATION OF PAYMENT OF CREDITORS (A0917)			
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G.R. Dougall - Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### **CRC197 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

Council notes the payments authorised and made by the Chief Executive Officer, exercising his delegated authority and detailed in the list of invoices for the month of May, presented to the Corporate Services Committee and to Council, per the summaries set out above include Creditors yet to be paid and in accordance with the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

CARRIED 4/0

C198/06/01 DEBTOR ACCOUNTS WITH A BALANCE IN EXCESS OF \$1,000 (A0917)			
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	01/06/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### **CRC198 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

Council receive and note the report on Debtors accounts with a balance in excess of \$1,000 outstanding for 90 days or greater as at 1 June 2001.

CARRIED 4/0

C199/06/01	SUNDRY DEBTOR OUTSTANDING ACCOUNTS (A0917)		
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

**CRC199 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

Council receive and note the report on Sundry Debtor Outstanding Accounts as at 1 June 2001.

CARRIED 4/0

C200/06/01	RATE DEBTORS REPORT (A0917)		
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

**CRC200 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Richards

Council receive and note the report of Rate Debtor accounts as at 1 June 2001.

CARRIED 4/0

C201/06/01	INFORMATION REPORT		
Proponent	Director Corporate Services		
Officer	G.R. Dougall – Director Corporate Services	Date of Report	Various
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

**CRC201 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

The information report to the 5 June 2001 be received.

CARRIED 4/0

C203/06/01 WESTERN POWER REQUEST FOR NATURAL POWER TESTIMONIAL (A0572)			
Proponent	Western Power		
Officer	D.E Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	06-06-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### **CRC203 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Richards:

Council approves the following testimonial by the Chief Executive Officer for use by Western Power in relation to the use of Natural Power.

*"By converting to renewable energy, we are demonstrating how serious we are about protecting the environment for our future generations. We want to play a leading role in social, economic and environmental sustainability. Using renewable energy will reinforce our commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and limit climatic warming. The extra cost associated with NaturalPower will be recovered from the savings made by reducing our level of energy consumption through sound energy management programmes."*

CARRIED 4/0

C204/06/01 MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY-STYLE GUIDE (A0033)			
Proponent	Communication and Marketing Working Group		
Officer	D.E Price-Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	06-06-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	C047/09/00, SM037/03/01, SM043/04/01,		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

### **CRC204/06/01 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

1. Council adopts the refined Corporate Logo as presented and agrees to the use and application of the Council Crest and the Corporate Logo as recommended in the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Style Guide prepared by Esther Price Promotions.
2. Council Management\Service Team Work Procedure CSWP10 Council Crest and Image be amended to reflect the use and application of the Council logo and Crest as detailed in the attached Style Guide.

CARRIED 4/0



C205/06/01 JARRAHDAL E HERITAGE PARK PEEL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION 2001-220 FUNDING REQUEST,(P00509-03)			
Proponent	Chief Executive Officer		
Officer	D.E Price – Chief Executive Officer	Date of Report	08-06-01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	SMO27/02/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **CRC205/06/01 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson:

1. Council agrees to a contribution of \$15,000 cash and \$10,000 in-kind support (total \$25,000) to support to the cost of the Concept Planning process in the 2001-2002 budget.
2. Council endorses the request to the Peel Development Commission seeking a contribution of \$30,000 toward the Concept Plan for the Jarrahdale Heritage Park and authorises the Shire President to sign the letter of request on behalf of Council.

CARRIED 4/0

Note: There was a typographical error in the figures.

### 11.2 Asset Services – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

AS072/06/01 MASTERS ROAD SPEED ZONE (R0154)			
Proponent	SERPENTINE JARRAHDAL E HOLDING YARDS PTY LTD		
Officer	ROBERT HARRIS DIRECTOR ASSET SERVICES	Date of Report	30.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **CRAS072 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Star seconded Cr Buttfield that Main Roads Western Australia be advised that Council concurs with a change in the speed zone on Masters Road between Rowley Road and Thomas Road, Darling Downs, from 80km per hour to 70km per hour.

CARRIED 4/0

**CRAS074 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Note: The Director Asset Services will submit an addendum to the submission regarding the inability of current Department of Environmental Protection livestock holding yard licence conditions to adequately protect the environment.

**CRAS076 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Byford .....	Mr John Woodland
Oakford .....	Mr Len Hofert-Smith
Mundijong.....	Mr Darryl Ronan
Jarrahdale .....	Mr Greg Johnson
Serpentine .....	Mr Dave Robinson – West
	..... Mr Paul Chapman – East
Keysbrook .....	Mr Ken Elliott – West
	..... Mr Graham Parkin – East

***A copy of the Meeting Minutes of Bush Fire Advisory Committee held on 10 May 2001 is included in the attachments at AS076/06/01***

AS077/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	Director Asset Services		
Officer	Various	Date of Report	25.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **CRAS077 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Buttfield seconded Cr Simpson that the Information Report to the end of May 2001 be received.

CARRIED 4/0

### 11.3 Community & Recreation Development – 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

CRD47/06/01 FUNDING: PURPOSE BUILT FACILITY (A0173)			
Proponent	Armadale Home Help Service		
Officer	D Henderson – Acting Community Development Officer	Date of Report	29.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	CRD45/05/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Needham

- 1 That Ms Jan Fletcher be thanked for her attendance at the meeting.
- 2 That Cr Needham, Cr Buttfield, the Community Development Officer and Ms Jan Fletcher form a working group to prepare a detailed proposal, including costings, for further consideration by Council.

CARRIED 4/0

CRD49/06/01 REGIONAL FUNDING REQUESTS (A0168)			
Proponent	Perth Hills Tourism Group		
Officer	David Henderson – Acting Community Development Officer	Date of Report	28.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	CRD34/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Simpson seconded Cr Needham that Cr Price, as Council's delegate to the Perth Hills Group, continue to attend meetings of the Perth Hills Marketing Alliance to ascertain the benefits of Council joining the Alliance.

CARRIED 4/0

CRD51/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	N/A		
Officer	David Henderson – Acting Community Development Officer	Date of Report	30.05.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	N/A		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Richards seconded Cr Simpson that Council accepts the May 2001 information report.

CARRIED 4/0

#### 11.4 Building Services – 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

B35/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	N/A		
Officer	S Searle – Building/Health Support Officer	Date of Report	06.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	N/A		
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Star that Council accepts the May 2001 Information Report.

CARRIED 4/0

#### 11.5 Health Services – 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

H27/06/01 PRINCIPAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER'S RETIREMENT			
Proponent			
Officer		Date of Report	18.06.01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **Preamble**

Today's Committee meeting is the last one Hans Hunter, Principal Environmental Health Officer will be attending.

### **Comments**

The members of the Committee wished to thank Mr Hunter for his years of service as the Principal Environmental Health Officer. They wished him a happy retirement.

11.6 Planning Development & Environment – 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2001

E029/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	Environmental Officer		
Officer	Andrew Del Marco – Environmental Officer	Date of Report	01/06/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

**E029 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Murphy that the Information Report to 12 June 2001 be received.

CARRIED 4/0

P154/06/01 PROPOSED SCHEME AMENDMENT – COMMERCIAL VEHICLE PARKING – PT LOT 12 SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY, BYFORD (A0763-02)			
Proponent	Dykstra and Associates		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	9/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

**P154 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Needham that Council refuses to initiate an amendment to allow for the introduction of commercial vehicle parking as a permissible land use (subject to Council discretion) in the Rural Living A subdivision at Pt Lot 12 South Western Highway, Byford for the following reasons:

1. Prospect for adverse amenity impacts to landowners within the subject Rural Living A estate and nearby community;
2. A principal policy objective of the Rural Living Policy Area under the Rural Strategy is to provide opportunities for a 'rural-living' lifestyle with a greater sense of space and privacy. The proposal with associated noise impacts is seen as contrary to this objective;
3. Amendment No. 94 recently gazetted to provide for the estate was extensively advertised for public comment with the current land use management provisions. It is considered inappropriate that these provisions now be modified/revisited;
4. Support for the amendment would set an undesirable precedent for such land use to be advocated by developers for inclusion in Council's other developed and/or future Rural Living A estates.

CARRIED 4/0

P148/06/01 LAND ACQUISITION FOR TONKIN HIGHWAY EXTENSION (A0471)			
Proponent	Main Roads Western Australia		
Officer	Robert Harris Director Asset Services	Date of Report	18/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

#### **P148 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Murphy, seconded Cr Star that Council concurs with Main Roads proposed taking of the land indicated on Main Roads Drawing No. 9823-118-6 and also its dedication as road under Section 56 of the Land Administration Act for the purposes of the Tonkin Highway including land for service roads and drainage purposes.  
CARRIED 4/0

P149/06/01 PROPOSED WHOLESALE PLANT NURSERY – LOT 381 KARNUP ROAD, HOPELAND (P00150)			
Proponent	K Stevens		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	29/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

#### **P149 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Murphy that Council approves the proposal to establish a Wholesale Plant Nursery at Lot 381 Karnup Road, Hopeland in accordance with the application dated 4 April 2001 and associated plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. Operating hours to public to be restricted to 7.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday;
2. All drainage shall be contained on site to Council's satisfaction;
3. Landscaping to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Environmental Officer in accordance with Council's Info Note PS03 – Landscaping and Revegetation on Developments Policy. Remnant vegetation in the south east corner to be retained and protected to the satisfaction of the Environmental Officer;
4. Landscaping to be implemented by 30 September 2001 and from thereon suitably maintained to Council's satisfaction;
5. The development/use to comply with the Department of Environmental Protection Noise Regulations and any other requirements of that Agency;
6. A bore licence to be obtained from the Water and Rivers Commission;
7. Building licence to be obtained for any development infrastructure;
8. No retail sales to be conducted from the subject premises;
9. Any development structures to be a minimum of 20 metres from front and rear boundaries and 10 metres from side boundaries (NB: Minimum setback(s) may need to be increased as required to accommodate buffer requirements);
10. Any clearing of trees is to be in accordance with Council's Town Planning Scheme provisions;
11. Disabled access and toilet facilities to be provided in accordance with the Building Code of Australia;
12. Provision of static fire/water supply to Council's satisfaction;
13. Use of slow release fertilisers only. In this regard, the applicant is to submit a nutrient and irrigation management plan for the approval of Council prior to commencement of the land use. Applicant to submit nutrient management plan prior to commencement of land use;

- 14 All hardstanding areas (driveway, crossovers, vehicle manoeuvring space/car parking area etc) shall be designed and constructed in accordance with AUSTROADS, Pavements Design or Main Roads WA Engineering Road Note No.9. Details of the Pavement Design shall be shown on detailed engineering drawings to be submitted to and to be to the satisfaction of Council's Design Engineer;
- 15 Signage subject to separate application to Council.

Advice Notes:

1. Control of dieback infection should be instituted in accordance with industry best practice.
2. A nutrient management plan is to have regard to Agriculture WA advice and Councils Drainage and Nutrient Management Guidelines.

CARRIED 4/0

P150/06/01 PROPOSED BED AND BREAKFAST ACCOMMODATION AND TWO HORSE HOLDING YARDS – LOT 22 (NO. 148) NETTLETON ROAD, BYFORD (P00053)			
Proponent	P & M Bolingbroke		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	28/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
Delegation	Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01		

**P150 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Hoyer, seconded Cr Murphy that

- A. Council approves the use of the residence at Lot 22 (No. 148) Nettleton Road, Byford for 'Bed and Breakfast' Accommodation in accordance with the application dated 15 May 2001 and attached plans and subject to the following conditions:
  1. Provision of a minimum two car parking bays on site for guests;
  2. Compliance with Health and Building requirements of Council;
  3. Signposting in heritage theme and colour to be limited to completely within the property and shall not exceed 0.5m<sup>2</sup> (i.e 1.0m x 0.5m) on the property frontage;
  4. Premises subject to occasional inspection by Council's Environmental Health Officer;
  5. Hard wired smoke alarm and lighting to assist evacuation to be installed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia Part 3.7.2 in accordance with the provisions for Class 1b Buildings;
  6. Short Stay accommodation up to five nights only.
5. Council approves two horse holding yards in accordance with the application subject to them being located a minimum of 10 metres from the side boundary of the subject land and 15 metres from the dwelling.

CARRIED 4/0

P151/06/01 LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 2 – SUBDIVISIONS WITHIN THE BYFORD STRUCTURE PLAN AREA (A0975)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Strategic Planner	Date of Report	25/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P128/04/01		
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P151 COMMITTEE DECISION/Officer Recommended Resolution**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Murphy that Council pursuant to Part 9 of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, resolves to adopt Local Planning Policy No.2 – Subdivisions within the Byford Structure Plan Area as follows:

### **LOCAL PLANNING POLICY NO.2 – SUBDIVISION WITHIN THE BYFORD STRUCTURE PLAN AREA**

#### **Policy Objective**

To outline Council's position on subdivision within the Byford Structure Plan Area.

#### **The Policy**

Where Council receives a referral from the Western Australian Planning Commission or a request from developers or owners of a property within the Byford Structure Plan Area for subdivision within the Byford Structure Plan Area the following shall apply:

1. The Council will not consider any application for subdivision in the Byford Structure Plan area unless a Detailed Area Plan is carried out for the precinct(s) that the subject lot falls within.
2. The Council will only consider subdivision of lots within the Byford Structure Plan without Detailed Area Plans being previously carried out for the precinct, if they are those five lots zoned 'Rural Living A' fronting Larsen Road on the northern side.

Attachment 1 shows the Byford Structure Plan Area.

Attachment 2 shows the precincts within the Byford Structure Plan.

CARRIED 4/0



P152/06/01 PROPOSED SUBDIVISION – LOT 1 THOMAS ROAD, BYFORD (S116602)			
Proponent	Brown McAllister		
Officer	David Lodwick – Senior Planner	Date of Report	23/5/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P152 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Hoyer that Council recommends to the WA Planning Commission that the proposed subdivision of Lot 1 Thomas Road, Byford be refused for the following reasons:

1. The subdivision application is inconsistent with Council's adopted Rural Strategy. The property is currently zoned rural and cannot be subdivided down to the lot sizes proposed without rezoning;
2. Approval of the subdivision would unreasonably predetermine Council's settlement Strategy as it relates to the area;
3. Would set an undesirable precedent for surrounding landowners to seek approval for similar subdivisions which do not meet the strategic intentions of the Rural Strategy;
4. The proposed subdivision proposes a substantial increase in density and number of blocks to that previously approved by the then Minister for Planning (WAPC 99662 refers) on appeal and under WAPC 113147.

CARRIED 4/0

P153/06/01 PROPOSED SUBDIVISION – LOT 51 LARSEN ROAD, BYFORD (S116654)			
Proponent	Gray & Lewis		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Planning Officer	Date of Report	7/6/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P153 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Hoyer that Council recommends to the WA Planning Commission that because of a technicality in Councils Town Planning Scheme the proposed subdivision of Lot 51 Larsen Road, Byford be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The land in question has only recently acquired subdivision potential, following an amendment to the Shire's TPS 2 whereby the land was rezoned. Prior to that amendment the land was zoned "Rural" and accordingly enjoyed no relevant subdivision potential.
2. The Shire has in place two planning proposals which have significance in relation to the subdivision application. The first planning proposal is an amendment to TPS 2 whereby Byford would be constituted a "Development Area" within the meaning of clause 5.18.3.10 of TPS 2. That clause provides:

"The local government requires a Structure Plan for a Development Area, or for any particular part or parts of a Development Area before recommending subdivision or approving development of land within the Development Area".

Although not a gazetted amendment, it is a “seriously entertained planning proposal” within the meaning of that concept recognised in planning appeal decisions in Western Australia.

Council is of the view that it should not recommend approval of subdivision in the absence of a concluded Structure Plan, given that the land in question is on the verge of being included in a formally-constituted Development Area.

The second “seriously entertained planning proposal” to which Council and the Commission need to have regard is the proposed Structure Plan itself for Byford. This Structure Plan has been formally approved by Council and is awaiting Commission approval. Ministry for Planning officers worked closely with the Shire in the formulation of the Structure Plan.

However, as there is no concluded, Commission-approved Structure Plan in place a present, and as TPS No. 2 clause 5.18.3.10 requires such a Structure Plan before subdivision can be recommended, Council recommends refusal of this subdivision at this point.

Support for this position is also found in clause 5.18.7 of TPS No. 2 which provides that generally there is to be “no new development or use of land to be commenced or carried out within the Urban Development Zone until a Structure Plan has been approved for the relevant part of the zone.” It is to be recalled that part of the land the subject of this application for subdivision is zoned “Urban Development”.

Although there may be a question as to whether the reference to “development” in clause 5.18.7 includes subdivision, the least that can be said is that, taken with clause 5.18.3.10, the overall intent of the regime is that there should be a concluded Structure Plan in place before specific applications impinging on the planning of the area, are dealt with.

It is also to be noted that it is open under clause 5.18.7, for a Structure Plan to be formulated to deal with part only of an Urban Development Zone, and such a Structure Plan may be proposed by the owner rather than Council. There has however been no such owner-proposed or limited-area Structure Plan.

3. This subdivision application is distinguishable from the recent applications in relation to Lots 54 and 55 Larsen Road which were approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission. The present subdivision would create three habitable lots whereas Lot 54 and 55 left only one habitable lot (the other lot was almost wholly located in the Multiple Use Corridor). Approval of the present application would set an undesirable precedent for subdivision in advance of proper planning controls being in place.
- B. Without prejudice, in the event the subdivision is approved, the following conditions should be imposed:
  1. The subdivider making arrangements satisfactory to the Western Australian Planning Commission to ensure that prospective purchasers are advised of the use and management provisions of the Shire of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2 as they relate to the Rural Living A zoned portion of the land (the proposed 4026m<sup>2</sup> lots and the 4418m<sup>2</sup> front portion of the proposed 1.3320ha lot) and the Urban Development zone provisions for the balance rear portion of the proposed 1.3320ha lot, including that the land is identified in the (draft) Byford Structure Plan for “Multiple Use Corridor”, and that any land use and development in this area will require Council approval and that land use and development proposals that do not provide for the requirements of this corridor may not be supported.

2. The subdivider pay to Council an amount of, \$16,305.30 for proposed lot 1, \$16,305.30 for proposed lot 2 and \$53,946 for proposed lot 3 to be held by the Shire on trust for the purpose of the Shire implementing in due course the following infrastructure works:  
Drainage headworks, that sum representing a fair estimate of the proportionate contribution of the subdivision, to the need for those infrastructure works.
  3. The identification by survey of a suitable building and effluent disposal envelope on the proposed 4 026m<sup>2</sup> blocks.
  4. All building and effluent disposal systems, having the necessary clearance from the new boundaries.
- B. Council writes to the WA Planning Commission and the subdividers of Lot 54 and Lot 55 Larsen Road in accordance with the draft correspondence recommended by McLeod and Co. in its advice to Council dated 8 June 2001, requiring that condition 1 of the approvals be implemented by means of a section 70A Notification under the Transfer of Land Act 1893, in the form recommended by McLeod and Co.

CARRIED 4/0

P156/06/01 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2 – PROHIBIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES AND USE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS (A0347)			
Proponent	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale		
Officer	Jocelyn Cockbain – Planning Officer	Date of Report	5/6/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously	P126/12/99		
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P156 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Needham, seconded Cr Star that

1. Council does not continue with an amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.2 to prohibit the establishment of nuclear activities and use of nuclear materials in the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale as a result of the existing legislation covering the issue significantly.
2. The Shire President on behalf of Council writes to the following Members of Parliament expressing the position of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale in relation to nuclear activities in the Shire:
  - the Prime Minister
  - the Leader of the Federal Opposition
  - the Federal Environment Minister
  - the Premier
  - the leader of the Western Australian opposition
  - the State Minister for the Environment
  - to all local State and Federal of Parliamentary representatives expressing the position that the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale does not support the following activities occurring within the municipal boundaries of the Serpentine-Jarrahdale:
    - the extraction of uranium, radium or thorium or any other radioactive material
    - the establishment of any industry or other use or activity involving the transportation, storage, treatment or processing of any such mineral or nuclear fuel that is likely to produce radioactive material as a bi-product or nuclear fuel

- the production, storage or disposal of nuclear waste or by-product, by any industry or other use or activity, except in direct and exclusive association with a hospital or medical facility

CARRIED 4/0

P157/06/01 INFORMATION REPORT			
Proponent	Director Sustainable Development		
Officer	Andrew Watson – Director Sustainable Development	Date of Report	24/05/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P157 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Hoyer that

1. The Information Report to 11 June 2001 be received.
2. In respect of item P157.20/06/01, Council lodges an objection to the proposed sand mining on nature Reserve 28167

CARRIED 4/0

P158/06/01 ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THROUGH WAMA (A0163-04)			
Proponent	Cr Star		
Officer	Cr Star	Date of Report	18/6/01
Signatures	Author: Senior Officer:		
Previously			
Disclosure of Interest			
<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Committee In Accordance With Resolution SMO049/05/01</b>		

### **P158 COMMITTEE DECISION**

Moved Cr Star, seconded Cr Hoyer that Council takes the motion to WAMA that data required for local government that is available in government agencies be provided free of charge and that WAMA pursue this with the relevant agencies.

CARRIED 4/0

## **12. CLOSE**

The meeting closed at 8.14pm.

I certify that these minutes were confirmed at the  
Ordinary Council Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2001

.....  
Presiding Member

.....  
Date