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ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council
held in the North Fremantle Community Hall
on **17 April 2019** at 6.00 pm.

1 OFFICIAL OPENING, WELCOME AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.00 pm and welcomed members of the public to the meeting.

2.1 ATTENDANCE

Dr Brad Pettitt Mayor
Cr Ingrid Waltham Deputy Mayor / East Ward
Cr Jenny Archibald East Ward
Cr Doug Thompson North Ward
Cr Bryn Jones North Ward
Cr Rachel Pemberton City Ward
Cr Adin Lang City Ward
Cr Jon Strachan South Ward
Cr Andrew Sullivan South Ward
Cr Dave Hume Beaconsfield Ward

Mr Philip St John Chief Executive Officer
Mr Glen Dougall Director City Business
Ms Fiona Hodges Director Community Development
Mr Paul Garbett Director Strategic Planning and Projects
Mr Graham Tattersall Director Infrastructure and Project Delivery
Ms Charlie Clarke Manager Governance
Mr Paul Dunlop Manager Communications and Marketing
Ms Beverley Bone Manager Community Development
Mr Ryan Abbott Manager Parks and Landscapes
Mr David Janssens Manager Infrastructure Engineering
Mr Sri Sriranjan Principal Engineer
Ms Tanya Toon-Poynton Meeting Support Officer

There was approximately 1 member of the public and 1 member of the press in attendance.

2.2 APOLOGIES

Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge Beaconsfield Ward
Cr Sam Wainwright Hilton Ward
Cr Jeff McDonald Hilton Ward

2.3 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil
3. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt     Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Cr Doug Thompson’s request for a leave of absence from 6 May 2019 to 18 June 2019 (inclusive) is approved.

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume

4. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

Nil

5. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following member of the public spoke in relation to item FPOL1904-10-Arthur Head Cliff Stabilisation:

Roel Loopers

7. PETITIONS

Nil

8. DEPUTATIONS

8.1 SPECIAL DEPUTATIONS

Nil

8.2 PRESENTATIONS

Cr Jon Strachan made a presentation to Council on the Smart City Summit and Expo held in Taipei, Taiwan. Cr Strachan and the Director City Business were part of delegation from the South West Group who attended the event.
9. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt    Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council dated 27 March 2019 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume

10. ELECTED MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Nil
11. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

11.1 PLANNING COMMITTEE 3 APRIL 2019

PC1904-11 MUNICIPAL INVENTORY AND HERITAGE LIST - ANNUAL UPDATE 2019

Meeting Date: 3 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: St John's Ambulance Station – Heritage Assessment (2018)

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consider the listing of several properties on the Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) and Heritage List as part of the annual update required of the MHI under Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990 and Council's Local Planning Policy 2.6.

This report recommends Council approve the following modifications to the MHI and Heritage List:

1. Add to MHI (Category 3) and Heritage List:
   a. 10-12 Stirling Street, Fremantle (Limestone Wall)
   b. 14 Parry Street, Fremantle (St John's Ambulance Station)

2. Remove from Heritage List and retain on MHI for Historical Record Only:
   a. 14 and 14A Arundel Street, Fremantle
   b. 388 South Terrace, South Fremantle
   c. 68 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle (Limestone Features)
   d. 81 Ellen Street, Fremantle
   e. 2 Newman Court, Fremantle (Site of former Hutton Building & Harris Scarfe & Co)
   f. 10 William Street, Fremantle (Site of Former Mongers West Aust Stores)
   g. 20-26 South Terrace, Fremantle (Timezone)

3. Modify the MHI listing of 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13 Leslie Road to redefine the statement of significance to exclude 11 Leslie Road and modify the Heritage List to exclude 11 Leslie Road.

4. Retain 38 Thompson Road, North Fremantle on MHI (Category 3) and Heritage List

5. Retain 81A Ellen Street on MHI (Category 2) and correct Heritage List to re-include this property (reflecting its new street number).

Consultation with all affected landowners is required to occur prior to any modification to the Heritage List and MHI, with the report recommending that this occur and that any objections received be referred back to Council.
The report also recommends that all properties where demolition of the features originally included on the MHI has (legitimately) occurred since their original inclusion on the Inventory be removed from the Heritage List and retained on the MHI for historical record only, subject to no objection being received from the affected owner. This will correct a number of anomalies where demolition was either approved by Council following review of the heritage significance of the place, or occurred prior to any statutory controls restricting it.

BACKGROUND

The **Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990** requires that local governments compile and maintain a Municipal Heritage Inventory (‘MHI’) of places which, in its opinion, are or may become of cultural heritage significance. That inventory is required to be updated annually and reviewed every 4 years after compilation.

The **Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015** (‘the Regulations’) Schedule 2 ‘Deemed Provisions for local planning schemes’ part 3 make provision for the establishment and maintenance of a Heritage List and Heritage Areas which have been identified as of significance and worthy of built heritage conservation.

Council adopted its initial MHI in September 2000 and subsequently adopted the MHI as its Heritage List through the provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 4 upon gazettal of the scheme in 2007. Both have been amended since. The City’s **Local Planning Policy 2.6 ‘Procedure for amending the Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) and Heritage List’** (LPP 2.6) outlines the process for modification to the MHI and Heritage List and stipulates that:

- Requests for inclusion, removal or amendment are to be made in writing; and
- A decision on these shall be made by Council on an annual basis in February to April.

The process to add or remove a place from the Heritage List, as stipulated in the Regulations, includes three steps:

1. Notify each owner and occupier of the place and provide them with a description of the place and the reason for its proposed entry or removal.
2. Invite the owner and occupier of the place to make a submission for a period of not less than 21 days.
3. Following consultation the City is to consider the submissions made on each proposal and resolve if a place is to be added or removed from the heritage list [the subject of this report].

During the past year, the city has received 6 requests for removal from the Heritage List for the following properties:

1. 10-12 Stirling Street, Fremantle
2. 14 Arundel Street, Fremantle
3. 11 Leslie Road, North Fremantle
4. 388 South Terrace, South Fremantle
5. 38 Thompson Road, North Fremantle
6. 68 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle
The City has also identified the following properties as requiring review during its routine administrative processes:

1. Former Myer building, 2 Newman Court, Fremantle
2. Former Queensgate building site, 10 William Street, Fremantle
3. Commercial Building, 20-26 South Terrace, Fremantle (Timezone)
4. St John’s Ambulance Building, 14 Parry Street, Fremantle
5. A number of MHI listed properties which have been demolished either with the consent of Council or prior to the MHI receiving statutory protection, but which have not been formally removed / recategorised.

The purpose of this report is to consider these requests in accordance with LPP 2.6.

OFFICER COMMENT

The Strategic Community Plan indicates that Fremantle wishes to “sustain and grow arts and culture and preserve the importance of our social capital, built heritage and history”. Maintenance of the City’s MHI and Heritage List contribute to this objective.

Each place nominated for review is discussed below including a recommendation on its future listing. Consultation with the affected landowners will be necessary prior to a final decision.

1. 10 – 12 Stirling Street, Fremantle (Limestone Wall)
 Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
 The Property Manager for 10-12 Stirling Street contacted the City of Fremantle regarding the heritage status of an old limestone wall lining the rear property boundary on Ord Street.

Current listings
There are no current heritage listings for this property.
Comment

10 – 12 Stirling Street is a multi-unit town house development constructed in the late 1970s on the site of three earlier houses. The housing development has little heritage value but there is an early limestone wall lining the rear boundary that is clearly an important historic streetscape element on Ord Street but which has not been included on the MHI or the Heritage List.

The limestone wall is constructed from random rubble capstone flush pointed with lime mortar and capped with a rendered, weathered coping. The stone is typical of material sourced during the late 19th century from local stone outcrops and remnants of original mortar contain small pieces of unburnt lime and charcoal suggesting it was manufactured and slaked on site. The wall shows evidence of later repairs with cement mortars in different colour.

The wall at 10-12 Stirling Street closely matches that on the adjacent property 237 High Street, which extends along Ord Street and around the corner onto High Street. 237 High Street is included on the MHI as a category 2 property but the information in the listing does not refer specifically to the limestone boundary wall. It would appear that both walls were constructed at the same time prior to subdivision of this street block.

The street boundary wall to 237 High Street is identified in *19th Century Limestone Walls and Steps in Fremantle*, 1986 by Silvana Grassadonia as being an early limestone wall but the adjacent identical wall to 10-12 Stirling Street is not included. The report by Ms Grassadonia was used as the key document for identifying suitable limestone features to be included on the MHI and then the heritage list and its failure to identify the wall at 10-12 Stirling Street will explain how it has been excluded from the MHI.
Historic limestone boundary wall on Ord Street (right) abutting more recent wall (left).

Historic limestone boundary wall on Ord Street (left) and sheet metal fence to side boundary.

**Recommendation**

The limestone boundary wall at 10-12 Stirling Street, Fremantle is of considerable local significance and should be afforded statutory protection by being included upon the Heritage List. The place should also be included upon the MHI as a Limestone Feature/Level 3.

2. **14 & 14A Arundel Street, Fremantle**

   **Why was the property identified for review in 2019?**

   The strata manager for the property questioned the meaning of the heritage listing. The place is on the City of Fremantle Heritage List but it is only included on the MHI for historic purposes because it has been demolished.

2018 aerial photograph of site, CoF Intramaps.

14 and 14A (rear) Arundel Street, 2019.

**Current listings**

**INTRAMAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place Name</th>
<th>HOUSE 14 and 14a Arundel Street (Demolished)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>hatched with heritage tone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inherit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>HOUSE (demolished) 14 and 14a Arundel Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>Yes – 8 May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>Adopted, 18 September 2000, no category stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
<td>DEMOLISHED – retained on MHI database for historic purposes only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
Aerial photographs in Intramaps indicate that the site was vacant between 1947 (earliest photo) and 1995 and the existing houses had been constructed by 1999. The existing structures on the property do not have enough cultural heritage significance to be included on the Heritage List or as Category 3 on the MHI.

It would appear that House 14 and 14A Arundel Street has been reviewed in the past and its MHI category has been modified to reflect its lack of heritage significance. In this situation the property remains on the MHI but only as a record of its past status. However the property has remained on the Heritage List as all MHI listed properties were originally included on the Heritage List, and rectification to remove those included only for historic purposes has not systematically occurred. Correction of such anomalies is recommended to occur across the board.

Recommendation
- Remove 14 and 14A Arundel Street from the City of Fremantle Heritage List.
- Retain 14 and 14A Arundel Street on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing.

3. Limestone Feature(s), 11 Leslie Road, North Fremantle
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
The property owner asked that 11 Leslie Road be removed from the Heritage List because the Limestone Features no longer exist or cannot be identified. The owner provided the City of Fremantle with photographs of a rendered boundary retaining wall but it was difficult to determine if this was a heritage limestone wall concealed by render or a later structure.
2018 aerial photograph of 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Leslie Road, CoF Intramaps. 11 Leslie Road is highlighted in red.

Current listings
The property is included as part of a joint heritage listing for 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13.

**INTRAMAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place Name</th>
<th>LIMESTONE FEATURE(s) Leslie Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a joint listing for 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13 Leslie Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage listed CoF (on Heritage List)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>hatched with tone for heritage list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inherit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Leslie Road - photo of rear retaining wall provided by property owner, 2018.

11 Leslie Road, rear retaining wall 2019.

9 Leslie Road, rear retaining wall, 2019

5 Leslie Road, heritage limestone feature c. 1940s.
Limestone feature on 5 Leslie Road appears to continue into 7 Leslie Road and becomes part of shed.

Limestone feature on 5 and 7 Leslie Road set in from rear boundary (brick wall) approximately 1800mm.

11 Leslie Road, street facade

**Comment**

11 Leslie Road is included on the Heritage List as part of a larger listing for a limestone feature that runs across 5, 7, 9, 11 & 13 Leslie Road. However, only 5 Leslie Road is included on the MHI.

The limestone feature, which runs near the rear (southern) boundary of 5 – 13 Leslie Road was identified in *19th Century Limestone Walls and Steps in Fremantle*, 1986 by Silvana Grassadonia as being a limestone “wall or part of wall of later construction”. The report also records that the central part of the wall was in a ‘dilapidated state’.

Heritage Officers visited 11 Leslie Road on 21 March 2019 to investigate the wall at the rear of 11 Leslie Road. They were also able to look at the heritage listed limestone features on the vacant block at 5 Leslie Road. 7, 9 and 13 Leslie Road were not inspected.
The retaining wall at the rear of 11 Leslie Road is built against the rear boundary of the site. The wall is approximately 2400mm high and is evenly coated with spray on concrete which completely conceals the substrate below. The wall extends to the east and west of 11 Leslie Road into the adjoin properties. A timber fence stands on the rear boundary at the top of the retaining wall at the ground level of the adjoining property.

An Inter-war era squared random rubble limestone wall stands towards the rear of 5 Leslie Road. This wall is set approximately 1800mm in from the rear boundary of the site and appears to extend into the property of 7 Leslie Road. The wall is in good condition. This wall correlates to the location of the 1940s era wall visible on historic aerial photographs and the limestone feature identified in *19th Century Limestone Walls and Steps in Fremantle* and included on the CoF Heritage List.

**Documentary evidence**

A 1939 Sewerage Map (PWDWA Metropolitan Sewerage North Fremantle Municipality 2025) shows 5 – 13 Leslie Road as a single property with a galvanised iron cottage located roughly on the site of 13/15 Leslie Road. The only limestone wall is a small section in the south-west corner. Historic aerial photographs show that by 1947 the cottage had been demolished and a solid masonry boundary wall constructed around the site. However a 1981 aerial photograph shows that the central section of the southern wall has broken down and earth has spilled onto the site.
In 2007 11 Leslie Road was redeveloped, along with the adjacent 7, 9 and 13. The buildings were all designed by the architects, Architetti, but were submitted as separate development applications.

The 2006 planning application for 11 Leslie Road (DA421/06) by the architect Ian Hooke of Architetti notes that “… “The proposal includes the demolition of an existing limestone wall at the back of the site. It is approximately two meters off the south boundary. It is of rubble limestone with the dimension and proportion of a fence. Subsequent backfilling has caused the wall to crack. The wall has become unstable in parts due to cracking, (see engineers report and photos attached). It is proposed that the wall be replaced with an engineered retaining wall of lower height.”

Public comments were received on the development of all four properties. One commentator notes “Retaining wall at back of block has been there as long as I can remember and part of original wall which fell down is still under the soil - wall is - so older residents have told me - at least as old as the flour mill”

The planning report on the four development applications states that “The property is listed upon the City’s Municipal Heritage Inventory as a Management Category 3 due to a remnant limestone wall which is to remain” and that “With respect to the heritage retaining wall located upon the Leslie Road properties, the applicant has indicated that the wall is to remain and will not be removed.” However, it would appear that this reference relates only to the extant sections of wall and not the collapsed section.

DA 421/06 was approved with no conditions regarding the retention of a limestone feature.
In 2007, a variation to the planning application was submitted because the ‘rear retaining wall shown on the planning drawings had not been built’. Structural engineer’s drawings for concrete piling on the rear boundary were approved under delegated authority.
Recommendation

- Modify the existing heritage listing for Limestone Feature(s) Leslie Road to exclude reference to 11 Leslie Road.

Update Inherit and Intramaps to reflect the removal of 11 Leslie Road from the Heritage List and include information to record why this listing was modified.

Include 7, 9 and 13 in the 2020 Annual Municipal Inventory and Heritage List Review.

4. House, 388 South Terrace, South Fremantle

Why was the property identified for review in 2019?

The property owner requested this review because they believe that the original building has been demolished or significantly altered and had little heritage value.

Current listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAMAPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Place Name</td>
<td>House, 388 South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>hatched with heritage tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>House, 388 South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>Yes – 8 May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>Adopted, 18 September 2000, no category stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Significance**

House (fmr), 388 South Terrace, is a modified single storey house dating from 1895. It is historically significant as a representation of working people’s living conditions and commercial activity in the Fremantle area. The place has undergone significant alterations.

**Historic description**

By 1895, a cottage had been built on the property. In 1895, it was listed as owned and occupied by George Locke, a storeman. The address at this time was 222 Mandurah Road.

A diagram dated 1954 shows a brick house of roughly square plan form with a full length front verandah and asbestos extension down one side of the house. There was also an asbestos section at the rear of the house, as well as a laundry and brick room. There were several galvanised iron sheds in the backyard.

A photograph c. 1979 shows a painted brick house with a corrugated iron roof. At this time it was included in the list of heritage places identified by the Fremantle Society (1979/80) and classified as RED -significant for contributing to the unique character of Fremantle.

388 South Terrace was assessed and included in the "Heritage Study South Fremantle", prepared by John Taylor Architects, for the City of Fremantle, June 1993.

**Physical description**

Presuming the original house is still extant, its appearance from the street has been much altered. 388 South Terrace is a single storey commercial building with recent rendered front facade and roof that forms an alfresco eating area.

**Comment**

House, 388 South Terrace was constructed in 1895. The earliest clear aerial photographs of the place date from 1965 and show that it had a simple roughly square plan, with a hipped ‘M’ shaped roof and a separate front verandah all set back from the street behind a small front garden. The photograph of the house taken as part of the Fremantle Society’s classification of heritage places shows a typical workers cottage with brick walls and a corrugated iron roof.
Later aerial photographs indicate that House, 388 South Terrace was significantly changed between 1981 and 1985 when it was converted into a restaurant. While the outline of the original house can be identified when comparing the 1965 and 1985 aerial photographs, the hipped roof has been replaced with a flat roof concealed behind parapet wall built on top of the original external walls. The front verandah has also been removed and an extension has been constructed that completely fills the front yard and conceals the original house behind.

388 South Terrace was placed on the MHI after being identified in the 1998 Heritage Study South Fremantle, prepared by John Taylor Architects. This property was reviewed in the 2008 City of Fremantle Municipal Heritage Update, South Fremantle, Stage 1 and it was retained.

Recent inspections of the place found that the 1980s extension conceals any surviving original building fabric so that it no longer contributes to the heritage streetscape of South Terrace or even obliquely from the surrounding streets.

Further, the identification of original fabric behind the extension is difficult due to the level of change. While it likely that the original external walls of the house have been retained, they have been substantially modified and then rendered to unify the old and new elements making it difficult to find original fabric. The doors and windows to the original façade and most of the original internal walls have been removed and large openings formed to create one large open space for the servery kitchen and dining area. The timber floors have been replaced with tiled concrete floors and acoustic tile ceilings have been installed throughout.

The extent and comprehensive nature of the change means that reversing these changes to recover the significance of the original house would be extremely difficult and as there is little documentary or physical evidence available to guide restoration, any attempt at reconstruction will be speculative.

Recommendation
- Remove House, 388 South Terrace from the City of Fremantle Heritage List.
- Retain House, 388 South Terrace on the City of Fremantle MHI but reduce it to a Historical Purpose classification to record of its earlier status as heritage listed property

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the Heritage List and changed classification on the MHI.

5. House 38 Thompson Road, North Fremantle
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
The property owner has indicated that they would like to demolish 38 Thompson Road to accommodate side access so the site can be sub-divided for two dwellings. The owner cites the following reasons why the house should not be included on the heritage list (correspondence dated 11/12/18):
- the exterior of the house has been modified. Prior to 1938 the front door was located in the street façade. Sometime between 1939 and 1994 a timber verandah was constructed along the length of the north side of the building and the front door was relocated to the north elevation. Modifications were made to the front verandah roof to suit the north verandah.
- a modern wall was constructed on the front boundary of the property
- the narrow width of the lot means that there is not sufficient space to construct a driveway to access the rear of the property even if the later northern verandah was removed.

38 Thompson Road, Intramaps 2018  
38 Thompson Road, Google Streetview 2018.

### Current listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAMAPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Place Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inherit

| Name | HOUSE 38 Thompson Road |
| Mapping | correct |
| Photograph | No |
| Statutory Heritage Listing | Heritage List – 8 May 2007 |
| Municipal Inventory | Adopted, 18 September 2000, Level 3 |

### History

House, 38 Thompson Road was built c. 1905, when the Casey family were listed as the occupants.

A 1939 diagram shows House, 38 Thompson Road as a long, narrow weatherboard house with a full length front verandah.

This place was included in the "North Fremantle Heritage Study", prepared by Craig Burton, for the City of Fremantle, June 1994.

### Physical description

House, 38 Thompson Road, is a single storey weatherboard and iron cottage constructed in the 1900s. The place is a long and narrow building. Walls are painted weatherboard and the roof is hipped corrugated iron with no eaves. There is a rendered and corbelled chimney. The verandah is under a separate corrugated iron roof and runs along the front and north side of the building. The entry is on the north side, not the street front. The verandah is supported by turned and chamfered timber posts. There is a limestone wall.
| Statement of Significance | House, 38 Thompson Road, is a typical weatherboard and iron single storey cottage dating from the 1900s. The place has aesthetic value for its contribution to the streetscape and the surrounding area. It is representative of the typical building stock located within the residential areas of North Fremantle. Historically significant as a representation of typical workers' houses in the North Fremantle area. |

Comment

*House, 38 Thompson Road* was constructed in 1900s. Sewerage Maps from 1939 show that originally this timber cottage had only a front verandah. Historic aerial photographs in Intramaps show that the side (north) verandah had been added by the 1960s and the large rear extension was added in the 1980s. The 1960s and 1980s extensions have little significance and can be removed or retained as required. Generally these extensions have had minimal impact upon the original house because they are additive and they could be removed and the original configuration reinstated if required.

*House, 38 Thompson Road* is included on the MHI as a Level 3 place – "The City of Fremantle has identified this place as being of some cultural heritage significance for its contribution to the heritage of Fremantle in terms of its individual or collective aesthetic, historic, social or scientific significance, and /or its contribution to the streetscape, local area and Fremantle. Its contribution to the urban context should be maintained and enhanced."

It is acknowledged that that the house has some modified elements, such as the front door and the verandah return that connects to the north verandah extension but it is considered that these do not greatly detract from the overall significance of the place or its contribution to the streetscape and local area. The existing house still makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and meets the threshold for being included on the Heritage List and the MHI as Category 3 place.

The front wall detracts to a limited degree from the presentation of the house but it is separate from the house and can be easily removed and replaced in future with little impact upon the house. Removal of the front fence would enhance the significance of the house but not to a level that would require its elevation to category 2.

Subdivision of the lot is not entirely precluded by the listing of the property, as rear lot access might be achieved through removal of the latter additions (including northern verandah) or could potentially be achieved from the adjoining property.

Recommendation

- Retain *House 38 Thompson Road* on the Heritage List and the MHI as a category 3 place.

6. Limestone Feature(s) 68 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle

Why was the property identified for review in 2019?

The owner requested clarification as to the status of the heritage listing and identification of the limestone features in preparation for the redevelopment of the site:
68 Queen Victoria Street, Intramaps 2018. The identified limestone features are located on the rear boundary of the site facing Beach Street. There are also limestone features in the Beach Street road reserve that were part of the property before land was resumed for the road reserve.

Limestone features located at the rear of 68 Queen Victoria Street facing Beach Street.

Limestone feature on the rear boundary of 68 Queen Victoria Street shown in *19th Century Limestone Walls and Steps in Fremantle*, 1986.
Limestone features including a natural outcrop and retaining walls in the Beach Street road reserve behind 68 Queen Victoria Street

Limestone features/ building foundation in the Beach Street road reserve behind 68 Queen Victoria Street

Current listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAMAPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Place Name</td>
<td><strong>Limestone feature(s) 68 Queen Victoria Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td><strong>Limestone features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Hatched to indicate Heritage List and MHI, adjacent road reserve is hatched to indicate Heritage List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inherit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th><strong>Limestone feature(s) 68 Queen Victoria Street</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td><strong>Yes – 8 March 2007</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td><strong>Adopted, 18 September 2000, no category stated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
<td><strong>Generic statement limestone features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic description</td>
<td>Generic history of limestone features plus a comment that the age of the feature at 68 Queen Victoria Street in unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical description</td>
<td>No description provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment
A retaining wall running along the rear (western) boundary of 68 Queen Victoria Street was identified in *19th Century Limestone Walls and Steps in Fremantle*, 1986 by Silvana Grassadonia as being a limestone “wall or part of wall of later construction” This wall is extant. It is a retaining wall that creates a flat parking area at the rear of the site. It is constructed from large format limestone blocks in stretcher bond and flush pointed with cream coloured cement mortar.

Historic aerial photographs on Intramaps show that this wall was constructed between 1965 and 1974 following the resumption of the rear of the site in the 1960s for the relocation of the railway line and Beach Street. This wall has little historic significance and does not make a significant contribution to the streetscape or local area.

There are a number of other limestone features in the road reserve which was formerly part of 68 Queen Victoria Street including:
- A natural outcrop of limestone
- A retaining wall lining the rear of the Beach Street footpath
- Limestone foundations/ retaining wall to a shed on the west corner of the road reserve

The natural rock outcrop (largely covered by grass and scrub vegetation) is situated within the road reserve in Beach Street to the rear of the northernmost part of 68 Queen Victoria Street and also extending past the rear of No. 76 Queen Victoria Street. The outcrop, which is part of the larger limestone ridge that forms Cantonment Hill, has been extensively cut back and is now set back about six meters behind the back of the Beach Street footpath. Due to its modified state and general condition and appearance, this limestone outcrop is not of sufficient heritage significance to justify its inclusion on the MHI or the Heritage List.

Historic aerial photographs on Intramaps show that the limestone retaining walls on the back edge of the Beach Street footpath are also of recent construction. The limestone retaining wall / foundations to the shed on the west corner of the site were constructed in the 1960s and the wall retaining the carpark on the northern corner of the site were constructed around 2005. Both of these walls are of limited heritage significance and should not be included on the Heritage List or MHI.

Recommendation
- Remove *Limestone Features 68 Queen Victoria Street* from the City of Fremantle Heritage List.
- Retain *Limestone Features 68 Queen Victoria Street* on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing.

7. 81 and 81A Ellen Street, Fremantle
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
The owner of 81 Ellen Street requested the City review the listing of 81 given that it is a new building (8 years old) constructed within the curtilage of the originally listed dwelling (now 81A)
### Current listings

**INTRAMAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place Name</th>
<th>81 Ellen Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td>Yes (81 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>hatched (81 only) with heritage tone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inherit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>House, 81 Ellen Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>Yes – 8 May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>Adopted, 18 September 2000, Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Significance
The place is a good example of a rendered masonry residence in the Victorian Italianate style influence, representing the expansion of Fremantle in the gold boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Comment
The original 81 Ellen Street was included on the MHI when it was compiled and adopted in 2000. The property was subdivided to separate the side garden area into a new lot which was allocated street number ‘81’. The original dwelling was given the number ‘81A’.

The subdivided portion of the site automatically inherited and retains the same listed status, as components of the original site. The Statement of Significance for the site relates to the residence retained at 81A Ellen Street, and states: “The place is a good example of a rendered masonry residence in the Victorian Italianate style influence, representing the expansion of Fremantle in the gold boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.”

It is considered that the new dwelling at 81 Ellen Street has little cultural heritage significance in terms of its contribution to the heritage of Fremantle, either for its individual or collective, historic, social or scientific significance, or for its contribution to the streetscape, the local area and Fremantle. While it is acknowledged that different people and communities may attach different weights to the same heritage values of a place at the same time, experience shows that judgements about heritage values, especially those relating to the recent past, tend to grow in strength and complexity over time as people’s perceptions of a place evolve. At present, however, it is considered that 81 Ellen Street does not fulfil the minimum criteria for inclusion on either the Municipal Heritage Inventory or the Heritage List.

Due to the subdivision and change in street number allocation, the original dwelling at 81A is not separately listed on the Heritage List (with the original number 81 only being listed) but should be re-included to reflect its significance and need for statutory protection. This essentially reflects an administrative correction.

Recommendation
- Remove 81 Ellen Street from the City of Fremantle Heritage List.
- Include 81A Ellen Street on the City of Fremantle Heritage List
- Retain 81 Ellen Street on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.
- Retain 81A Ellen Street on the City of Fremantle MHI as Category 2.

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing.

8. 2 Newman Court, Fremantle - Site of former Hutton Building & Harris Scarfe & Co.
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
The Heritage Co-ordinator recommended that this property listing should be reviewed in light of the changes that have occurred on site over the last 50 years.
### Current listings

#### INTRAMAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place Name</th>
<th>Site of Former Hutton Building &amp; Harris Scarfe &amp; Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>Historic / Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Hatched with tone for Heritage list and MHI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inherit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site of Former Hutton Building &amp; Harris Scarfe &amp; Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>8 March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>18 September 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Significance
Site of former commercial buildings, Hutton Building and Harris Scarfe & Co, is significant as evidence of the place being a commercial site since the early twentieth century. It represents the expansion of Fremantle in the gold boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the changing needs of the community and commerce in the Fremantle area.

History
NOTE: The MHI listing includes an extensive history of this site between 1870s when the first known building was recorded, and 2013 when the Myer Department Store closed.

Comment
The existing 3 storey concrete framed building with a basement and roof-top car parking was constructed in 1972 as the Myer Department Store. This building, which completely covers the site is currently being redeveloped as mixed use commercial building with food tenancies in the basement and ground floor and offices above. The building facades are being completely reclad as a part of these works and an extra two floors are being added on top.

The Myer Department Store was constructed on the site of the former Hutton Buildings (demolished 1967) and Harris Scarfe building (demolished 1971). The 1972 excavation of the entire site for the construction of the3 basement of the Myer building would have destroyed any archaeological materials from earlier buildings.

Recommendation
- Remove Site of Former Hutton Building & Harris Scarfe & Co from the Heritage List.
- Retain Site of Former Hutton Building & Harris Scarfe & Co on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing. Update history section on Inherit to reflect current refurbishment of the Myer Building.

9. 10 William Street - Site of Former Mongers West Aust Stores
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
The Heritage Co-ordinator recommended that this property listing should be reviewed in light of the changes that have occurred on site over the last 50 years.
2018 aerial photograph of site, CoF Intramaps

10 William Street, Google Streetview 2018.

Current listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAMAPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Place Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InheritName</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement of Significance

The Site of former Westralian Farmers Warehouse is significant as evidence of the place being a commercial site since the early twentieth century. It represents the expansion of Fremantle in the gold boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the changing needs of the community and commerce in the Fremantle area.

### History

**NOTE:** The MHI listing includes an extensive history of this site between the 1990s. In summary, the Goldrush era warehouse on the site in the 1890s. In the early 1970s these buildings were demolished and a Woolworths supermarket was constructed in 1972. This building was then demolished and replaced with the ‘Queensgate’ development of shops, offices and cinemas in 1989.

### Comment

The 1898 Mongers West Aust Stores (later known as Burns Philp & Co Ltd) was demolished in 1972 for the construction of Woolworths Supermarket which was in turn demolished in the 1980s for the four story Queensegate Complex. Queenstgate has recently been demolished and work is currently underway on construction of a new five storey commercial building.

The 1970s supermarket and the 1980s commercial building both completely covered the site. The construction of these buildings would have destroyed or compromised the archaeological record of the previous buildings on site and devalued the scientific potential of the site. It is unlikely that any significant archaeological remains from these early buildings remain.

### Recommendation

- Remove *Site of Former Mongers West Aust Stores* from the Heritage List.
- Retain *Site of Former Mongers West Aust Stores* on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.

Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing. Update history section on Inherit to record demolition of Queensegate for new development.

### 10. Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace, Fremantle (Timezone)

**Why was the property identified for review in 2019?**

The Heritage Co-ordinator recommended that this property listing should be reviewed in light of the changes that have occurred on site over the last 50 years.
Current listings

**INTRAMAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place Name</th>
<th>Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage listed CoF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Category</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Heritage inventory listed</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Hatched with tone for Heritage list and MHI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inherit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Heritage Listing</td>
<td>8 March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Inventory</td>
<td>18 September 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Significance

Commercial Building, 20-26 South Terrace, a single storey rendered brick and iron building, has aesthetic significance for its contribution to the streetscape of the South Terrace commercial strip. It is historically significant as a representation of commercial buildings in the Fremantle area.

History

In 1880 the rate book shows a house/shop; in 1885 it is listed as new building plus house and shop. By 1905-6 it appears from the rate book that there is a bakehouse, stable and carriage shed, a butcher and a blacksmith as well as dwellings. A colour photo dated c1993 and described as 20 & 28 South Terrace shows a single storey building with a parapet wall at the front with a curved portion above the main level in the centre and a front verandah with plain wooden verandah posts. The building is rendered brick, with a large opening and a large modern window on the right of the entrance. The building was then occupied by 'Timezone', a game and entertainment centre. As at 2013 the building is still occupied by 'Timezone'.

Physical description

Commercial Building, 20-26 South Terrace is a single storey, rendered brick and Colorbond building. It has a symmetrical façade, with a shop entrance flanked either side by large shopfront windows. There is a Colorbond verandah awning projecting from the façade supported by timber posts with decorative timber brackets. The building has a rendered parapet with a central segmental pediment.

Comment

This single storey rendered brick commercial building dates from the 1980s and demonstrates the hallmarks of 1980s Heritage Nostalgia style. It has been designed to be sympathetic with and celebrate the traditional commercial buildings on South Terrace and Market Street with shopfronts, a parapeted façade and a timber framed verandah sheltering the footpath. It is in the same architectural style as the South Terrace Piazza development which is located behind the adjacent c. 1900s Manning Buildings at 35 – 50 South Terrace. Historic aerial photographs in Intramaps show that both sites were redeveloped between 1981 and 1985.

Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace are of recent construction and have little cultural heritage significance.

Recommendation

- Remove Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace from the Heritage List.
- Retain Commercial Building, 20 -26 South Terrace on the City of Fremantle MHI as a record of its earlier status as heritage listed property – for historic purposes only.
Update Inherit and Intramaps and include information on its removal from the MHI and Heritage List to clarify the listing.

11.14 Parry Street Fremantle (St John’s Ambulance Building)
Why was the property identified for review in 2019?
A heritage assessment was undertaken when considering future potential use of the site.

2018 aerial photograph of site, CoF Intramaps
14 Parry St, Fremantle, Western Australia

Google
14 Parry Street, Google Streetview 2018.

Current listings
There are no current heritage listings for this property.

Comment
An assessment of the site was undertaken by Hocking Heritage Studio in 2018 (refer Attachment 1). This concluded that the place has some cultural significance for its contribution to the heritage of Fremantle in terms of its aesthetic, historic and social significance and its contribution to the streetscape, local area and Fremantle. Its contribution to the urban context should be maintained and enhanced.

Recommendation
The building and associated social history of 14 Parry Street, Fremantle is of local significance and should be afforded statutory protection by being included upon the Heritage List. The place should also be included upon the MHI as Level 3.
12. Demolished Properties

During general maintenance of the MHI and Heritage List, a series of properties which have either been granted demolition approval by Council in light of further assessment of their heritage significance, or which were demolished before the extension of formal statutory protection to listed properties have been identified. Removal of these from the Heritage List and their reclassification to Historical Record Only is necessary to accurately reflect their status.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* requires the annual update of the MHI, which requirement this report meets.

CONSULTATION

The *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* and the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) 2015 Regulations* specify that consultation with the landowners of all affected properties is required to be undertaken prior to modification to the Municipal Heritage Inventory and Heritage List, respectively.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required
Moved: Cr Jon Strachan  
Seconded: Cr Ingrid Waltham

That Council:

1. Invite comment from affected landowners on the following proposed modifications to the Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places (MHI) and Heritage List:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places</th>
<th>Heritage List</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12 Stirling Street, Fremantle</td>
<td>Add as Management Category 3</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>The rear limestone boundary wall at 10-12 Stirling Street, Fremantle is of considerable local significance and should be afforded statutory protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 14A Arundel Street, Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Original house has been demolished. The current (modern) dwellings are of insufficient significance for retention on the Heritage List or MHI Category 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Leslie Road, North Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>The original limestone retaining wall in this location previously collapsed, and so was removed and replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388 South Terrace, South Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>The 1980s extension conceals any surviving original building fabric so that it no longer contributes to the heritage streetscape of South Terrace or even obliquely from the surrounding streets. The extent and comprehensive nature of the change means that reversing these changes to recover the significance of the original house would be extremely difficult and as there is little documentary or physical evidence available to guide restoration, any attempt at reconstruction would be speculative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Thompson Road, North Fremantle</td>
<td>Retain as Management Category 3</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>The building continues to meet the threshold for inclusion as category 3 on the MHI and make a valuable contribution to the streetscape, notwithstanding modifications and additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Retaining wall of modern construction. Natural limestone features located within adjoining road reserve have been extensively cut back and modified and do not meet the threshold for inclusion on the MHI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 and 81A Ellen Street</td>
<td>Retain 81A as Management Category 2 and 81 as Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Include 81A and remove 81</td>
<td>Retains and protects the originally listed 1901/02 dwelling at 81A Ellen Street and removes the new lot and dwelling created at 81 Ellen Street. Administrative correction arising from subdivision and renumbering of new lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Newman Court, Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>The Myer Department Store was constructed on the site of the former Hutton Buildings (demolished 1967) and Harris Scarfe building (demolished 1971). It is doubtful that any significant archaeological remains from these early buildings remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 William Street, Fremantle</td>
<td>Retain as Management Category 3</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>This site has been completely redeveloped three times since the demolition of the historic 1898 building so it is highly unlikely that the site retains any archaeological value as the sub-strata which may have contained remnants of footings and other artefacts will have been completely disturbed and altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 South Terrace, Fremantle</td>
<td>Historical Record Only</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Building is of recent construction and has little cultural heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event of landowners making no objection to modifications recommended to the Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places (MHI) and Heritage List, that these changes be finalised, documented and communicated to the Heritage Council of Western Australia and the City’s records updated accordingly. Where objection is received, the recommendation be referred back to Council.

2. Invite comment from affected landowners on removal from the Heritage List and retention on the MHI for historical record only of the following properties where demolition of the features originally included on the MHI has legitimately occurred since their original inclusion on the Inventory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 Parry Street, Fremantle</th>
<th>Add as Management Category 3</th>
<th>Add</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The St John’s Ambulance station has some cultural significance for its contribution to the heritage of Fremantle in terms of its aesthetic, historic and social significance and its contribution to the streetscape, local area and Fremantle. Its contribution to the urban context should be maintained and enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 169 Edmund Street, Beaconsfield (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 108 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle (Commercial Building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 349 South Terrace, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 16 Stevens Street (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 129 Hampton Road, South Fremantle (Glennisfer Cottage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 10 Crandon Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) 38 Douro Road, South Fremantle (Former Oate’s Stables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) 4 Coral Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) 24 Hulbert Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) 34 Arundel Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) 15 Ashburton Terrace, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) 17 Ashburton Terrace, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) 103 Attfield Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) 5 Christina Parade, North Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) 20 Scott Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) 21 Ashburton Terrace, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) 2 Lefroy Road, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) 203 South Terrace, South Fremantle (Commercial Building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s) 198 South Terrace, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t) 317 High Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u) 30 Hulbert Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) 48 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (Cold Stores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w) 32 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (F Mandford’s Stables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) 27 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y) 29 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z) 35 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa) 38 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb) 52 Jenkins Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc)</td>
<td>134 Marine Terrace, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd)</td>
<td>142 Marine Terrace, South Fremantle (Duplex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee)</td>
<td>144 Marine Terrace, South Fremantle (Duplex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff)</td>
<td>2 Martha Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg)</td>
<td>25 Mouat Street, Fremantle (Site of Bateman's Warehouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh)</td>
<td>1 Norfolk Street, Fremantle (Terrace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>3 Norfolk Street, Fremantle (Terrace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jj)</td>
<td>11 Norfolk Street, Fremantle (Terrace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kk)</td>
<td>20 Norfolk Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll)</td>
<td>6 Norman Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm)</td>
<td>8 Norman Street, Fremantle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn)</td>
<td>24 Price Street, Fremantle (Stables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo)</td>
<td>27 Scott Street, South Fremantle (Duplex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp)</td>
<td>8 Scott Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qq)</td>
<td>5 Silver Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr)</td>
<td>335 South terrace (Commercial Building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ss)</td>
<td>340-342 South Terrace, South Fremantle (Factory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt)</td>
<td>436 South Terrace, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uu)</td>
<td>364 South Terrace, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vv)</td>
<td>25 Stevens Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ww)</td>
<td>4 Suffolk Street, Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx)</td>
<td>2 Suffolk Street, Fremantle (House and Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yy)</td>
<td>29 Thomas Street, South Fremantle (House)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of the landowners making no objection to modifications recommended, that these changes be finalised and communicated to the Heritage Council of Western Australia and the City's records updated accordingly. Where objection is received, the recommendation be referred back to Council.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
11.2 FINANCE, POLICY, OPERATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE 10 APRIL 2019

ITEMS APPROVED “EN BLOC”

The following items were adopted unopposed and without discussion “En Bloc” as recommended.

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-3  STRATEGIC COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW - DRAFT REVISION

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments:
2. Draft Strategic Community Plan Companion Plan

SUMMARY

In September 2018, Council supported the conduct of a review of the Strategic Community Plan to inform and feed into the new Corporate Business Plan.

Recognising the comprehensive process which went into the formulation of the Strategic Community Plan, and its relatively recent (2016) adoption, the review has focused on ensuring that its direction remains current, and takes greater account of capacity and priorities.

This report considers the outcomes of the review and recommends that Council endorse revisions to the document for the purposes of public consultation. It also recommends receipt of a (non-statutory) companion plan, prepared at the request of Council, and notes several steps recommended to occur ahead of the next (major) review of the Strategic Community Plan (scheduled for 2021/22).

BACKGROUND

On 19 September 2018, Council considered a report on the Strategic Community Plan (FPOL1809-14) and resolved:

That Council:

1. Note the requirement to prepare a new Corporate Business Plan in 2018/19.
2. Support the conduct of a review of the Strategic Community Plan in 2018/19 to inform and feed into the new Corporate Business Plan.
3. Support the pursuit of an integrated strategic planning and reporting framework which involves:
   a) major (statutory) review of the Strategic Community Plan every four years, aligning with the mayoral election cycle.
   b) minor (non-statutory) review of the Strategic Community Plan every four years, aligning with the non-mayoral election cycle.
   c) Annual update and extension of the Corporate Business Plan.
   d) Integration of planning for and workshops on corporate planning priorities and capacity ahead of and informing planning for and workshops on the annual budget.
4. Consider as part of the review of the Strategic Community Plan referred to in part 2 above the preparation of a companion document to the Strategic Community Plan which graphically illustrates and describes key spatial projects and strategic initiatives including (but not limited to) the following:

- Priority public transport corridors (South Street and Fremantle to Cockburn)
- Victoria Quay development opportunities
- Railway/bus station forecourt public realm improvements
- Fremantle Oval precinct
- Major development areas (e.g. Heart of Beaconsfield and Knutsford Street/Swanbourne Street development zones)
- Fremantle Alternative diverse housing areas
- Bike Plan routes
- Urban intensification precincts (e.g. Queen Victoria Street ‘east end’ precinct, Hilton centre)

The report noted that the current Strategic Community Plan was prepared following extensive community engagement and adopted relatively recently (2016). The recommended focus of the review proposed was to ensure that the strategic direction of the plan remained current and that capacity be more fully considered, and that more technical refinements be deferred until the major review scheduled for 21/22.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A budget allocation has been included in the 18/19 budget for the review of the Corporate Plan for $10,000 and can be used to support the Strategic Community Plan review.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Review of the Strategic Community Plan is required every 4 years under Regulation 19C (4) the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996.

Adoption and modification of the Strategic Community Plan is required by absolute majority under Regulation 19C (7).

CONSULTATION

Consultation is required on any major review of the Strategic Community Plan. Precinct Groups were advised of the review and invited to provide preliminary input. Formal advertising of the revised draft is recommended.

OFFICER COMMENT

The review process has involved the following steps:

1. Inform Precinct Groups of the planned review and invite preliminary input (October 2018)
2. Elected Member workshop #1 (key directions): Strategic Focus Areas and Outcomes (November 2018)

3. Informal stocktake of progress against current plan (November 2018)

4. Elected Member workshop #2 (capacity and priorities) (December 2018)

5. Informal presentation of draft revisions to Elected Members (April 2019)

The outcomes of these steps is summarised as follows:

**Step 1 - Preliminary Engagement**

No formal comment has been received from Precinct Groups. However the engagement has made them aware of the review, and so better placed to consider and provide comment during formal consultation. The absence of comment could suggest general acceptance of the direction of the Plan (though the timing of engagement, dictated by the need to complete the review ahead of the Corporate Business Plan, could also have limited opportunities for input).

**Step 2 - Elected Member workshop #1 (key directions):**

Feedback from the first workshop suggests general satisfaction with the broad direction of the Plan. Key suggestions for change made during the workshop are summarised as follows:

1. Acknowledgement of the traditional owners of the land should be included in the front of the document, as well as greater recognition of aboriginal history and heritage within the document.
2. The vision statement should be shortened (eg by removing the last section ‘and delivering on our promises’).
3. The structure and key focus areas (outside of review scope) are generally satisfactory, though the document would benefit from greater connection and line of sight with associated strategic documents (specifically the Corporate Business Plan, Long Term Financial Plan and subsidiary strategies and plans).
4. The outcomes and objectives are broadly acceptable but would benefit from streamlining and rationalisation: fewer clearer and more integrated objectives would be preferable.
5. Future reviews should also consider the appropriate balance between council activities and community roles in achieving outcomes, and better describe this to fulfil the broader role of the plan.
6. Measures of success (outside of review scope) require review and should be prioritised as these feed into direct work activities and priorities. They are also important in accurately gauging progress.
7. Strategic projects should be reviewed, categorised and updated.

**Step 3 - Stocktake of progress**

The informal stocktake of progress against key measures of success indicated that progress is being made in most areas. The extent of that progress varied, however, and no data was available in a few areas. The stocktake suggested that a review of measures of success should be undertaken ahead of the next strategic community plan review to confirm that the measure represents the best indicator of success, and to identify and ensure the systematic collection of data against those indicators currently lacking in this.
The stocktake also suggested that greater priority should be placed in some areas including:
1. Commercial vacancy rates
2. Employment opportunities
3. State and federal investment
4. Asset ratios.

**Step 4 - Elected Member workshop #2 (capacity and priorities)**

The second elected member workshop included a briefing on capacity which confirmed the limited capital available for major new asset projects for the next few years, pending successful completion of Kings Square. The priority on improving the city’s asset ratios also requires structured upgrade of the city’s asset renewal program (in train - refer draft Long Term Financial Plan and Asset Management Plan for details).

The workshop identified a series of existing and new policy and planning initiatives including:

- Review of strategic reserves
- Sports and recreation planning
- Leisure centre precinct planning
- Pedestrian & walkability planning
- Economic development planning (new initiatives)

Development of the city’s advocacy framework (in train) was also identified as a high priority.

Progression of corporate initiatives including continued operational reviews was also supported as a further priority area.

A series of specific suggestions were made against each key focus area with the following modifications proposed as a result:

**Economic Development**

- Include reference to diverse and thriving economy, and health, education and tourism in outcome
- Modify measures of success in ‘shared vision’ to include maintenance of Economic Development Strategy and business liaison group and delete retail vacancy measure
- Include reference to Freo as premier port gateway and second city in outcome
- Include retention of priority port functions in Westport as a measure of success

**Environmental Responsibility**

- Modify waste outcome to relate to working with community to reduce waste
- Combine water and energy efficiency in CoF facilities outcomes
- Relocate community access to green space to ‘Health & Happiness’
- Remove climate change preparation outcome and transfer relevant most measures of success to other outcomes, including a new one relating to increased consideration of environmental sustainability in decision making
- Include innovative technology knowledge and uptake as a new objective
• Include reference to foreshore planning as a measure of success

**Transport and Connectivity**

• Reduce and combine measures of success to reduce overlap
• Include new objectives relating to design of streets to accommodate multiple transport modes safely and comfortably based on hierarchy
• Replace reference to light rail with ‘high frequency fixed route public transport corridors’
• Reference investment in ‘right infrastructure’ in port measure of success
• Modify parking measure of success to locate majority of off-street public parking on periphery of city, reflective of the ITS strategy.

**Character, Culture and Heritage**

• Include reference to pre-European heritage in goal
• Reorder outcomes to include history and heritage at top
• Include new outcome relating to aboriginal heritage and culture
• Include reference to heritage renewal and adaptation
• Include investment in heritage as an objective and a measure
• Redefine ‘environment that supports arts and culture’ to ‘Fremantle provides a cultural, economic and physical environment which supports arts and culture’
• Include increased sustainability of arts organisations in measure

**Places for People**

• Include reference to ‘diverse’ as well as ‘affordable’ living opportunities and separate two different measures
• Include reference to recreation nodes in objective relating to development of quality places
• Include reference to innovative and sustainable approaches
• Include references to redevelopment precincts
• Transfer reference to the Fishing Boat Harbour precinct redevelopment to Strategic Projects (as one of the Freo 2029 initiatives)

**Health and Happiness**

• Amend goal to recognise both physical and social environments as important in supporting health and happiness
• Introduce reference to sustainable community organisations
• Include walkable open space as an objective (relocated from Environment Focus Area)
• Include reference to active transport as an objective
• Include reference to social capital and capacity building

**Capability**

• Amend objective to be clearer (‘An innovative, responsive, influential local government which leads the way in delivering services and projects through good governance, effective communication, responsible management and excellence in delivery’), including the term ‘influential’ as a key component
• Reduce Outcomes by combining headings to focus on:
  – Transparent and responsive (community)
Leadership and empowerment (internal)
Influential and collaborative (external)
Sustainable and responsive asset and financial management (financial)

**Strategic Projects**

- Sort into:
  - Advocacy Projects
  - Policy & Planning Projects
  - Capital & Delivery Projects

- Group projects including combining:
  - Freo 2029 projects
  - Greening Freo & Urban Forest projects,

- Include and group urban renewal/redevelopment projects (Heart of Beaconsfield, Leisure Centre Precinct, Oval Precinct)
- Include leisure and recreation plan as a new initiative
- Include links to subsidiary documents.

**Step 5 - Elected Member presentation on revised draft**

The draft revisions proposed as an outcome of the feedback received were informally presented to Elected Member in early April and are formally submitted in this report.

**Companion Plan**

In addition to considering the draft revisions, the report proposes a plan to address resolution 4 (illustrative companion document). This was understood to be sought to assist in communication of the Plan and to increase understanding of the interrelationship of elements and the relationship of subsidiary plans and projects to the Strategic Community Plan objectives. A range of options were considered including:

1. To prepare a single graphic plan illustrated some of the key spatial initiatives included in the Strategic Community Plan.
2. To prepare a series of graphic plans illustrating some of the key spatial initiatives included in the Strategic Community Plan relating to each Key Focus Area, and one summary plan at the conclusion.
3. To prepare a companion document similar in style to the Freo 2029 document covering city-wide priorities and incorporating a descriptive element.
4. To defer preparation of a companion document until this can incorporate full strategic review of initiatives as part of the next Strategic Community Plan review.

Whilst all options have pros and cons, the preparation of a single graphic plan illustrating some of the key spatial initiatives has been pursued as an initial (and the most feasible first) step (refer Attachment 2). The plan is not proposed to be included a formal component of the Strategic Community Plan as elements of it may evolve and so require more regular update, and it is essentially a communication tool, however it provides a useful reference in locating some of the initiatives stemming from the Strategic Community Plan. Development of this into or complemented by a more explanatory document (potentially with a web-based version) is proposed as a second step. This work could complement the development of advocacy material and the review of the City's website.
Next Steps
Draft revisions to the Strategic Community Plan document have been prepared reflecting the direction outlined above. This is provided in attachment 1 for Council’s endorsement for public consultation. Whilst the revisions do not represent a fundamental change in direction to the plan, community consultation is recommended to enable public feedback on the revisions and any other suggestions. Consultation on the plan will also meet the requirements of the Regulations for a major review to enable Council to align into the review cycle approved last September, consistent with the recommendations of the Department of Local Government.

Community consultation is proposed to include:

1. Publication on website
2. Notification of all Precincts Groups (and offer to present)
3. Advertising in local papers
4. Pop up sessions and / or information available in community venues.

A report on the outcomes of advertising and finalisation of the revision is planned to be submitted to Council in June.

Subsequent to that, the following steps are recommended to occur ahead of and in preparation for the next (major) review:

1. Undertake a review of the measures of success to ensure that these represent the best available in relation to each outcome (recognising that outcomes may alter in future but general areas of endeavour are likely to remain unchanged).
2. Establish best data sources available for each measure of success not currently routinely monitored, and implement data capture.
3. Review biennial Community Perceptions Survey to ensure community priorities are well captured, and to refine any questions which may assist in success measure monitoring. (note substantial review of the Perceptions Survey is not recommended).
4. Complete strategic documents audit in 2019 to determine priority gaps / reviews required.
7. Continue annual integrated planning workshop process on annual basis with view to developing this and improving line of sight between strategic documents (as per September 2018 resolution).

Further development of communication material associated with the Strategic Community Plan and associated projects is also occurring.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
Simple Majority Required
OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge   Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. Endorse the revised Strategic Community Plan as provided and amended in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Minutes (10 April 2019), for the purposes of public advertising.

2. Note the preparation of the draft Strategic Community Plan Companion Plan as provided in Attachment 2 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019), which provides a non-statutory illustration of the location of some of its key spatial initiatives.

3. Note the steps proposed to occur in preparation of next major review of the Strategic Community Plan scheduled for 2021/22.

AMENDMENT 1

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt   Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

To amend part 1 of the officer’s recommendation to include the words shown in green italics, as follows:

1. Endorse the revised Strategic Community Plan as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Minutes (10 April 2019), including an amendment to Outcome 1.3, to add the words ‘and creative industries’, for the purposes of public advertising.

Carried: 7/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Sam Wainwright, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Andrew Sullivan

Reason for change:

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure there is a clear link between the development strategy and the plan.

Additional officer’s information

An updated copy of the draft Strategic Community Plan Companion Plan is provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda (17 April 2019).
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-3
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council:

1. Endorse the revised Strategic Community Plan as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Minutes (10 April 2019), including an amendment to Outcome 1.3, to add the words ‘and creative industries’, for the purposes of public advertising.

2. Note the preparation of the draft Strategic Community Plan Companion Plan as provided in Attachment 2 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019), which provides a non-statutory illustration of the location of some of its key spatial initiatives.

3. Note the steps proposed to occur in preparation of next major review of the Strategic Community Plan scheduled for 2021/22.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
ADVERTISING OF THE PROPOSED DIFFERENTIAL RATE FOR THE 2019/2020 FINANCIAL YEAR

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Director City Business
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Objects and Reasons for Differential Rates for the 2019/2020 financial year

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider approval of advertising of the proposed 2019/2020 differential rate categories, rate in the dollar and minimum payment as detailed in the Objects and Reasons for differential rates (shown in Attachment 1), in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995.

This report recommends that Council endorse the proposed 2019/2020 differential rate categories, rate in the dollar and minimum payment and approve advertising of the proposed 2019/2020 differential rates.

BACKGROUND

The power to raise local government property rates is set out under the Local Government Act 1995 (Act). In adopting its annual budget, the Council must consider its current Strategic Community, Corporate Business and Long Term Strategic Plans and, subject to the rating provisions under the Act, the Council is at liberty to use its rating powers to raise rate revenue at the level it determines appropriate. To determine this level requires the Council to assess the current and future service needs, aspiration of the community and their capacity and willingness to pay for those services.

As part of the process for the 2019/2020 draft budget it is proposed to continue to apply differential rating. In accordance with the City’s Long Term Strategic Plan, a proposed increase of 1.50% has been applied to the rate in the dollar and minimum payment for each differential rate category. It is noted that Perth’s CPI increased by 1.3% in the latest quarter to December 2018 and the weighted average for Australia was 1.8% for quarter to December 2018.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Differential rates represent a strategic approach to rating which is Council's major revenue source.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Under the Local Government Act 1995 section 6.33 and 6.34 allows Council to impose differential rates and minimum payment. Section 6.36 requires Council to give notice of certain rates before imposing.
CONSULTATION

Nil

OFFICER COMMENT

It is recommended that the proposed differential rate categories, rate in the dollar and minimum payment as detailed in the attached 2019/2020 Objects and Reasons for differential rates and outlined below, be advertised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Rate Category</th>
<th>Proposed Minimum Payment</th>
<th>Proposed Rate in the Dollar ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Improved</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.073110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Industrial General</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.081355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Commercial and Industrial</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.146219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Commercial</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.086031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightclubs</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.146220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential Land</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>0.117018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Short Term Accommodation</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.081345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before Council can impose differential rates across the City, Council must advertise the proposed differential rates for a minimum of 21 days. The advertising period can occur up to two months prior to adoption of the budget. This period of advertising allows ratepayers the ability to consider the proposed rates in the dollar and make any submissions prior to Council adopting the proposed rate as part of the budget adoption process.

Public advertising of the proposed rate in dollar and minimum payment does not bind Council to these when adopting the 2019/2020 budget. The advertising process does not prohibit Council from amending the rate in the dollar and minimum payment at budget adoption.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required
Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council:

1. Endorse the proposed 2019/2020 differential rate categories, rate in the dollar and minimum payment as outlined below and detailed in the Objects and Reasons for differential rates, provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Agenda (10 April 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Rate Category</th>
<th>Proposed Minimum Payment</th>
<th>Proposed Rate in the Dollar ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Improved</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.073110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Industrial General</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.081355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Commercial and Industrial</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.146219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Commercial</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.086031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightclubs</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.146220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential Land</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>0.117018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Short Term Accommodation</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>0.081345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approve the 2019/2020 differential rate categories, rate in the dollar and minimum payment as outlined in part 1, be advertised.

Carried en bloc: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-5 INTENTION TO MAKE A DETERMINATION - RELEASE OF GAS FILLED BALLOONS - LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LOCAL LAW

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Governance
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Nil

SUMMARY

The City of Fremantle Local Government Property Amendment Local Law 2019, allows Council to make a determination relating to the release of gas filled balloons on local government property.

To support the administration in restricting the release of gas filled balloons this report recommends Council give local public notice of its intention to make a determination under the local law.

This report recommends that Council, in accordance with the process outlined in the City’s Property Local Law, gives local public notice of its intention to make a Determination prohibiting the release of gas filled balloons on all local government property within the City of Fremantle.

Purpose: The purpose of the determination is to prohibit the release of gas filled balloons from local government property within the City of Fremantle.

Effect: The effect of the determination is the provision of authority to enforce and administer fines relating to the release of gas filled balloons, reducing balloon litter and preventing injury to marine and wildlife.

BACKGROUND

In light of the success of the City’s sustainability guideline principal of eliminating the use of balloons at City run events, Council recently amended its Property Local Law to include a provision which enables the City to make determinations relating to the release of gas filled balloons on local government property.

It is anticipated that the amendment to the City’s Property local law and subsequent determinations made under that law will help reduce balloon litter being deposited (deliberately or accidentally) in our City and our oceans, offering protection to both marine and wildlife.

“Balloons can end up in the ocean which adds to the already unacceptable levels of plastic and waste in our waterways and ecosystem. Fish, birds and other animals are being found with unacceptable amounts of rubber and plastic in their bodies.”
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

A determination and its enforcement are provided for in the City of Fremantle Local Government Property Local Law 2002.

The procedure for making a determination is set out in Section 2.2
1. The local government is to give local public notice of its intention to make a determination.
2. The local public notice is to be in the format prescribed
3. Council is to consider submissions received and give public notice of the outcome of its consideration.
   a. Adoption of the proposed determination
   b. Amendment and further advertising of the proposed determination
   c. Not to continue with the proposed determination.

CONSULTATION

In accordance with the local law, the intention to make a determination will be advertised in the local newspaper and public submissions may be received for a period of twenty-one (21) days.

Submissions will be considered by Council before a final decision is made and further public notice given.

OFFICER COMMENT

The proposed determination will prohibit the release of gas filled balloons (often released in large groups during funerals and other ceremonial occasions). When balloons are released and they burst high in the atmosphere and cause jellyfish shaped pieces of debris to fall, which often end up in our oceans.

Sea turtles and other marine creatures can mistake these brightly coloured pieces of marine debris, which are often shaped like jellyfish, as food. This mistake can often prove fatal to marine creatures.
VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-5
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council, in accordance with the process outlined in the City’s Property Local Law, gives local public notice of its intention to make a Determination prohibiting the release of gas filled balloons on all local government property within the City of Fremantle.

Purpose: The purpose of the determination is to prohibit the release of gas filled balloons from local government property within the City of Fremantle.

Effect: The effect of the determination is the provision of authority to enforce and administer fines relating to the release of gas filled balloons, reducing balloon litter and preventing injury to marine and wildlife.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to adopt the Age Friendly City Plan 2019-2024. The report has been prepared to outline the purpose, key principles and approach taken by the City’s Age Friendly Working Group.

This report recommends that the City builds on its achievements and continues to make the City the most positive place it can be for older people.

The Age Friendly City Plan 2019–2024 (AFC Plan), along with the development of an implementation plan, will support and guide a broad range of initiatives over the next five years.

BACKGROUND

The City commenced the Age Friendly City (AFC) journey in 2010 with an intensive community engagement process. Two AFC plans have been executed, firstly in 2011-2014 and an interim plan 2014-2015. There was no active plan from 2015 however an outcomes report 2015-2018 was compiled (see attachment 1). The 32 page report shows actions completed across the organisation’s business units.

The World Health Organisation’s Age Friendly Cities Framework was used to guide the development of the vision, outcomes and strategies for the AFC Plan 2019-2024. The World Health Organisation (WHO) has established eight domains of the urban environment that contribute to healthy and active ageing. These domains include social participation, community support and health, housing, civic participation and employment, communication and information, transportation, outdoor spaces and buildings, respect and inclusion.

WHO state that our environments “play an important role in determining our physical and mental capacity across a person’s life course and into older age and also how well we adjust to loss of function and other forms of adversity that we may experience”¹.

The City was awarded membership to the World Health Organisation Age Friendly City Global Network in 2016. This achievement endorses the City of Fremantle as a local government that values older people while striving to be inclusive and accessible in an urban environment that promotes positive ageing.

A new AFC Plan 2019-2024 has now been developed (contained within the recommendation).

Through the AFC Plan 2019-2024 the City will endeavour to decrease loneliness, increase social participation and volunteering, provided intergenerational and cross cultural activities and improved communication on relevant services and opportunities for people over the age of 55 within the Fremantle LGA.

The City provides a range of low cost free activities, including the Wanjoo Lounge (former One Stop Shop), Come and Try programs, community forums, social dancing and in-home library services. The City will also concentrate on catering for seniors as part of its mainstream services to the community, notably at the Leisure Centre, Library, The Meeting Place and the Fremantle Arts Centre.

The AFC Plan 2019-2024 aims to build on and maintain the work achieved over the last nine years, across the organisation and under the WHO domains.

The new AFC Plan will continue to support the Wanjoo Lounge, promote social participation and volunteering opportunities as well as continue to facilitate communication opportunities through projects, expos, events and community engagement.

The City has been recognised for its efforts to become an age-friendly by taking out the Age Friendly Local Government category at the WA Seniors Awards in November 2018.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The actions associated with the new plan will be delivered from within Community Development’s Positive Ageing account.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil, however for the City to maintain its status as a WHO global age friendly city the plan will need to be evaluated in three years.

CONSULTATION

The City of Fremantle’s Strategic Community Plan 2015-2025 aims for Fremantle to be an environment where it is easy for people to live safe, happy and healthy lives. It seeks to celebrate and support diversity and improve community inclusiveness and participation for all.

In 2018 City staff were supported by a consultant to assist with community engagement for the new plan. A working group was established comprising the Mayor, three Elected Members, four service providers and six community representatives. The final draft of the AFC Plan 2019-24 was endorsed by the working group in March 2019.

The AFC Plan engagement report summarises the approach, `what we heard` via the community engagement channels, key stakeholder consultation, informal events, survey results and key findings (see attachment 2 for details).
The draft AFC Plan 2019-2024 was released for community comment from 19 February and closed on 19 March 2019 via the My Say, City of Fremantle website.

OFFICER COMMENT

The purpose of the Age Friendly City Plan is to prioritise positive ageing opportunities for the Fremantle community and a great place for older people to visit.

According to 2016 Census data the City of Fremantle has both a higher median age and a larger proportion of people over 55, compared to Western Australia. As a destination city it also attracts visitors of all ages.

The community engagement process was invaluable in developing this plan. It was a vehicle to inform people on the city’s current initiatives. It also provided opportunity to listen to the lived experience of people over 55 and learn what can be done to empower individuals as they age, live independently and vibrantly.

Being age friendly is a village approach to ensure that older people live full and healthy lives, participating in and contributing to their community.

The working group representatives brought a collective voice for specific cohorts - aged care providers, multicultural groups and the challenges of living with dementia.

Betty Garlett, Aboriginal representative on the working group provided a brilliant solution on how to hear from isolated residents. A stamped address postcard was put into prescription bags at the Chemist.

The City supports the development of an age friendly community and embraces the World Health Organisation’s age friendly communities concept of consideration and planning for the ageing of the community.

Age friendly communities are those that are inclusive and accessible for people of all ages. This encompasses spaces and places, programs and initiatives that make a community better for all residents, including children, young people, parents and older people.

An age friendly community benefits everyone by creating a culture of inclusion enjoyed by people of all ages and abilities.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-9
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt    Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council:

1. Adopt the City of Fremantle Age Friendly City Plan 2019-2024, outlined below.

2. Notes the Age Friendly City Plan 2015-2018 Outcomes Report, as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

3. Notes the Age Friendly City Plan Community Engagement Report, as provided in Attachment 2 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

Age Friendly City Plan 2019-2024

Introduction

The City of Fremantle’s Strategic Community Plan 2015-2025 aims for Fremantle to be an environment where it is easy for people to live safe, happy and healthy lives. It seeks to celebrate and support diversity and improve community inclusiveness and participation for all.

According to 2016 Census data the City of Fremantle has both a higher median age and a larger proportion of people over 55, compared to Western Australia. As a destination city it also attracts visitors of all ages.

The City’s journey to becoming an age friendly city started in 2010 and in 2016 the City was accepted as a member to the World Health Organisation Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities. The WHO age-friendly cities guide highlights eight interconnected domains that cities and communities can address to better adapt to the needs of older people:

- The built environment
- Transport
- Housing
- Social participation
- Respect and social inclusion
- Civic participation and employment
- Communication
- Community support and health services.

To prepare a new Age Friendly City Plan a review of the City's progress commenced in 2018. A Working Group with representatives from community members, key organisations, City staff and Elected Members met throughout the review to guide the process. Over 150 people were engaged either online, through surveys, at events or via one-on-one meetings and their input informed the development of new and revised actions for the City.
Purpose of the Plan
The purpose of the Age Friendly City Plan is to prioritise positive ageing opportunities for the Fremantle community and a great place for older people to visit. The plan is organised in line with the eight WHO age friendly city domains and covers actions the City can lead, facilitate or promote as well as advocate for where the responsibility sits outside local government. The Plan represents a whole-of-organisation approach and will be supported with an implementation plan. To maintain its status as a WHO global age friendly city the plan will need to be evaluated in three years.

1. Social participation

   Provide a range of lifelong learning activities that encourage older people to participate in community life.

   1.1 Provide activities and courses at various locations that encourage participation and increase social participation.

   1.2 Provide affordable programs that encourage older people to try new and different sports or other forms of physical activity.

   1.3 Advocate and promote programs and initiatives which target respect, inclusion and social participation.

2. Community Support and Health Services

   Assist people in Fremantle to age positively and actively by providing appropriate information and support to maximise health and wellbeing.

   2.1 Improve communication between the City and Fremantle-based aged care providers by offering opportunities for networking meetings.

   2.2 Facilitate opportunities which provide information to older people to navigate ageing well and healthy lifestyles.

   2.3 Promote My Community Directory which provides details on the range of services and activities for older people in the Fremantle area.

3. Civic participation and employment

   Create opportunities for older people to actively participate in the community through civic involvement.

   3.1 Community engagement will be accessible, well-promoted and flexible, engaging older people to have their say.

   3.2 Support local organisations to recruit and retain volunteers through Volunteer Fremantle.
3.3 Facilitate opportunities for older people to share their skills and knowledge on a paid or voluntary basis.

4. Communication and information

Provide accessible information on aged care services in a variety of formats.

4.1 Promote the programs and activities provided by the City of Fremantle for older people in a range of formats.

4.2 Ensure the City of Fremantle website meets accessibility guidelines set out by Vision Australia and the Disability Services Act.

4.3 Community engagement opportunities are well-promoted and offered in a range of formats.

5. Outdoor spaces and buildings

Ensure that older people have the same opportunities as other people to access the City's buildings, facilities, parks, reserves, playgrounds and beaches.

5.1 Regular upgrades in the Fremantle local government area where better seating, shading, footpaths and pedestrian crossings are required as part of ongoing capital works.

5.2 Provide accessible community facilities for older persons.

6. Respect and Inclusion

Provide activities that promote positive images of older people of diverse cultures and increase community participation.

6.1 Celebrate the achievements of older people through a range of events, activities and media.

6.2 Maintain a range of initiatives that encourage inclusive, intergenerational and cross cultural relationships.

6.3 Provide educational opportunities and workshops for older people that enable access to new technologies.

6.4 Provide opportunities for older people to contribute to community led programs and activities.
7. Transportation

Ensure that older people are able to move around their community easily through public and active transport.

7.1 Advocate to the State Government authorities to improve public transport for older people.

7.2 Continue to contribute to the funding of the Central Area Transit (CAT) Service to allow for easy mobility around the Fremantle central business district.

7.3 Advocate for a light rail transport system in Fremantle.

7.4 Encourage mobility and social connection by promoting trails for walking, cycling or access by mobility device in the Fremantle local government area.

7.5 Advocate for shelters and seating to be provided at all bus stops.

8. Housing

Ensure that there is provision of housing which is diverse and affordable to meet the current and future needs of the older people.

8.1 Advocate for statutory changes to the planning system to promote accessible and ageing appropriate housing.

8.2 Establish partnerships with local community housing providers to enable the provision of affordable housing in large development projects and sites.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-12 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING - PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF FREMANTLE ITALIAN CLUB

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Director City Business
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between City, Italian Club and

SUMMARY

The proposed redevelopment of the Italian Club property at 65 Marine Terrace, Fremantle, and adjoining car park is one of the five key developments to support the necessary change to unlock the potential of the city as a vibrant and sustainable urban centre contained in the Freo 2029 Transformational Moves document.

The City has been engaged in discussion with the Italian Club since early 2016 to progress this proposed redevelopment. In mid-2017 the Club sought to include the Fini Group in the discussion.

The three parties have now agreed to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to detail the role of each party in undertaking the preparatory planning work for this proposed redevelopment. The MoU will allow the Fini Group to undertake the preparation work for the proposal and work with state government to consider land tenure requirements.

BACKGROUND

The City and the executive of the Club have been in discussion for some time on the future needs and aspirations of the Club. Part of the conversation includes the current size of the venue and whether it will suit the needs of the club going forward. The City is interested in progressing the conversation in relation to the extension of Norfolk Street through to Mews Road and the extension of the Esplanade Reserve across to the road reserve in accordance with the Esplanade Park Masterplan and Freo 2029 Transformational Moves. This also includes retention of the approximate 200 car parking spaces in the current car park between the Club and Esplanade Reserve.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The progress of preparatory work on a proposal for redevelopment of 65 Marine Terrace and the adjoining car park will require no financial contribution by the City. All financial costs associated with the preparatory planning for redevelopment will sit with the Fini Group.

The MoU proposes that in the circumstance that redevelopment is agreed and approved by all necessary parties, Fini Group will provide the forward funding of all works – including public works. Further agreements will be considered on how long Fini may hold certain assets such as the car park to recover the costs of the public works.
LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The MoU requires all legislative requirements to be met in the development of preparatory planning. This will include state approvals and agreements.

It is not a binding agreement for redevelopment and does not fetter any statutory rights of the City, nor does it remove the requirement of any part of the Local Government Act 1995 in relation to future requirements.

The land where the Club sits and adjoining car park land is crown land vested in the City. Agreeing to the MoU will allow Fini Group to engage in discussion with the state government over redevelopment of this land and provide the basis for preparatory work.

CONSULTATION

Nil.

OFFICER COMMENT

The proposed MoU provides the vehicle for the three parties to work exclusively in allowing the forward planning for the possible redevelopment of the Italian Club and the possible extension of Norfolk Street through to Mews Road to take place. This would include the extension south for Esplanade Reserve to the new road alignment.

This proposed MoU is not a binding agreement for redevelopment and does not fetter the City’s statutory powers nor does it remove any obligations the City may have under the Local Government Act. If required, the City may still need to consider the provision of the Act in relation to a major land transaction. There is still plenty of preparatory planning required before a formal proposal for redevelopment of the site will be ready for consideration. The MoU is not the approval for redevelopment but will allow for this planning to be undertaken.

The opportunity to discuss possible future development options on the Italian Club site at 65 Marine Terrace, Fremantle, works well with the strategic outcomes identified by the City in various key plans including the Freo 2029 Transformational Moves strategy.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

Additional officer’s information

The MoU provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019), has been slightly amended to include provision of parking as part of the benefit for the Club and amend the confidentiality clause to remove the MoU from the clause. The revised MoU is shown in Attachment 1 of this item in the Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda (17 April 2019).
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-12
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council;

1. Approve the City of Fremantle entering into the Memorandum of Understanding for the proposed redevelopment of the Fremantle Italian Club site at 65 Marine Terrace, Fremantle, as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019), between the Fremantle Italian Club, Fini Group (Ocved Pty Ltd) and the City of Fremantle;

2. Authorise the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and execute the Memorandum of Understanding in part 1 above, once signed by the two other parties.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

To adopt various budget amendments to the 2018/2019 budget account numbers as detailed below in accordance with the Budget Management Policy. The budget amendments have nil effect to the overall budget.

This report recommends that Council approves the required budget amendments to the adopted budget for 2018/19 as outlined in the report.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the Budget Management Policy this report provides details of proposed amendments to the 2018/2019 budget on a monthly basis to Council (via FPOL) to adopt budget amendments to:

1. Consider an additional purpose, or grant acceptance or release of quarantined funds.

2. Reflect any expenditure above the budget amount agreed by the CEO in the previous month, and to adjust other accounts to accommodate the value of these.

3. Make amendments to the carried forward budget to reflect the final position at the end of financial year.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications are detailed in this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Local Government Act 1995:

Section 6.2 (1)
The Council is required to prepare and adopt, by Absolute Majority, an annual budget for its municipal fund by 31st August each year.

Section 6.8 (1) and (2)
The Council cannot incur expenditure from its municipal fund for a purpose for which no expenditure estimate is included in the annual budget (known as an ‘additional purpose’) except where the expenditure —
(a) is incurred in a financial year before the adoption of the annual budget by the local government;
(b) is authorised in advance by resolution by Absolute Majority; or
(c) is authorised in advance by the mayor or president in an emergency.

Where expenditure has been incurred;
(a) under S 6.8 (1) (a) it is required to be included in the annual budget for that financial year; and
(b) under S 6.8 (1) (c), it is to be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the council.

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996:

Regulation 33A
A formal review of the annual budget is to be presented and adopted by Council, by Absolute Majority, between 1st January and 31st March each year.

CONSULTATION

There are no community engagement implications as a result of this report.

OFFICER COMMENT

The following amendments to budget account numbers to the adopted budget for 2018/2019 are submitted to Council for approval as outlined below.

1. Budget amendments for proposed expenditure for an additional purpose

The proposed budget amendments below are for expenditure for an additional purpose to be determined by Council as required by S6.8 (1) (b) of the Act. The decision will amend the budget by creating a new budget account number to accommodate that proposed expenditure, and by transferring the required funds from one or more existing accounts to the new account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Details</th>
<th>2018/19 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Revenue (Increase)/Decrease</th>
<th>Expenditure Increase/(Decrease)</th>
<th>2018/19 Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Budget amendments for proposed expenditure for a purpose identified within the budget for which there are insufficient funds allocated

CEO has the delegated authority under the Budget Management Policy to incur expenditure for a purpose identified within the budget for which there is insufficient funds allocated, where:

a) The proposed expenditure is a maximum of 5% or $50,000 (whichever is the lesser) above the budgeted amount, and

b) There are sufficient funds equivalent to the value proposed to be sent allocated to other budget line items within the overall budget, and which, in the opinion of the CEO, are not expected to be spent during that financial year.
The budget amendments below are to reflect any expenditure above the budget amount agreed by the CEO during the previous month, and to adjust other accounts to accommodate the value of those.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Details</th>
<th>2018/19 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Expenditure Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>2018/19 Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>300001.1606</td>
<td>P-10212 Install-Gil Fraser Oval shed – Cap Exp</td>
<td>($58,000)</td>
<td>$2,545</td>
<td>($55,455)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300001.4212</td>
<td>P-10212 Install-Gil Fraser Oval shed – Cap Inc</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>($2,545)</td>
<td>$35,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>300082.1606</td>
<td>P-10882 Design and construct-Stevens Reserve cricket nets – Cap Exp</td>
<td>($104,850)</td>
<td>($6,850)</td>
<td>($111,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300082.4214</td>
<td>P-10882 Design and construct-Stevens Reserve cricket nets – Cap Inc</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
<td>$56,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>300016.1606</td>
<td>P-10818 Resurface MRRG-McCombe Ave – Cap Exp</td>
<td>($202,768)</td>
<td>$9,933</td>
<td>($192,835)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300016.4211</td>
<td>P-10818 Resurface MRRG-McCombe Ave – Cap Inc</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>($9,933)</td>
<td>$140,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300024.1606</td>
<td>P-11749 Resurface MRRG-High St – Cap Exp</td>
<td>($49,474)</td>
<td>$3,127</td>
<td>$46,347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300024.4211</td>
<td>P-11749 Resurface MRRG-High St – Cap Inc</td>
<td>$36,867</td>
<td>($3,127)</td>
<td>$33,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Carried forward projects estimate budget amendments

The budget amendments below are to adjust the carried forward project estimates and to amend the carried forward budget to reflect the final position at the end of financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Details</th>
<th>2018/19 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Expenditure Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>2018/19 Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority Required
Council Decision Item FPOL1904-14
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council approves the required budget amendments to the adopted budget for 2018/2019 as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Details</th>
<th>2018/19 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Expenditure (Increase)/ Decrease</th>
<th>2018/19 Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>300001.1606</td>
<td>P-10212 Install-Gil Fraser Oval shed</td>
<td>($58,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545 ($55,455)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>300001.4212</td>
<td>P-10212 Install-Gil Fraser Oval shed</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>($2,545)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>300082.1606</td>
<td>P-10882 Design and construct-Stevens Reserve cricket nets</td>
<td>($104,850)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($6,850) ($111,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>300082.4214</td>
<td>P-10882 Design and construct-Stevens Reserve cricket nets</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>300016.1606</td>
<td>P-10818 Resurface MRRG-McCombe Ave</td>
<td>($202,768)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,933 ($192,835)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>300016.4211</td>
<td>P-10818 Resurface MRRG-McCombe Ave</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>($9,933)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>300024.1606</td>
<td>P-11749 Resurface MRRG-High St</td>
<td>($49,474)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,127 ($46,347)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>300024.4211</td>
<td>P-11749 Resurface MRRG-High St</td>
<td>$36,867</td>
<td>($3,127)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried by absolute majority, en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

Each year, the City is invited to submit for consideration projects qualifying for the Metropolitan Regional Road Group (MRRG) grant program. The closing date for the financial year 20/21 programme submissions is the 26 April 2019 and the successful projects funded will be announced in May 2020.

There is a maximum limit of $750,000 that the City can apply in relation to grant funding for MRRG projects each financial year. Under the MRRG two thirds/one third (MRRG/City) grant contribution mechanism, the City will be required to contribute a minimum of $375,000 as part of an annual total programme budget to satisfy the MRRG guidelines. A total programme budget of $1,125,000 is proposed for financial year 20/21.

The proposed MRRG resurfacing projects will also provide the opportunity to undertake maintenance works on footpaths, kerbs and drainage as identified in the Asset Management Plan. Any additional maintenance work (other than resurfacing and line markings) to accommodate these improvements will need to be funded through additional municipal funds within the annual renewal budget. This will be referred to as the ‘Complete Streets’ approach.

Selection for funding through the MRRG grant program is based on the condition of the road surface. An application will only be made by the City of Fremantle where the condition of the road surface is necessary.

This report recommends that the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee (FPOL) supports the financial year 20/21 MRRG grant program submission for the projects as listed in the officer’s recommendation, under section 1.1 of the delegation of authority.

BACKGROUND

The MRRG Grant Program has been created to provide the basis of an unbiased approach to determining the condition and importance of potential grant funded rehabilitation projects. Each project is assessed using the approved accumulative points scoring system that considers road condition, surface age, volume of traffic and number of heavy vehicles using the road.

Sites are inspected and condition ratings carried out, in accordance with the current MRRG Rehabilitation Guidelines March 2018. All traffic lanes are inspected. Each site’s score is reviewed and a visual condition point’s score table is produced to ensure that they are suitable projects for final submission.
The existing road profile and deflection survey is also conducted for all sites and this determines the recommended road treatment.

The following criteria apply to all MRRG rehabilitation submissions:

- All district distributor A and B roads are applicable for funding with no required minimum number of vehicles per day (vpd)
- All local distributor roads carrying greater than 2000 vpd are applicable for funding.
- Access roads are not applicable for funding
- A pavement investigation and design is required for all submissions

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As required under the MRRG funding guidelines, the City must contribute one third of the road rehabilitation cost. In addition the City must cover the cost of extra traffic management and any ancillary cost associated with the ‘Complete Streets’ approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRRG Road Rehabilitation (Financial Year 20/21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution – MRRG Grant Funding (2/3 of Road Rehabilitation Cost)</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for Road Rehabilitation (1/3 of Road Rehabilitation Cost)</td>
<td>$375,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Additional Costs (Financial Year 20/21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for other works including traffic management and Complete Streets</td>
<td>$353,585.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

All road pavement rehabilitation will require final approval from Main Roads WA as part of the MRRG grant application.

**CONSULTATION**

The South West Sub Group Metropolitan Regional Road Group has been informed of the current intention.

Residents will be consulted by the construction team prior to any works being undertaken.

**OFFICER COMMENT**

The City of Fremantle Infrastructure Engineering team engaged external consultants to carry out the field investigation, explore design options and recommend road treatments for a number of roads within the City boundary for funding consideration by MRRG.
A draft summary of the investigation and recommended treatments is shown in the report Attachment (MRRG Pavement Design). The City can elect not to progress any or all of the submitted sites subject to funding availability and or select specific projects from the list below under the officer’s recommendation.

In accordance with the latest MRRG Rehabilitation Guidelines, any costs other than the resurfacing and line marking, will need to be sourced from the local authority’s annual capital budget. This includes the costs associated with traffic management, maintenance works and other improvement initiatives within the nominated resurfacing extent.

Recommended roads for the City’s MRRG funding submission for financial year 20/21 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name and Extent</th>
<th>Total Cost of Road Rehabilitation Treatment</th>
<th>Proposed Treatment</th>
<th>Cost of additional works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>$104,300</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
<td>$36,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street – Adelaide Street to High Street (excluding intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
<td>$31,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street/High Street Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>$128,400</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
<td>$44,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street – High Street to Henderson Street (excluding intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>$686,500</td>
<td>Foam Bitumen stabilisation</td>
<td>$205,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefroy Road - Edmund Street to Caesar Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>$116,800</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>$35,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterfold Road - Mc Combe Avenue to Property No 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,125,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$353,585</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Costs (Financial Year 20/21)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRRG’s Grant Funding Contribution</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for additional works</td>
<td>$353,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,478,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Queen Street rehabilitation work was previously planned for completion in financial year 18/19 but the grant application was deferred by Council to align with the King Square Public Realm works.

Officers have nominated Sites 1 through 3 in this report to be rehabilitated on Queen Street during financial year 20/21; this timing will now coincide and follow on from the completion of the Kings Square building developments during the same financial year.

The Queen Street and High Street intersection surface treatment will be matched with the nominated treatment within the King Square Public Realm Master Plan. In this location a non-Asphaltic surface treatment has been nominated. The costs of these materials are not included in the road rehabilitation costs tabled above and will need to be sourced from an alternative budget.

Officers will submit a budget proposal to reflect these works for Council consideration as part of the 2020/21 budget process, the intention being to deliver the works at the intersection at the same time as the road rehabilitation works in the intersection.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge Seconded: Cr Rachel Pemberton

The Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation committee acting under delegation 1.1, Approve the application for grant funding be submitted to the Metropolitan Regional Road Group, for the 2020/21 financial year grant program for the following road improvement projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name and Extent</th>
<th>Proposed Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1 Queen Street section between Adelaide Street to High Street (excluding intersections).</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2 Queen Street and High Street Intersection.</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3 Queen Street section between High Street and Henderson Street (excluding intersections).</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4 Lefroy Road (between Edmund Street and Caesar Street).</td>
<td>Foam Bitumen stabilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5 Winterfold Road (between McCombe Avenue and Property No 120 Winterfold Road).</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge

The item be referred to the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held 17 April 2019 for a decision.

Carried: 7/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Sam Wainwright, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Andrew Sullivan

Additional officer’s information

At the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee meeting a number of queries were raised in relation to this item, these are addressed as follows:

1. Clarification about extent of Winterfold Road

Winterfold Road between McCombe Avenue and Property No 114 (not 120) Winterfold Road. For clarification, proposed works will only cover the extent in the eastbound carriageway within the City of Fremantle boundary and was an error in the report. The detailed scope and proposed costs remain unchanged.

2. Concerns about the inclusion of Queen Street road reconstruction (sites 1 to 3 – between Henderson Street and Adelaide Street) – specifically relating to costs, quality and timing with other works in Kings Square.

The grant funding and cost of additional works in this report covers the road rehabilitation on a ‘like for like’ basis, it does not cover the additional costs associated with upgrading of the road in line with the Kings Square Master Plan. Officers would however, propose to complete the works to the specification for the Kings Square Master Plan project and following detailed design, include a request for budget funding as part of the 20/21 FYR budget process. The Queen Street sections of the proposed works were nominated to coincide and follow on from the completion of the Kings Square building developments. Practical completion of the City’s new civic building and library is scheduled for the end of July 2020; this will be followed by the building fit-out works – estimated to run between August and November 2020. Building occupation / activation is anticipated during November / December 2020. Subject to approval, the Queen Street road reconstruction works, as nominated in this report for grant funding was targeted to occur towards the end of the City’s building fit-out when the construction traffic was anticipated to have significantly reduced.

Following discussion at FPOL and to address the concerns raised, officers have reviewed the timing and the inclusion of Queen Street in the road reconstruction grant submission and would propose that this be re-scheduled for a future financial year.
As an alternative, officers would propose the following amended MRRG funding submission for financial year 20/21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Street Name and Extent</th>
<th>Total Cost of Road Rehabilitation Treatment</th>
<th>Proposed Treatment</th>
<th>Cost of additional works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lefroy Road (East Bound and WestBound) 10m West of Edmund Street to 20m East of Caesar Street, including Curedale Street roundabout</td>
<td>$730,600</td>
<td>Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation</td>
<td>$219,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Winterfold Road (East Bound) between McCombe Avenue and the boundary with the City of Cockburn (Property No 114)</td>
<td>$116,800</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>$35,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Terrace (North Bound and South Bound) 25m North of Alma Street to 50m North of Russel Street, including Wray Avenue roundabout</td>
<td>$186,900</td>
<td>Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation</td>
<td>$56,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carrington Street (South Bound) 15m North of Hughes Street to Property 188</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Fill and part Reconstruction of Road</td>
<td>$17,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,092,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$327,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Costs (Financial Year 20/21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRRG’s Grant Funding Contribution</td>
<td>$728,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$364,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Contribution for additional works</td>
<td>$327,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,420,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council, approve the application for grant funding be submitted to the Metropolitan Regional Road Group, for the 2020/21 financial year grant program for the following road improvement projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Street Name and Extent</th>
<th>Proposed Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site 1| Lefroy Road (East Bound and West Bound)  
10m West of Edmund Street to 20m East of Caesar Street, including Curedale Street roundabout | Foam Bitumen stabilisation             |
| Site 2| Winterfold Road (East Bound)  
between McCombe Avenue and the boundary with the City of Cockburn (Property No 114) | Overlay                                |
| Site 3| South Terrace (North Bound and South Bound)  
25m North of Alma Street to 50m North of Russel Street, including Wray Avenue roundabout | Foam Bitumen stabilisation             |
| Site 4| Carrington Street (South Bound)  
15m North of Hughes Street to Property 188                                               | Mill & Fill and part Reconstruction of Road |

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FROPOL1904-6   SPORTS LIGHTING AUDIT AND PRIORITY

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Director Infrastructure and Project Delivery
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Nil

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to inform Council on the outcomes of the recently completed active reserve floodlighting audit. The audit inspected floodlight pole condition and lux and uniformity level to inform a proposed program of works to improve sports floodlighting across the City. Officers have also identified opportunities for new or improved sports reserve floodlighting which will be considered in conjunction with the recommendations of the City’s proposed Sport and Leisure Plan.

This report recommends that Council:

1. Note the following priorities in respect to the City’s floodlighting requirements:
   
   a. Capital Renewal
      i. Frank Gibson Park (Pole replacement – budget estimate $60 000)
      ii. Gil Fraser Reserve, North Fremantle (Replace one pole and luminaires – budget estimate $30 000)
   
   b. Capital New
      i. Hilton Park South (upper oval) – (Upgrade floodlighting – budget estimate $250 000)

2. Request officers submit a program of works for consideration by Council as part of the annual budget process and include in the City's 10 year financial plan.

3. Request officers prepare a further report to Council to consider floodlighting improvements at Fremantle Park, Stevens Reserve, Frank Gibson Park and Ken Allen Reserve subject to the findings and recommendations of the City’s Sport and Leisure Plan.

BACKGROUND

The City has a number of active reserves and outdoor courts which are used for sports training, competition and general recreation. Some of the reserves and courts have floodlighting to allow training and competition at night. The following table shows the City maintained sports reserves, their sporting club use and current lighting provision:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Sporting Club Use</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Fraser Reserve,</td>
<td>North Fremantle AFC&lt;br&gt;Fremantle Mosman Park CC&lt;br&gt;Fremantle Phantoms MFC&lt;br&gt;East</td>
<td>6 floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fremantle</td>
<td>Fremantle JCC - EFJCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Reserve,</td>
<td>Fremantle District Cricket Club&lt;br&gt;Fremantle Hockey Club</td>
<td>3 floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gibson Park,</td>
<td>Fremantle Netball Association</td>
<td>2 floodlights (turf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>and floodlit netball courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Park,</td>
<td>Fremantle City Junior Dockers FC&lt;br&gt;Hilton Park Junior Cricket Club&lt;br&gt;Bicton-</td>
<td>No Floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Attadale Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Park,</td>
<td>South Fremantle Football Club</td>
<td>6 Floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval, Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lee Reserve,</td>
<td>Fremantle City Football Club</td>
<td>4 floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Lawrence Oval,</td>
<td>Fremantle City Junior Dockers FC&lt;br&gt;Hilton Park Junior Cricket Club&lt;br&gt;Kardinya</td>
<td>4 floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td>Lake Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Park South (soccer</td>
<td>Fremantle City Football Club</td>
<td>No floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitch), Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Park South (upper</td>
<td>Fremantle City Football Club&lt;br&gt;Hilton Park Junior Cricket Club&lt;br&gt;Hilton Palmyra</td>
<td>6 floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oval), Hilton</td>
<td>Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Allen Reserve, Hilton</td>
<td>Fremantle Roosters Rugby League</td>
<td>4 floodlights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently, the floodlighting has had the following asset condition issues:

- Stevens Reserve had 4 light poles which were used by Fremantle District Cricket Club and Fremantle Hockey Club for training. In July 2018 one of the floodlight poles failed in high winds and was removed. A subsequent engineering inspection of the remaining 3 floodlights led to their removal due to the poor structural condition creating a public safety risk. Stevens Reserve now has 3 floodlights available for use for training.

- Hilton Park South (upper oval), Hilton had 3 light poles which were used by Fremantle City Football Club for training. Following a visual inspection and subsequent Engineering inspection, one of the poles was removed on public safety grounds in November 2018. The remaining 2 floodlights have been recommended for removal prior to winter 2019 due to poor structural condition creating a public safety risk.
Following these structural condition failures of the sports reserve floodlights, the City commissioned a Consultant to undertake a pole condition and lux and uniformity level (illumination measure) audit of the City’s active reserves and outdoor courts. This audit has been used to develop a list of maintenance and renewal works for the City’s sports reserves floodlights.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 27 March 2019, Council considered a proposal for floodlighting upgrade in response to the lighting issue at Hilton Park South. This was to allow officers to progress the design and tendering phase for a potential lighting upgrade, for project consideration as part of the 2019/20 budget process, to minimise the downtime of lighting infrastructure at Hilton Park. This area is used for seasonal hire and the demand for this area is very high. Council endorsed the following recommendation:

1. **Supports the consideration of a budget allocation for the upgrade of floodlights at Hilton Park as part of the 2019/20 budget deliberation process.**

2. **Request the preparation and advertisement of tender documents for a floodlighting upgrade prior to the 2019/20 financial year in order to be ready to progress with implementation of the works should Council allocate sufficient funding as a result of the 2019/20 budget deliberation process.**

Officers are progressing with part 2 of this recommendation.

**Floodlighting Requirements**

When installing new lighting, the City should comply with the Australian Standard 2560 Sports Lighting to ensure safe playing conditions are provided for the community. The standards ensure lighting level, uniformity and glare are appropriate for the intended sporting use. The Australian Standard is not applied retrospectively to existing floodlights.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The cost estimate to undertake the required renewal and upgrade of active reserve floodlighting to the current standard is shown in the table in the Officer Comment section of this report.

As well as the upfront capital cost as above, the predicted annual maintenance, globe replacement and depreciation cost will be included in the City’s operational budget as an ongoing expense.

The scheduling of any capital works should be considered in the context of the City’s Long Term Financial Plan.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil
CONSULTATION

The City and the Fremantle District Cricket Club and Fremantle Hockey Club have been in ongoing discussions for the clubs requirements for lighting at Stevens Reserve. The City provided temporary lighting for the balance of the training season in 2018; however this was not compliant with the Australian Standard requirements and is not recommended as an interim solution.

The City and the Fremantle City Football Club have been in discussions about the clubs requirements for lighting for Hilton Park South upper oval following the recent removal of the floodlight. The City, on the advice from a consultant engineer, has agreed to retain the 2 remaining floodlights until the start of winter 2019.

Consultation has not yet been undertaken with other sporting clubs. This will occur when renewal or maintenance works are planned for the reserve.

OFFICER COMMENT

Officers have developed a list of floodlighting works by analysing the results of the floodlight pole condition audit and lux and uniformity level (illumination measure) audit. Officers have also identified opportunities for new or improved sports reserve floodlighting which may be considered as part of the Sport and Leisure Plan.

Floodlighting Asset Audit

In February 2019 the City engaged a Consultant to undertake a floodlight pole condition audit and lux and uniformity level (illumination measure) audit. The results and works required are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Audit Results</th>
<th>Pole Condition</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Fraser Reserve, North</td>
<td>6 floodlights</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant.</td>
<td>1 pole poor condition – high rust build up at base plate</td>
<td>Lamp replacement 1 new pole and luminaire required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniformity and glare non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Reserve, Fremantle</td>
<td>3 floodlights</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant directly adjacent poles, non-compliant elsewhere.</td>
<td>3 poles ok condition – surface rust build up at base plate</td>
<td>Not able to be made compliant in current configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniformity non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gibson Park, Fremantle</td>
<td>2 floodlights (turf)</td>
<td>Turf area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 floodlights (netball courts)</td>
<td>• Lux levels non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniformity non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball courts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniformity compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 poles poor condition – high rust build up at base plate</td>
<td>5 new poles required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Floodlights (main field)</td>
<td>Lux levels compliant</td>
<td>Uniformity compliant</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Park, Fremantle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Lux levels non-compliant.</td>
<td>• Uniformity non-compliant.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Oval, Fremantle</td>
<td>6 Floodlights</td>
<td>• Not tested</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good condition – no issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lee Reserve, Beaconsfield</td>
<td>4 Floodlights</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant.</td>
<td>• Uniformity compliant.</td>
<td>Good condition – no issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Lawrence Oval, Hilton</td>
<td>4 Floodlights</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant.</td>
<td>• Uniformity compliant.</td>
<td>Good condition – no issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Park South (soccer pitch), Hilton</td>
<td>No floodlights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Park South (upper oval), Hilton</td>
<td>6 floodlights</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant.</td>
<td>• Uniformity compliant.</td>
<td>4 poles good condition – no issues 2 poles – poor condition, removal required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Allen Reserve, Hilton</td>
<td>4 floodlights (main field)</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant for training only.</td>
<td>• Uniformity non-compliant.</td>
<td>Good condition – minor surface rust at pole top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 flood lights (second field)</td>
<td>• Lux levels compliant for training only.</td>
<td>• Uniformity non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The short term (0-3 years) actions out of the condition audit are as follows:

- Frank Gibson Park, North Fremantle: replace 5 poles
- Gil Fraser Reserve, Fremantle: replace 1 floodlight (pole and luminaires) and lamp replacement to other floodlights
- Fremantle Oval, Fremantle: lamp replacement
- Hilton Park South (upper oval), Hilton: lamp replacement
- Ken Allen Reserve, Hilton: lamp replacement

The lamp replacement works will be funded through base operating budget. The pole replacements will be considered as part of the capital renewal budgets in the long term financial plan.
Sport Club Floodlight Requirements and Future Needs

During the floodlighting asset audit, officers have identified the following reserves with the potential for new or improved floodlighting:

- Fremantle Park, Fremantle
- Stevens Reserve, Fremantle
- Frank Gibson Park, Fremantle
- Hilton Park South (upper oval), Hilton
- Ken Allen Reserve, Hilton

Floodlighting of these reserves will be considered as part of the Sport and Leisure Plan.

Recommendations

Officers propose the following list of capital new and renewal works to be considered in line with the long term financial plan and sport and leisure plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Budget Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gibson Park, Fremantle</td>
<td>Replace 5 poles</td>
<td>$60 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil Fraser Reserve, North Fremantle</td>
<td>Replace 1 floodlight (pole and luminaires)</td>
<td>$30 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital New</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Park South (upper oval), Hilton</td>
<td>New floodlighting to upper oval</td>
<td>$250 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be considered as part of the Sport and Leisure Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Park, Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Reserve, Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gibson Park, Fremantle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Allen Reserve, Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-6  
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council:

1. Note the following priorities in respect to the City's floodlighting requirements:

   a. Capital Renewal
      i. Frank Gibson Park (Pole replacement – budget estimate $60 000)
      ii. Gil Fraser Reserve, North Fremantle (Replace one pole and luminaires – budget estimate $30 000)

   b. Capital New
      i. Hilton Park South (upper oval) – (Upgrade floodlighting – budget estimate $250 000)

2. Request officers submit a program of works for consideration by Council as part of the annual budget process and include in the City's 10 year financial plan.

3. Request officers prepare a further report to Council to consider floodlighting improvements at Fremantle Park, Stevens Reserve, Frank Gibson Park and Ken Allen Reserve, subject to the findings and recommendations of the City’s Sport and Leisure Plan.

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-7    NORTHBANK FOreshORE STABILISATION PLAN 2018

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Parks and Landscape
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: City of Fremantle, Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan August 2018 prepared by GHD Pty Ltd

SUMMARY

The City of Fremantle were successful in obtaining Riverbank funding for a project aiming to stabilise a section of Swan River foreshore reserve adjacent to the Northbank Development, North Fremantle. The foreshore at this location is subject to erosion compromising the amenity value to the community and would benefit from an appropriate foreshore stabilisation solution. This is a partnership project between the City of Fremantle and Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions.

The City engaged consultants to prepare the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018. The plan developed and assessed concept options to stabilise the river foreshore in consultation with community and other stakeholders, and with reference to recommended best practice set down by the Swan River Trust. The options were assessed and ranked using a multi-criteria analysis of community preference, amenity, environment, feasibility and cost. The plan recommends a block retaining wall along the riverward alignment.

The plan was considered at the Finance, Policy, Operation and Legislation Committee on 12 September 2019 and then reconsidered at on 14 November 2018 where Council requested officers carry out a further review and develop a preferred concept to be brought back to Council for endorsement subject to environmental and cost implications. Officers have conducted a further review of the report and presented the basis for the report’s recommendation together with the process followed to arrive at the recommendation to Councillors at two site visits and an informal briefing conducted in March 2019. This item is now being resubmitted for consideration and recommends that Council:

1. Receive the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018, as provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda.

2. Endorse concept option 1A (block wall riverward alignment) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.

BACKGROUND

The Northbank area extends between the Fremantle Traffic Bridge and Stirling Bridge, along the Swan River foreshore. The Swan River is a registered Aboriginal Heritage Site. The Whadjuk people maintain the cultural significance of the area.
Vested with the City of Fremantle, the Northbank area was rezoned in 1995 as ‘Urban’ and ‘Parks and Recreation’ and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) conditionally approved the Northbank residential development in May 1995, with one of the conditions being the creation of a foreshore management plan for the Northbank area.

The current alignment of the Northbank foreshore is wholly artificial, created mostly through deposition of dredge material. Land uses prior to the residential development were primarily light industrial activities, including wool scouring, boat repairs and container storage. The western side of the Northbank foreshore is bounded by the Fremantle Traffic Bridge embankment which is managed by WA Main Roads.

The existing river wall and associated landscape works extending to the east of the project site were constructed in 2004 by the City of Fremantle with monetary contributions from WAPC. The construction of the final residential subdivision in the Northbank area was completed in 2012 and the project site is situated in front of it. The extensive modifications made to the foreshore, combined with the significant currents, tidal pressures, boat wakes and storm surges place considerable stress on the area.

The City of Fremantle engaged consultants GHD Pty Ltd (GHD) to:
- assess foreshore stabilisation options according to the Swan River Trust best management practices for foreshore stabilisation
- determine issues related to foreshore stabilisation from community and other stakeholders
- recommend the most appropriate and cost-effective option that minimises future erosion damage and improves public amenity for the section of foreshore between the Fremantle Traffic Bridge abutment and the Northbank riverwall.

Recently, the Federal government announced a commitment of funds towards the replacement of the Fremantle Traffic Bridge.

The plan was considered at 12 September 2018 Finance, Policy, Operation and Legislation Committee (FPOL). FPOL moved a procedural motion to defer a decision to the next appropriate Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee to allow for more time to consider available stabilisation options.

The plan was reconsidered at 14 November 2018 FPOL with the following resolution, Council:

1. Receive the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018 noting the concepts included and request officers carry out a further review and develop a preferred concept to be brought back to Council for endorsement, subject to consideration of environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.
2. Request officers place stage two (detail design) on hold pending:
   
   a. further liaison with Main Roads WA to investigate opportunities and constraints to incorporate into the detailed design for the Northbank foreshore stabilisation works the future proposed Fremantle Traffic Bridge replication project and ongoing maintenance requirements of the bridge embankment and retaining wall.
   
   b. approved Riverbank grant funding for the detailed design and construction.
   
3. Request officers include stage two (detail design) and stage three (construction) in a high-level project plan to accommodate the phases and include a potential funding profile for consideration as part of the City’s 10 year financial plan.

Officers have conducted a further review of the report and presented the basis for the report’s recommendation together with the process followed to arrive at the recommendation to Councillors at two site visits and an informal briefing conducted in March 2019.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Stage one (concept development) has been implemented under a current project budget with contributing funds through Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) - Parks and Wildlife, Riverbank funding program. The council decision regarding the concept option selected will complete this stage.

Stage two (detailed design) and stage three (construction) will require a future municipal budget allocation and provided the Riverbank program is ongoing, it is likely to continue to be eligible for Riverbank funding upon application. Stages two and three will be included in a high level project plan accommodating phasing and potential funding for consideration as part of the City’s 10 –year financial plan.

Regarding concept option selection, to enable comparison of concept options, the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018 provides an indicative cost estimate at current prices for the construction and maintenance of each option as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Design life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Block wall riverward alignment</td>
<td>$530 000 to $600 000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Block wall riverward alignment with scour protection</td>
<td>$850 000 to $1 200 000</td>
<td>$200 000</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Block wall landward alignment</td>
<td>$550 000 to $750 000</td>
<td>$200 000</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Block wall landward alignment with scour protection</td>
<td>$850 000 to $1 400 000</td>
<td>$100 000</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Groynes and Geotextile Sand Container Wall</td>
<td>$800 000 to $1 400 000</td>
<td>$100 000</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more accurate cost for construction will be estimated at the conclusion of stage two (detailed design).
The capital cost pre-estimate for Option 1A is up to $600,000 for construction. This does not include associated landscape elements including but not limited to paths, river access, lighting and vegetation. Additional costs for soil contamination and acid sulphate soil management may also be required and will be determined during stage two: detailed design.

For the operating pre-estimate for maintenance of beach amenity, Option 1A is the only option where the ongoing costs are at $0 for the design life. Option 1A: Block wall on riverward alignment, is the only option that will not require a regular operational budget increase to maintain beach amenity. However, it is possible that if Option 2A: Block wall on landward alignment is implemented without ongoing beach nourishment, the need for a regular operational budget increase to maintain it will also not be required. However, for Option 2A the amenity of the river in front of the block wall is likely to be reduced over time as erosion exposes the industrial legacy of the area.

In addition, all options will require ongoing operating budget for maintenance of associated landscaping works. The value of the increase in operating budget required will depend on the landscaping elements installed.

LEGAL IMPlications

Similar to other areas of the Swan Canning Riverpark, the management of the North Fremantle foreshore falls under the governance of other bodies and associated legislation.

The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions (DBCA), principally under a Parks and Wildlife, Rivers and Estuaries Division assumes all planning authority for the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act 2006 and the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Regulations 2007, while the Swan River Trust remains as an advisory body. Planning approval for the construction of the preferred shoreline treatment is required prior to the commencement of works and will require information obtained through the detailed design stage.

The Swan River is a registered Aboriginal site under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972. Consent of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs under Section 18 of the Act is required to construct the shoreline treatment. The City has also consulted with the Whadjuk Working Party on the proposed options as part of the stakeholder engagement process for the development of the options; the outcome of this consultation is outlined in the Officer Comment.

CONSULTATION

Community and other stakeholder consultation was undertaken by GHD in partnership with the City consistent with the City’s Community Engagement Policy. This is detailed in section 3 and appendix B of the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018 and is summarised below.
Community Engagement

Community engagement was undertaken in two phases:

- The first phase involved a community information session where community members could obtain an overview of the project and provide comments on the issues values of the site. 26 community members attended this session. Comment was also invited via survey form on the day and also via the City’s MySay website, a total of three (3) responses were received. Information obtained through the information session and survey form was considered when developing the concept options.

- The second phase provided an opportunity for the community to provide feedback through the City’s MySay website on the five options developed. This was supported by a community information session to provide more detailed information on the concept options and an opportunity for the community to seek clarification from GHD, the City and DBCA on any aspect of the concept options and foreshore stabilisation generally. The information session was attended by approximately 25 attendees.

The second phase MySay survey identified the overall community preference as option 3: build three rock groynes and use geotextile sandbags.

The data from community preferences expressed in the MySay survey question 3 was incorporated into the multi-criteria analysis (MCA) as one of the weighted decision criteria to assist in ranking the five concept options. Discussion of the survey results is contained in Appendix B of the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018.

Other Stakeholder Engagement

Other stakeholder engagement involved a facilitated discussion with the City, DBCA, Department of Planning, and Fremantle Ports. A second session was held with Main Roads WA (MRWA) who were unable to attend the first session. The purpose of the facilitated discussion was to share information relevant to the project site and the objectives of foreshore stabilisation along with any future planning for the area to identify issues or opportunities that may impact on the stabilisation options.

Further stakeholder engagement with MRWA will be undertaken in stage two (detailed design) to ensure any opportunities and constraints presented by the future proposed Fremantle Traffic Bridge realignment project, including connectivity for public amenity are addressed in the design.

In addition to the GHD-lead stakeholder engagement, the City presented the concept options at a meeting of the WWP to inform them of the project and its objective, the process undertaken to develop the concept options and to seek their feedback on the five options. Subsequent advice from the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council stated that the WWP could not endorse any of the options presented and that they hold a strong view, for many areas of the Swan River, that a natural approach to restoring the riverbank by soft landscaping, natural material and vegetation. They further indicated that if the project were to go ahead that the City consider monitoring, cultural engagement and employment opportunities for Noongar people. These requests will be considered in stages two and three of the project and are specifically addressed in Officer Comment below.
Opportunities for additional community consultation include progress updates of the project, and comment on the detailed design with regard to landscaping, access stairs and ramps, paths, lighting and other hard landscaping features.

OFFICER COMMENT

The City of Fremantle initiated a project to stabilise a section of Swan River foreshore reserve within the Northbank development, North Fremantle. This was in response to repeated community requests to address the erosion and amenity of this ‘unfinished’ section of foreshore reserve. The foreshore at this location is subject to erosion which compromises the amenity value to the community and it would benefit from an appropriate foreshore stabilisation solution.

This project aligns with the following City community strategic plan objectives under the environmental responsibility strategic focus area:

- “to ensure best practice open space design is applied in an integrated way for existing and new public open space” by improving access to functional public open space within a walkable catchment
- “a city that can adapt to impacts of climate change and help its community adapt” by incorporating available information on sea level rise into the development of the concept options in this report.

The Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018 concludes the first of three stages to complete this project where:

- stage one is concept development
- stage two is detailed design
- stage three is construction.

Stage one was undertaken as a partnership project with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attraction’s Rivers and Estuaries Branch through Riverbank funding. Stages two and three will be the subject of further Riverbank funding applications.

The foreshore stabilisation options were developed according to the guidelines provided in the Swan River Trust document, Best Management Practices for Foreshore Stabilisation – Direct Shore Stabilisation Approaches 2009, and the City of Fremantle’s North Fremantle Foreshore Management Plan 2013 (NFFMP). The Swan River Trust recommends soft landscaping if it can be practically implemented and maintained before considering riverwalls and other hard structures. The depth and slope of the project site together with the local river characteristics does not support soft landscaping alone, therefore hard structures were investigated for the options.

The foreshore stabilisation concept options were developed after a detailed desktop site analysis, community and stakeholder engagement, and identification of opportunities and constraints. A discussion on block retaining wall construction types is also provided in the report and will be considered further in stage two (detailed design). Advantages and disadvantages of each concept option were identified in relation to amenity, environment, feasibility and cost. This information, together with the community preference of concept
option, was used to inform a multi criteria analysis (MCA) to rank the options as shown in Table 1 below (refer Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018, Appendix 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Option</th>
<th>Raw Sum</th>
<th>Weighted Sum</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A - Block wall - River Alignment</td>
<td>624.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B - Block wall - River Alignment with Rock Beach Stabilisation</td>
<td>501.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A - Block wall - Land Alignment</td>
<td>534.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B - Block wall - Land Alignment with Rock Beach Stabilisation</td>
<td>544.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Rock Groynes &amp; Centreville Sand Container Wall</td>
<td>473.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Concept Options Multi Criteria Analysis results**

Concept option 1A, the block wall along the riverward alignment was selected through the MCA process (refer image 1). It is the most environmentally sustainable solution in terms of footprint and soil disturbance and will improve the overall amenity in the area, noting that beach area will be reduced. Concept option 1A is the most cost effective in terms of construction and ongoing maintenance requirements. It is the only option where ongoing beach renourishment (the addition of suitably sourced sand) is not required. Renourished sand will continually erode from the beach and be transported to other areas along the river. The volume of sand replenishment required and where the sand will be transported to is not well understood. It is possible that sand replenishment will cause an ongoing maintenance requirement in other locations to address accumulated sand.
Image 1: Artist perspective of the preferred Option 1A: block wall along the riverward alignment (note: landscaping including endemic planting and paths will be developed during detailed design).

Notwithstanding the above, should the detailed site investigations result in soil contamination, acid sulphate soil and asbestos management processes that cause significant variation in the cost assumptions for construction used in the MCA for ranking the concept options, it is possible that an alternate ranking will result. Consideration of the cost implications for managing these factors should be reassessed in the MCA rankings to confirm the ranking of options at the commencement of the detailed design stage.

Acid sulphate soils and potential soil contamination will be investigated and addressed as required in more detail during the detailed design stage. Previous industry on and near the site as well as detailed site assessments undertaken on adjacent land indicate that potential soil contaminants may be disturbed and exist in spoil that will require off-site disposal. An investigation into the presence of soil contaminants as well as an acid sulphate soil assessment will be required to support the detailed design and management of the soils in accordance with Department of Environment and Water Regulation contaminated sites guidelines.

For stage 3 (construction), and in keeping with the WWP requests, as far as practical:

- employment opportunities for local Noongar people will be sought through the City’s procurement process for the acquisition of services
- preference will be given for landscaping using local native plants to imitate a natural landscape in preference to the installation of turf or exotic gardens
- where there will be excavation of the foreshore, Aboriginal monitoring will be engaged
- cultural engagement opportunities for the site will be investigated further.

The City will continue to liaise with the corporate body at Rivershores Place Apartments to resolve their stormwater runoff issue which is currently affecting the foreshore. It is anticipated this will be resolved prior to the construction of the foreshore stabilisation solution.

Additional information following initial report

Following the Council resolution requesting 'officers carry out a further review and develop a preferred concept to be brought back to Council for endorsement, subject to consideration of environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils', officers facilitated two site meetings and informal Elected Member briefing with representatives from GHD and DBCA. At these meetings the pros and cons of landward and riverward alignment were discussed and the decision making process explained. It was noted concept option 1A, the block wall along the riverward alignment was selected through the MCA process (refer image 1) for the following reasons:

- It is the most environmentally sustainable solution in terms of footprint and soil disturbance.
- It will improve the overall amenity in the area, noting that beach area will be reduced.
- It is the most cost effective in terms of construction and ongoing maintenance requirements.
• It is the only option where ongoing beach renourishment (the addition of suitably sourced sand) is not required. Renourished sand will continually erode from the beach and be transported to other areas along the river. The volume of sand replenishment required and where the sand will be transported to is not well understood. It is possible that sand replenishment will cause an ongoing maintenance requirement in other locations to address accumulated sand.

Additionally, it was noted:
• An entirely soft landscaping solution is not suitable in this environment because the depth and slope of the project site together with the local river characteristics does not support soft landscaping alone, therefore hard structures were investigated in the options.
• The soft landscaping design will use endemic planting where appropriate, and the turf shown in the artists perspective is indicative only. This will be developed through detailed design.
• River and beach access points will be part of the final design and will be developed through detailed design.
• Opportunities to incorporate sufficient land area to permit a suitable dual use path connection from the foreshore to the proposed Fremantle Traffic Bridge replacement and Queen Victoria Street design should be considered in concept option selection.
• Access arrangements, local disturbance and financial implications for ongoing maintenance requirements and costs should be considered in concept option selection.

Recently, the Federal government announced a commitment of funds towards the replacement of the Fremantle Traffic Bridge. The future proposed Fremantle Traffic Bridge alignment has not been on Main Roads WA current works list, however this may change with this recent Federal government commitment. City officers will engage with Main Roads WA to determine what opportunities exist to incorporate future plans for the proposed Fremantle Traffic Bridge realignment and maintenance requirements of the bridge embankment and adjacent retaining wall.

Following the provision of additional information and site visits, the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018 and the preferred concept option is being resubmitted for Council consideration.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge Seconded: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

Council:

1. Receive the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018, as provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda.
2. Endorse concept option 1A (block wall riverward alignment) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.

**AMENDMENT 1**

Moved: Cr Andrew Sullivan  
Seconded: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

To amend part 2 of the officer's recommendation to remove the words shown in red strikethrough and to add the words in green italics;

2. Endorse concept option 1A 2A (block wall land based alignment) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of;

   a. *Environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.*
   
   b. *Exploration of an alignment closer to the private land.*

Amendment carried: 6/1

For  
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge, Cr Doug Thompson,  
Cr Sam Wainwright, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Andrew Sullivan

Against  
Cr Rachel Pemberton

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ITEM FPOL1904-7**  
(Amended officer’s recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  
Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. Receive the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018, as provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda.

2. Endorse concept option 2A (block wall land based alignment) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of;

   a. *Environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.*
   
   b. *Exploration of an alignment closer to the private land.*
AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Dave Hume  Seconded: Cr Andrew Sullivan

To include the words ‘seasonal beach’ in part 2 as shown in green below:

2. Endorse concept option 2A (block wall land based alignment, seasonal beach) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of;

   a. Environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.
   b. Exploration of an alignment closer to the private land.

Amendment carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-7
(Amended committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. Receive the Northbank Foreshore Stabilisation Plan 2018, as provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda.

2. Endorse concept option 2A (block wall land based alignment, seasonal beach) as the preferred concept option subject to consideration of;

   a. Environmental and cost implications identified through detailed investigations into potential soil contaminants and acid sulphate soils.
   b. Exploration of an alignment closer to the private land.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-10 ARTHUR HEAD CLIFF STABILISATION

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Asset Management
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Arthur Head Cliff Stabilisation Final Report

SUMMARY

The City has recently completed a comprehensive analysis of the cliff faces and man-made walls at Arthur Head Reserve as well as preliminary analysis of the condition of the Round House.

The condition of the cliff faces and man-made walls at Arthur Head Reserve were found to range from poor to good. The recommended remediation for different areas varies from minor works such as removal of vegetation and repairs such as repointing of existing masonry walls through to major works including the extension of the Whaler’s Tunnel portal in areas where there is significant potential for collapse and risk of harm to visitors.

The condition of the limestone walls of the Round House has been deteriorating for some time. Major conservation and restoration work is required to maintain this important historical building.

Design and contract documentation for all required remediation works of the cliff faces has now been finalised and is available to be used for funding advocacy, the procurement of contractors and remediation purposes.

This report recommends that Council:

1. Endorse the Arthur Head design and documentation package as detailed in the attached Arthur Head Cliff Stabilisation Final Report.

2. Request officers proceed with referring details of the proposed works to the relevant state government agencies under public works procedures and obtaining all necessary statutory approvals.

3. Request the CEO progress to seek State and Federal funding in order to progress the required remediation projects.

BACKGROUND

Arthur Head is recognised as a precinct of high aesthetic and heritage significance. It is predominately a natural feature which has been substantially quarried in the 1830s and 1960s reducing the size of the headland by 60% and leaving the quarried cliff faces exposed to an aggressive coastal environment.
Arthur Head Reserve was placed on the State Register of Heritage Places in November, 1993 and added to the Municipal Inventory in 2000. Any construction works within the Reserve are to be referred to and subject to approval from the Department of Planning, Land and Heritage (DPLH).

The quarried limestone cliffs and limestone masonry walls which are elevated above the surrounding landscape continue to deteriorate as the impact of wind, vegetation roots and flowing water cause erosion and the creation of loose areas of material that poses a significant risk of injury to visitors to the site.

In May 2018, as a result of increasing rockfall and risk of harm to the public, an area to the west side of the Whaler’s Tunnel was secured with safety fencing, scaffolding and a gantry erected. This temporary protection will need to remain on site until the adjacent areas of cliff face have been remediated.

Previous conservation and stabilisation works undertaken between 2001 and 2018 were completed in a piecemeal manner. Some of these works included shaving the cliff faces to address safety issues of rock fall did not consider or address the issue of erosion and only accelerated the retreating of the cliff face towards some significant heritage buildings.

The Round House which is recognised as being Western Australia’s oldest public building and is one of this State’s most significant heritage buildings is one of the biggest attractions in Fremantle with an estimated 100,000 persons per year visiting the building annually.

The last major conservation works of the Round House were undertaken in 2004. Since then small amount of maintenance works have been carried out each year under the City’s building maintenance budget.

Due to the exposed marine environment, vandalism and the well-intentioned but damaging repairs carried out during the twentieth century the building is now in need of some urgent conservation works. In particular, works are urgently required for the remediation and repair of the limestone walls.

Given the heritage significance of Arthur Head and its buildings, a long term solution to stop the erosion of the cliff faces and repair of the Round House walls is required to ensure that the assets in the Arthur Head Reserve survive for future generations to enjoy.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The pre-tender estimate completed in March 2019 which was developed from the completed designs and contract documentation indicates the total project cost for all remediation works to the cliff faces to be in the order of $1.8 million (Exc. GST).

The remediation works can be undertaken in stages which could be sequenced based on risk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>New tunnel portal and rockfall canopy.</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>Extension of retaining wall.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 8</td>
<td>Repair existing masonry walls.</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 11</td>
<td>Demolish and rebuild unstable areas of existing retaining walls.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>Close path &amp; re-build part of barrier wall.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>Undertake CIPS trial to applicable areas.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>Close path and re-inforce natural column.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Remove trees, repoint and repair wall.</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>Remove trees, repoint and repair existing wall.</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 9</td>
<td>Re-route existing pathway.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>Remove trees and re-render existing wall.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 10</td>
<td>Trim existing vegetation</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret tunnel</td>
<td>New lining system</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 13</td>
<td>Underpinning to Old Laboratory</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,800,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No escalation has been included in the above figure and if the works are not completed this would need to be allowed for.

The cost for the application of a Calcite In-situ Precipitation System (CIPS) is currently unknown as this is a non-standard treatment and the extent of treatment is dependent on the success of trials.

The conservation and remediation works to the Round House are estimated at between $500,000 and $1,000,000.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Planning and Development Act (s6) exempts local government authorities from the need to obtain development approval for public works on land zoned or reserved under the MRS. However the City will need to consult with the Western Australian Planning Commission over the proposed works and be able to demonstrate that they have had regard to the purpose of the Region Scheme for the land, and principles of orderly and proper planning and preservation of the amenity of the area.

Officers are confident that the scope of works at Arthur Head should be an acceptable proposal as it focuses on improving the safety, condition and appearance of the reserve for the benefit of the public.

As the next stage of this project the City should proceed with referring details of the proposed works to the relevant state government agencies under public works procedures and obtaining all necessary statutory approvals.

**CONSULTATION**

All proposed works have been referred to the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) and a notice of approval from the Heritage Services Development Committee was received in November 2018.
No public consultation has been carried out in terms of the proposed designs. Where public consultation is appropriate for a particular stage of works, having regard to the scope of works and the capacity for consultation to add value to the final outcome, public consultation will be scheduled and carried out at the appropriate time once there is certainty regarding funding to enable the works to proceed.

**OFFICER COMMENT**

**Cliff Stabilisation**

The City of Fremantle initiated a project to investigate, analyse and find solutions to the erosion of the cliff faces at Arthur Head. The project was in response to immediate safety concerns and the need to provide a long term solution for the cliff faces and the protection of the infrastructure in the reserve such as the Round House, all of which have significant heritage value.

In October 2018 the City appointed Hocking Heritage Studios (the Consultant) to assess the structural the structural integrity and stability of the natural cliff faces and man-made walls at Arthur Head Reserve and design and document the recommended remediation works.

The Consultant team consisted of specialist consultants and engineers including a Heritage Architect, Geo-technical Engineer, Structural Engineer, Surveyor and Quantity Surveyor.

The main objective and requirement of the project was to stop or mitigate as much as possible the erosion of the cliff faces, man-made walls and the Secret Tunnel. The Consultant’s recommendations considered the heritage significance of the cliff faces and walls and improve the access and safety for visitors to the reserve.

Following visual investigations and assessment the Consultant has concluded that there is no generic remediation that can be applied to the entire extent of the cliff faces and walls.

The recommendations for remediation were developed and assessed in accordance with The Australian Geomechanics Society’s Landslide Risk Management Guidelines and Practice Notes, known as AGS2007.

Alternative options and recommendations have been evaluated using quantitative risk and cost benefit analysis. Improvements in safety/risk and aesthetics were weighted equally and a scaled value of benefit divided by cost to determine a benefit/unit rate for comparison.
The final recommendations for remediation can be found in the attached report and are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommended option</th>
<th>Risk comment</th>
<th>Aesthetic comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All natural faces</td>
<td>Treat wall with Calcite In-situ Precipitation System</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of further deterioration and rock fall.</td>
<td>Need to trial to establish suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Remove trees, point and repair</td>
<td>Hazards will be substantially removed</td>
<td>Appearance will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>Remove trees, re-render</td>
<td>Will stop deterioration</td>
<td>Appearance will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>Remove trees, point and repair masonry wall</td>
<td>Hazards will be substantially removed</td>
<td>Appearance will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>Extend masonry wall</td>
<td>Will stop deterioration and support face</td>
<td>Appearance improves significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>Permanently close path and rebuild part of barrier wall</td>
<td>Path is currently closed</td>
<td>No change in appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>Permanently close path and reinforce base of column in cave</td>
<td>Path is currently closed</td>
<td>Existing appearance is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>Build support for portal in form of arch</td>
<td>Risk of collapse will be substantially reduced</td>
<td>Arch would barely be visible from outside of tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>Build rock fall canopy</td>
<td>Hazards will be managed and made safe for public use</td>
<td>Designed to complement surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 8</td>
<td>Repair masonry wall and install new rock bolts and straps, rock fall fences and reroute paths</td>
<td>Hazard reduced and risk of falling rocks minimised</td>
<td>Existing appearance is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 9</td>
<td>Re-route path away from face</td>
<td>Risk to public minimised</td>
<td>Existing appearance is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 10</td>
<td>Trimming of vegetation to avoid wedging</td>
<td>Reduce risk of further instability</td>
<td>Appearance will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 11</td>
<td>Demolish and rebuild unstable retaining wall</td>
<td>Risk of collapse will be substantially reduced</td>
<td>Existing appearance is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Tunnel</td>
<td>Do nothing and keep closed (annual inspection)</td>
<td>High risk if accessible</td>
<td>Installation of lining system would change the original tunnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These recommendations have now been documented in the completed Design and Contract Documentation package which will be used to procure the remediation and construction services.
All proposed works have been referred to DPLH and a notice of approval from the DPLH Heritage Services Development Committee was received in November 2018.

The recommendations have been documented in a manner to enable all of the recommendations to be completed in a single contract or to be broken down into a number of contracts which can be completed over a period of time.

**Round House**

The limestone walls of the Round House are showing signs of deterioration caused by the elements in its exposed location and years of neglect in the first half of the Twentieth Century and well-intentioned but misguided repairs in the second half. As part of the City’s asset management and heritage conservation planning Officers have identified the need for the building to be looked at in a similar way to the cliff stabilisation project and plan for its conservation and remediation.

A structured approach for the management of the Round House building has been developed by officers in Asset Management, Strategic Planning and Facilities Management whom have considerable experience undertaking conservation planning and works at the City of Fremantle.

The significance of this building means that it requires the highest level of care and conservation and it would benefit from a generous period of investigation to insure that proposals fully understand the building and its conservation issues before the commencement of work.

The proposed approach would consist of firstly appointing a team of consultants with the necessary conservation expertise to develop a Conservation and Management Plan which will be utilised as the primary guiding document for the conservation and future use of the building. From there conservation works will be investigated, design and documented in order for the City to prioritise the physical works in line with available budgets.

**Advocacy**

Given the nature and magnitude of the issue, the importance of the proposed works and the significance of this asset from a State and Tourism perspective, Officers feel that there is a clear and urgent requirement for active support and engagement from State and / or Federal Government. Proactive and timely remedial action is urgently required to mitigate the hazards and minimise further erosion of the cliffs, walls and buildings at this historic site.

It would appear that the timing is perfect to advocate for funds from both the State and Federal Governments for these works. A recent media release confirmed that the Prime Minister Scott Morrison has committed $6.7 million for a circumnavigation of the continent by the Endeavour replica to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Captain Cook’s first trip to Australia.

The cliff stabilisation project is a fully scoped and costed project, and with a similar approach developed for the Round House, the City is in a good position to advocate to
State and Federal Government to contribute to funding the remediation works that are required to protect and maintain these assets of significant heritage value.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ITEM FPOL1904-10

(Officer’s recommendation)

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge  Seconded: Cr Rachel Pemberton

Council:

1. Endorse the Arthur Head design and documentation package as detailed in the Arthur Head Cliff Stabilisation Final Report, provided in Attachment 1 of this report in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

2. Request officers proceed with referring details of the proposed works to the relevant state government agencies under public works procedures and obtaining all necessary statutory approvals.

3. Request the CEO seek State and Federal funding in order to progress the required remediation projects.

Carried: 7/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Sam Wainwright, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Andrew Sullivan

Additional officer’s information

Following feedback from the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee meeting on 10 April 2019, officers have consulted with the consulting engineers to understand how the vibrations from the nearby trains may have affected the cliffs and walls. Feedback from the consultant is that the vibrations could have contributed to the settlement and resultant cracking of the staircase and masonry walls at Arthur Head. It is unlikely that the limestone outcrop is adversely affected by the vibrations in a significant way.

All proposed treatments to the structures will remain the same and do account for the vibrations of the trains. The treatment of the limestone cliff faces centres around the need for erosion protection and rock fall mitigation. These treatments will not need to change when considering any impact of vibrations from the trains.

Officers are liaising with the PTA and Port Authority to determine if there are any existing reports into vibrations caused by trains. If required, officers can investigate the impact of train vibrations in the area through a study in the 2019/20 financial year.

Officer have prepared the following proposed recommendation to include an additional part 4, requesting the City investigate the impact of vibrations to the topography from trains at Arthur Head.
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-10
(Alternative recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. **Endorse the Arthur Head design and documentation package as detailed in the Arthur Head Cliff Stabilisation Final Report, provided in Attachment 1 of this report in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).**

2. **Request the City proceed with referring details of the proposed works to the relevant state government agencies under public works procedures and obtaining all necessary statutory approvals.**

3. **Request the City seek State and Federal funding in order to progress the required remediation projects.**

4. **Request the City investigate the impact of vibrations from trains to the topography and buildings at Arthur Head.**

   **Carried: 10/0**
   Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
FPOL1904-11  KINGS SQUARE PUBLIC REALM - PAVING, PROCUREMENT AND PROJECT TIMING FOR STAGE 1 WORKS

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Kings Square Project Director
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Material and Procurement Report

SUMMARY

The purpose of this Report is to provide Council with an update on project progress regarding the selection and procurement of paving material for Kings Square Public Realm. It provides information on the timing of Stage 1 of the project and the tasks required to be undertaken to ensure that the re-construction of Newman Court occurs immediately following completion of FOMO by the main contractor.

This report recommends that Council receives this update report, noting project decisions, activities and programmed timelines for Stage 1A works, commencing on site from August/September 2019.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting 28 February 2018 the Council approved the Kings Square Public Realm Concept Design, noting that further actions will be undertaken – including an on-site material palette trial, based on the concept design. The design team has liaised with the architects for FOMO and the architects for the new civic building in developing the design and more recently, focussed on detailed documentation for Stage 1 works.

A paving trial was installed in Kings Square in mid-January 2019, based on the approved concept, to test various aspects of materiality, including:

• Potential options of natural stone from different sources;
• Constructability, physical performance and maintenance issues.
• Colour, finishes and tonal differentiation.
• On site luminance and slip resistance.

Elected Members were invited to inspect the paving trial on site and to receive an informal briefing about the test area and the complexities around material selection.

OFFICER COMMENT

Material Selection

Following the installation and monitoring of the paving trial area in Kings Square, a final material palette has been confirmed by officers. This will provide a clear framework for detailed paving design and selection across the entire project. It consists of the following elements:

• Insitu, exposed aggregate concrete – as the primary material. This provides a practical and urban response, as well as being a cost-effective solution for large areas.
• **Granite cobbles** (*'limestone' colours*) – secondary, highlight paving to be used predominantly for stripes, to visually ‘break up’ the concrete paving.

• **Sandstone/limestone natural pavers** - for minor/secondary selected areas that have special historical/civic significance.

• **Black granite paving** – to be used sparingly as a highlight colour to further ‘break-up’ the expanse of other paving, and/or, identify paths of travel.

This base ‘material board’ enables procurement processes for Stage 1 to proceed, whilst retaining flexibility around the final mix of materials across the entire square.

Details of the paving material board are contained in the Attachment to this item.

**Procurement**
The City has released tenders for supply of natural stone, ahead of calling tenders for the actual construction. The reason for this is to ensure adequate lead-time for the supply of stone so that it is delivered to site in time for the civil contractor to start on site in August/September 2019.

Although there are only small quantities of natural stone required for Stage 1A, the tenders have been written to enable a consistent and ongoing supply of material for the duration of the whole project.

**Program**
The first construction works to the public realm, Stage 1, is scheduled to be tendered in April 2019 and will consist of two separable portions:

- **Stage 1A** – approximately 65% of Newman Court, to be constructed immediately after the main contractor on the Sirona FOMO site finishes work and hands Newman Court back to the City of Fremantle.

- **Stage 1B** – approximately 35% of Newman Court and part of High Street, to be constructed immediately after the main contractor for the Civic Building finishes work.

The program below sets out a high-level timeframe and project inter-dependencies for delivering Stage 1A Works of the public realm improvements. Importantly, it demonstrates the need for the City to place orders early for stone supply to ensure delivery is in time for construction - from September 2019 onwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Supply Tenders assessed and awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Supply Orders placed / supply lead time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Works Call tenders, assess, award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Works Contract sign, site establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOMO completion of Main Contract (estimated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1A Works Commence (with early access)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications to this update report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Forward planning of material procurement as well as construction tenders for Stage 1 works to the public realm is required to (a) mitigate project risks as well as (b) ensure compliance with the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996.

CONSULTATION

All community engagement and consultations have been completed in advance of delivering Stage 1 Works of the public realm in Kings Square.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge Seconded: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

Council receives the project update report on Kings Square Public Realm Project, noting that:

- The final paving material palette has been selected;
- Tenders for the procurement of stone paving are currently underway;
- Tenders for the Main Contractor for civil works, Stage 1, will be released in April 2019 for Council consideration in July 2019;
- Construction Works for Stage 1A is programmed to commence on site as soon as Newman Court is returned to the City, following FOMO construction, estimated to be August/September 2019.

AMENDMENT 1

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

To amend the officer’s recommendation to add an additional part, to read as follows:

2. Request that the project team prioritise the upgrading works along High Street - adjacent to Old Town Hall – as either an extension to the Stage 1 contract, alternatively as a separate contract to be implemented immediately after Stage 1, noting that the estimated cost of this to be presented to Council for consideration as part of its budget deliberations for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Amendment carried: 7/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Sam Wainwright, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Andrew Sullivan
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-11  
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

Council:

1. Receives the project update report on Kings Square Public Realm Project, noting that:
   - The final paving material palette has been selected;
   - Tenders for the procurement of stone paving are currently underway;
   - Tenders for the Main Contractor for civil works, Stage 1, will be released in April 2019 for Council consideration in July 2019;
   - Construction Works for Stage 1A is programmed to commence on site as soon as Newman Court is returned to the City, following FOMO construction, estimated to be August/September 2019.

2. Request that the project team prioritise the upgrading works along High Street - adjacent to Old Town Hall – as either an extension to the Stage 1 contract, alternatively as a separate contract to be implemented immediately after Stage 1, noting that the estimated cost of this to be presented to Council for consideration as part of its budget deliberations for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

In November 2017, Council endorsed a feasibility study be undertaken for a potential Indigenous Cultural Centre, as part of the South Quay redevelopment at Victoria Quay or at another location in Fremantle.

This report recommends that Council receives in principle the Visioning Report for an Aboriginal Cultural Centre at the preferred location of J Shed, Manjaree site at Arthurs Head, and that the centre be of state and local significance celebrating Aboriginal heritage and Nyoongar culture with a focus on tourism.

BACKGROUND

In November 2017, Council endorsed a feasibility study be undertaken for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, potentially as part of the South Quay redevelopment at Victoria Quay or at another location in Fremantle.

The City engaged Richmond Consulting in May 2018 to undertake Phase One of the feasibility study that covered the following as part of a Visioning Report:

- Review existing studies, reports and strategic plans.
- Culturally appropriate community engagement to gain insight into the needs and aspirations of the Aboriginal community, including establishing project principles.
- Site assessment / place analysis.
- Case studies.
- Draft concept plan along with partial look at the operational governance.

Within the analysis, opportunities and directions phase 5 themes were initially identified as a place of significance, a place to belong, a place to celebrate living culture, a place to thrive and a place of good cultural governance. It is recommended that Council endorse these principles based on the feedback from the Aboriginal community on this project.

The attached Visioning Report outlines the process, along with the preferred location of the Manjaree Boodja site where the J Shed is currently located within the Arthurs Head location.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The City will need to seek considerable external partnership funding from a variety of stakeholders towards building design and construction costs.
LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Arthur Head Reserve is described as “A” class Reserve No. 21563 being Lot 2051 on Plan 217075 vested to the City with the Current Purpose of Historic Buildings, Recreation and Community Services.

CONSULTATION

Richmond Consulting undertook consultation with the Aboriginal community and key stakeholders from September to December 2018. The engagement list is included as part of the attached Visioning report.

The consultation process included direct face-to-face and telephone conversations with Elders, for their stewardship within their community or their engagement in Fremantle cultural activities.

Highlighted from the report is the Vision for the Cultural Centre, as outlined below:

- a place of significance; Walyalup area.
- a place to belong being inclusive and welcoming to Aboriginal and wider community, socialise and hold events.
- a place of good cultural governance with strong Whadjuk leadership (cultural advisory reference group).
- a place to thrive with tourism opportunities, fee for service with financial independence over time.
- a place to celebrate living culture through performance, song, dance, language, art and education.

Aboriginal people have repeatedly expressed the need for a place to belong, that includes a space for events, to meet, gather, celebrate and yarn. Highlighted is the importance of the Centre being inclusive of people and multipurpose for cultural circumstances.

It should be noted that the culturally focused centre be inclusive to all families and language groups, and not dominated by one family group.

The report proposes that a Cultural Centre should be part of the fabric of Fremantle, not on the outskirts of the City. Easily walkable distances to other attractors in Fremantle in order to capture passers-by both tourists and locals, should be considered.

The Derbarl Yerrigan (Swan River) and the area known as Manjaree (Bather Beach and Arthurs Head area) is of great cultural significance to Whadjuk Nyoongar people and the Cultural Centre should have a physical and visual connection to the water.

Tracks from the North and South converged in Manjaree – Fremantle area, Arthurs Head has also an important place for the Nyoongar dreaming story “Walyalup Dreaming”

The consultation process identified the opportunities and considerations for each of the preferred locations in the following order of importance with the Manjaree Site (J-Shed location) as the first option, Pioneer Park second option and Victoria Quay as the third option. This information is captured in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manjaree Site</strong>&lt;br&gt;Current J-Shed Location</td>
<td>• Strong connections to Manjaree (Bathers Beach and Arthurs Head precinct).&lt;br&gt;• Opportunity to reclaim space for Aboriginal people, counteract the negative history of the Round House and colonial impacts.&lt;br&gt;• Opportunity to improve access from Fishing Boat Harbour through to the Maritime Museum “culture and heritage” trail.</td>
<td>• Existing building is heritage listed.&lt;br&gt;• Cultural sensitivities around proximity to Round House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J-Shed Retrofit</strong>&lt;br&gt;Existing building footprint 750m²</td>
<td>• Could occur in the relatively short term or as in interim site whilst longer term options play out.</td>
<td>• Retro fitting building could be equally as costly as new building, and result in a facility less fit for purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Facility to replace J Shed</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approx 2500m² footprint</td>
<td>• Take advantage of the limestone cliffs as part of the architecture.&lt;br&gt;• Can create a strong connect to the beach.</td>
<td>• Existing heritage shed will need to be relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2.</td>
<td>Opportunites</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pioneer Park</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approx 1200m² + internal courtyard 650m² + existing heritage building 330m²</td>
<td>• Location is a Gateway to Fremantle from the train station.&lt;br&gt;• High foot traffic area.&lt;br&gt;• Can form part of the fabric of Market Street.</td>
<td>• Risk of displacing those who use the park.&lt;br&gt;• Existing building currently occupied by Spare Parts Puppet Theatre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 3.</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Quay</strong>&lt;br&gt;Proposed building footprint approx. 2000m²</td>
<td>• New building will be first stop for tourists entering Fremantle by passenger ship.&lt;br&gt;• Will encourage a harbour side promenade from Maritime Museum to Passenger Ship Terminal.&lt;br&gt;• Site is somewhat ‘clean slate’ little existing infrastructure to contend with and the ability to create well designed access for both pedestrians, vehicles and service vehicles.</td>
<td>• Long term option reliant on development of the port.&lt;br&gt;• Innovative design required to connect the new Centre to the water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some participants raised the idea of a number of locations that may house different aspects of the cultural centre eg. one location with a tourism focus, one with a business incubator focus and one with a nature/bush focus.

The underlying principle of the Cultural Centre is to create a place for living culture, not only does this mean interactive experiences for tourists but a meaningful place for all Aboriginal people.

OFFICER COMMENT

Fremantle is a significant metropolitan centre for arts, culture, festivals and events. The development of an Aboriginal Cultural Centre would further capitalise on that local strength and character of Fremantle and form a substantial tourist hub for Western Australia.

The aim of the Cultural Centre is to provide a recognised promoted facility where living Aboriginal culture continues to be practiced and celebrated. It is envisaged that the Cultural Centre will position the City as the nexus of engagement of Aboriginal culture, people and visitors to Western Australia.

The purpose of the Cultural Centre Visioning Report is to provide an Aboriginal led (yarning) approach to determine the spiritual, physical, organisational and site with clear directions. The visioning formalises the high level economic, environmental, social and cultural benefits that will come from leveraging a significant City opportunity and asset.

Whilst acknowledging the facility being established in Whadjuk Nyoongar Boodja (country) Walyalup (Fremantle) the Centre would have strong Aboriginal cultural significance. A contemporary cultural facility located in Walyalup would foster, celebrate and showcase, State Aboriginal Culture on an international scale.

Community benefit includes the opportunity for Fremantle to become a place that speaks the truth and acknowledges the Traditional Owners of the land, along with a place for living culture that is meaningful for Aboriginal people and as a tourist destination. This has been identified as a key outcome from the consultation in the development of the Reconciliation Action Plan.

Phase one of the Visioning Report provides a foundation on which to develop a strategic approach to funding and partnerships with respect to the construction and successful operation of the significant state and local facility. This is a project of State significance and clearly the total cost is beyond the City's capacity to fund. Due to the significance of the project and costs involved, the City would need to establish significant external funding partnerships with the State and federal governments to progress this project.

The development of a business case would be required to further progress the concept plan and would include hypothetical modelling, identification and seeking of funding along with a more detailed scope of works required in regard to the site assessment including any issues and implications with the associated infrastructure, facilities and services.
A robust governance structure would be required to be established with a high standard Walyalup Aboriginal Cultural Centre board. The board should be culturally guided by a group of local Whadjuk families, potentially known as a Cultural Advisory Group and Aboriginal Management executive. This exercise would benefit from formation of a specific working group with relevant stakeholders to progress.

The Manjaree site (current J-Shed location) was a popular location during the engagement process, whether using the existing building or a new building. In general the Manjaree site J Shed location is preferred over the existing Walyalup Aboriginal Culture Centre (WACC) located next to the Round House.

Included as part of the feedback was the idea of retaining the existing WACC as an administrative building and moving the workshops and classes to J-Shed, which could be a viable option to expand the capacity of arts workshops in the short term.

The Manjaree site (J-Shed location) has strong visual and physical connections to the water and the beach. The area is known as the Manjaree site or Arthur Head precinct which is recognised as a site of significance by the City, as a part of Fremantle’s maritime history and as a trading and meeting place for Nyoongar people pre-colonisation.

The J Shed location has been chosen due to its cultural significance, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage and walkable connection to key visitor points within Fremantle’s historic foreshore. The programming of the Cultural Centre would be developed around three spaces, being public, private and transitional. These spaces allow for cultural sensitivities through to outright public display/tourism. Although programming of the Cultural Centre is recognised as flexible there is a focus on ‘the keeping’ and ‘sharing’ of cultural knowledge including promotion and practising of the arts. This provides a solid framework from which the project can develop.

A conceptual agreed direction has been reached which followed the principles developed through the process. This is focused on providing appropriate space for multiple programs, including outdoor space. The Visioning Report takes into account economic as well as cultural sustainability issues with a strong focus on preservation and sharing of the knowledge and culture of the Traditional Owners.

It is recognised that various opportunities and significant restraints apply to all sites discussed, as well as implications on time frames regarding the availability of certain sites or development opportunities in the future.

Council may wish to consider in principle the Manjaree site (J-Shed location) as the preferred option and request additional information with a future report to Council on the site condition and infrastructure requirements of this location, as well as the other aspects for further development identified above.

**VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority Required
OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge  Seconded: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

Council:

1. Receive and note the Visioning report for the Indigenous Cultural Centre, as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

2. Endorse the five principles for provision of an Indigenous Cultural Centre;
   - a place of significance
   - a place to belong
   - a place to celebrate living culture
   - a place to thrive
   - a place of good cultural governance

3. Agree that the Indigenous Cultural Centre be of State and local significance, celebrating Aboriginal and Nyoongar culture with a focus on;
   - tourism
   - Aboriginal living culture and heritage
   - a place to experience Aboriginal cultural practices

4. Agree in principle that the J shed building and/or environs is the preferred location for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, noting that significant further investigation is required.

5. Give consideration of a budget allocation of $50,000 as part of the 2019/2020 budget deliberation process to undertake the scope of works for the preferred location identified in recommendation 4, which includes:
   - detailed feasibility study
   - business case
   - governance
   - land tenure
   - management models
   - infrastructure requirement assessment
   - external funding sources

AMENDMENT 1

Moved: Cr Doug Thompson  Seconded: Cr Andrew Sullivan

To amend part 4, to include the words shown in green italics:

4. Agree in principle that the J shed building and/or environs is the preferred location for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, noting that significant further investigation and community consultation is required.
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ITEM FPOL1904-13
(Amended officer's recommendation)

Moved: Cr Hannah Fitzhardinge  Seconded: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

Council:

1. Receive and note the Visioning report for the Indigenous Cultural Centre, as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

2.endorse the five principles for provision of an Indigenous Cultural Centre;
   - a place of significance
   - a place to belong
   - a place to celebrate living culture
   - a place to thrive
   - a place of good cultural governance

3. Agree that the Indigenous Cultural Centre be of State and local significance, celebrating Aboriginal and Nyoongar culture with a focus on;
   - tourism
   - Aboriginal living culture and heritage
   - a place to experience Aboriginal cultural practices

4. Agree in principle that the J shed building and/or environs is the preferred location for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, noting that significant further investigation and community consultation is required.

5. Give consideration of a budget allocation of $50,000 as part of the 2019/2020 budget deliberation process to undertake the scope of works for the preferred location identified in recommendation 4, which includes:
   - detailed feasibility study
   - business case
   - governance
   - land tenure
   - management models
   - infrastructure requirement assessment
   - external funding sources

Carried: 7/0
Additional officer’s information

Following the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee meeting (10 April 2019), officers received the following information and would like to amend part 2 of the Walyalup Aboriginal Indigenous Cultural Centre Visioning report, provided in Attachment 1 of the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019), as follows:

Location: Pioneer Park - deletes the second dot point under the considerations section and adds a dot point which reads:

- Existing building currently occupied by Spare Parts Puppet Theatre is located on land managed in arrangement between that body and Department of Arts and Culture, not forming part of the lot known as Pioneer Park under city’s management.

Location: J-Shed - add a third dot point which reads:

- Currently occupied by various artists, including established long term small arts businesses and artists.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-13

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. Receive and note the Visioning report for the Indigenous Cultural Centre, as provided in Attachment 1 of this item in the Finance, Policy, Operations and Legislation Committee Agenda (10 April 2019).

2. Endorse the five principles for provision of an Indigenous Cultural Centre;
   - a place of significance
   - a place to belong
   - a place to celebrate living culture
   - a place to thrive
   - a place of good cultural governance

3. Agree that the Indigenous Cultural Centre be of State and local significance, celebrating Aboriginal and Nyoongar culture with a focus on;
   - tourism
   - Aboriginal living culture and heritage
   - a place to experience Aboriginal cultural practices.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-13

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:
4(a) Agree in principle that the J shed building and/or environs is the preferred location for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, noting that significant further investigation and community consultation is required.

Carried: 9/1

For:
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald,

Against:
Cr Dave Hume

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-13

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:
4(b) Give consideration of a budget allocation of $50,000 as part of the 2019/2020 budget deliberation process to undertake the scope of works for the preferred location identified in recommendation 4, which includes:

- detailed feasibility study
- business case
- governance
- land tenure
- management models
- infrastructure requirement assessment
- external funding sources

Carried: 9/1

For:
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald,

Against:
Cr Dave Hume
11.3 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Nil

11.4 AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Nil

11.5 LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Nil

12. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OFFICERS

ITEMS APPROVED “EN BLOC”

The following items were adopted unopposed and without discussion “EnBloc” as recommended.

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Doug Thompson

The following items be adopted en bloc as recommended:
C1904-1 – Quarterly Capital Works Progress Update
C1904-3 – Statement of Investments as at March 2019
C1904-4 – Schedule of Payments March 2019

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton,
Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

This report provides information on the progress of the delivery of programmed works by the Infrastructure and Project Delivery (IPD) Directorate against the approved 2018/19 capital works budget.

BACKGROUND

This Capital Works Quarterly Report summarises progress made on projects and helps the City to be more transparent in monitoring the quality of project performance.

1. Activity Areas

The City’s capital works program includes all projects to deliver new assets, renew or upgrade existing assets and also one-off operational projects such as a new activity, service or staff requisition.

The Capital Works update report includes only those projects delivered by the IPD Directorate. It does not include the Kings Square project – which is subject to a separate reporting process.

- Infrastructure Engineering

The resurfacing of Hampton / Rockingham Road north and southbound is complete with only line marking outstanding (P10819 and P10820).

The construction of the zebra crossings on Marine Terrace has started (P-11759). The area is ready for the installation of the new street lighting.

The Hampton Road / Lloyd Street Intersection is a new project for the team (P-11824) which is made up of grant money from the design and construction of the pedestrian crossing at Hampton Road and Scott Street (P-11664).

- Parks and Landscape

The following projects have been completed in the last month:

- P-10071 Program – Play space
- P-11780 Install - Beach Street irrigation
- P-11805 Install - Grigg Park basketball.
Bathers Beach Boardwalk (P-11017) has been deferred until the next financial year to seek further budget allocation so that the recommendations from the audit by LGIS can be addressed in full. The footpath on Monument Hill is now under construction (P-11079) and is due to be completed in advance of the ANZAC Day service.

- **Facilities Management and Environment**

  A couple of new projects have started in the last month:
  - Demolition of 26 Montreal Street (P-11821) which will make way for the changes to the Golf Course and sporting / community centre
  - The Fleet Management System (P-11825).

  Work to the Naval Stores has commenced on site and is progressing well (P-10325). The Council building upgrades project has been deferred (P-11798) and the Roundhouse signage project (P-11804) has moved from delivery by IPD to being managed by the Community Development Team.

- **Asset Management**

  The Golf Course design work (P-11799) is now complete and consultation is underway. The design of the works to the Town Hall (P-10964) has been delayed due to increased design scope. The full design package will be put out for tender with award expected in July 2019.

1. **Progress Update**

   The following information is correct as at 31 March 2019 and summarises progress made on projects and helps the City to be more transparent in monitoring the quality of project performance.

- **Project Status**

   See below the status of projects at the end of February and the end of March 2019.
Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Unit</th>
<th>Gross Project Budget ($)</th>
<th>Grant Funding Budget ($)</th>
<th>YTD Actuals Expense ($)</th>
<th>YTD Actuals Income ($)</th>
<th>YTD Committed ($)</th>
<th>Total Spent (Inc. Committed) ($)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Spend ($)</th>
<th>Carry Forward ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Engineering</td>
<td>2,371,811</td>
<td>924,544</td>
<td>1,492,787</td>
<td>-561,039</td>
<td>231,076</td>
<td>1,723,661</td>
<td>2,314,968</td>
<td>79,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Landscape</td>
<td>1,022,982</td>
<td>278,864</td>
<td>425,917</td>
<td>-103,873</td>
<td>415,021</td>
<td>840,938</td>
<td>953,022</td>
<td>49,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149,839</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,227</td>
<td>155,065</td>
<td>155,415</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management and Environment</td>
<td>4,795,582</td>
<td>2,118,000</td>
<td>313,338</td>
<td>-185,455</td>
<td>5,265,961</td>
<td>5,579,301</td>
<td>1,983,144</td>
<td>2,739,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,465,375</td>
<td>3,331,408</td>
<td>2,381,881</td>
<td>-850,837</td>
<td>5,917,285</td>
<td>8,299,166</td>
<td>5,407,547</td>
<td>2,988,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Please note, the budget summary will continue to be reported through the Monthly Financial Report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

OFFICER COMMENT

The next Capital Works Report will be the end of financial year report and will be issued in July 2019. In the new financial year, this report will form part of the quarterly update of the Corporate Business Plan and as such, will include all capital works projects, including those delivered outside IPD.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM C1904-1
(Officer recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Doug Thompson

Council receive the Quarterly Capital Works Update Report including the Progress Summary of Infrastructure Projects for the period ended 31/03/2019.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton,
Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
SUMMARY

The Monthly Financial Report for the period ending 31 March 2019 has been prepared and tabled in accordance with the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

This report provides an analysis of financial performance for March 2019 based on the following statements:

- Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature & Type and by Program;
- Rate Setting Statement by Nature & Type and by Directorate; and

BACKGROUND

The following table provides a high level summary of Council’s year to date financial performance as at 31 March 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C) =B−(A)</td>
<td>(D) =C/(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$69.20M</td>
<td>$69.47M</td>
<td>$0.27M</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>($57.02M)</td>
<td>($55.23M)</td>
<td>$1.79M</td>
<td>(3.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Surplus/Deficit</td>
<td>$12.18M</td>
<td>$14.24M</td>
<td>$2.06M</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$7.87M</td>
<td>$8.43M</td>
<td>$0.57M</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>($7.71M)</td>
<td>($6.57M)</td>
<td>$1.14M</td>
<td>(14.76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Surplus/Deficit</td>
<td>$15.08M</td>
<td>$18.75M</td>
<td>$3.67M</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER COMMENT

As detailed in the Statement of Comprehensive Income by Nature and Type operating income and expenses have mainly varied to the anticipated budget in the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates (including Annual Levy)</td>
<td>$88,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions</td>
<td>$160,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR VARIANCE ANALYSIS

In accordance with regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 and AASB 1031 Materiality, Council adopted the level to be used in statements of financial activity in 2018/2019 for reporting material variances as 10% or $100,000, whichever is greater (Item C1806-3 refers Council meeting on 27 June 2018).

The following is an explanation of significant operating and capital variances identified in the Rate Setting Statement by Nature and Type:

Operating Revenue

Profit on Disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount $</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>48,622</td>
<td>(368,378)</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variance is mainly due to the profit from the disposal of Car Park 13 is lower than anticipated budget by $362,731.

Operating Expenditure

Employee Cost – Agency Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount $</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(684,371)</td>
<td>(837,868)</td>
<td>(153,497)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variance is mainly due to hiring of agency labour more than budgeted in Waste Collection Team ($93k), Parks and Landscapes Team ($29k) and Business Services and System Team ($18k). Agency staff has been utilised to replace vacant positions or cover a lost time injury.

Capital Revenue

Capital Grants and Subsidies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount $</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>817,082</td>
<td>1,371,988</td>
<td>554,906</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variance is mainly due to the following capital grants being received earlier than budgeted:

- $337,596 for P-11796 Install-CCTV. The 2nd instalment was expected to be received in June however payment was received earlier than budgeted.
- $201,906 for Road to Recovery grant (R2R) grant claim for resurfacing works received earlier than budgeted.

### Capital Expenditure

**Purchase Infrastructure – Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount ($)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(210,000)</td>
<td>(35,377)</td>
<td>174,623</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variance is mainly due to $165,000 for P-11793 Install-Electronic parking signs. This project is unlikely to be completed this financial year and is expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.

**Purchase Furniture and Fittings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Amount ($)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(484,356)</td>
<td>(29,319)</td>
<td>455,037</td>
<td>(94%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variance is mainly due to the following projects:

- $371,356 for P-11796 Install-CCTV. The CCTV project was scheduled to commence in March 2019. Project has commenced in April with purchase orders raised for cameras and mobile CCTV trailer. This project will be carried forward to 2019/2020.
- $48,598 for P-11818 Purchase-Document Management System. The tender has been finalised and the successful supplier has been awarded. This project is likely to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $20,000 for P-10037 Program-Telecommunications equipment. The purchase will commence in June 19.
- $10,072 for P-10038 Program-IT equipment. Order of new Surface devices is expected in June 19.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This report is provided to enable Council to assess how revenue and expenditure is tracking against the budget. It is also provided to identify any budget issues which Council should be informed of.

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulation 34 requires a monthly financial activity statement along with explanation of any material variances to be prepared and presented to an ordinary meeting of council.
CONSULTATION

Nil

OFFICER COMMENT

This report is provided to Council to assess operational issues affecting the implementation of projects and activities contained in the 2018/19 budget.

The overall performance for the City of Fremantle for the period ended 31 March 2019 resulted in an additional $3,677,509 surplus being identified than anticipated, which is mainly as a result of :-

- **Reduction in anticipated surplus**
  - Reduced operating revenue (excluding general rates) of $188,280;

- **Increase in anticipated surplus**
  - Increased capital revenue of $567,431;
  - Underspending of capital expenditure to date of $1,138,351;
  - Underspending of operating expenditure to date of $1,783,200;
  - Reduced net transfer from reserve of $43,235;
  - Increased general rates income of $88,912.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required

**COUNCIL DECISION ITEM C1904-2**

(Officer recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Doug Thompson


Carried en bloc: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
C1904-3  STATEMENT OF INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 MARCH 2019

Meeting Date: 17 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Finance
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Investment Report – 31 March 2019

SUMMARY

This report outlines the investment of surplus funds for the month ending 31 March 2019 and provides information on these investments for Councils consideration.

This report recommends that Council receives the Investment Report for the month ending 31 March 2019.

The investment report provides a snapshot of the City’s investment portfolio and includes:

- Portfolio details as at March 19;
- Portfolio counterparty credit framework;
- Portfolio liquidity with term to maturity;
- Portfolio fossil fuel summary;
- Interest income earned for the month;
- Investing activities for the month;

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the Investment Policy adopted by Council, the City of Fremantle (the City) invests its surplus funds, long term cash, current assets and other funds in authorised investments as outlined in the policy.

Due to timing differences between receiving revenue and the expenditure of funds, surplus funds may be held by the City for a period of time. To maximise returns and maintain a low level of credit risk, the City invests these funds in appropriately rated and liquid investments, until such time as the City requires the money for expenditure.

The City has committed to carbon neutrality, and will review and manage its investment portfolio to identify financial institutions which support fossil fuel companies (either directly or indirectly) and has limited these investments to the minimum whilst maintaining compliance with the investment policy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

To date actual investment interest earned is $1,159,270 against a year to date budget of $1,089,410 which represents a positive variance of $69,860. This variance will be continued to be monitored throughout the year. Future interest earnings will be determined by the cash flows of the City’s surplus cash and movements in interest rates on term deposits.
The City’s investment portfolio is invested in highly secure investments with a low level of risk yielding a weighted average rate of return of 2.67% (refer report point 8), which compares favourably to the benchmark Bloomberg AusBond Bill Index reference rate of 2.08% (refer to Report 8 - 0.52% for 3 month) on an annualised basis as at the end of March 2019.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The following legislation is relevant to this report:

- Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 19 – Management of Investments; and
- Trustee Act 1962 (Part 3)

Authorised Deposit-taking Institutions are authorised under the Banking Act 1959 and are subject to Prudential Standards oversighted by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA).

CONSULTATION

Nil

OFFICER COMMENT

A comprehensive Investment Report for the month ending 31 March 2019 can be viewed in Attachment 1 of this agenda item. A summary of the investment report is provided below.

1. Portfolio details as at 31 March 2019

At month end the City’s investment portfolio totalled $60.8m. The market value was $61.4m; this value takes into account accrued interest.

The investment portfolio is made up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At call account</td>
<td>$ 4.98m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposits</td>
<td>$55.82m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$60.80m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of which:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash</td>
<td>$24.05m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash (Reserve Funds)</td>
<td>$34.11m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash (Trust Funds)</td>
<td>$ 2.64m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$60.80m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current amount of $24.05m held as unrestricted cash represents 30.81% of the total adopted budget for operating revenue ($78.06m).
2. Portfolio counterparty credit framework (as at 31 March 2019)

The City’s Investment policy determines the maximum amount to be invested in any one financial institution or bank based on the credit rating of the financial institution. The adopted counterparty credit framework is as below:

**Counterparty credit framework**

Investments are not to exceed the following percentages of average annual funds invested with any one financial institution or managed fund and consideration should be given to the relationship between credit rating and interest rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit quality</th>
<th>Maximum % of total investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 (excl. AAA government)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>($1m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graphs provide details of the funds invested this at the end of this month as per the City’s investment portfolio relative to the threshold allowed by the investment policy as below:

*Portfolio Credit Framework Amounts Relative to Maximum Allocations*
As reported in the above graph at the end of this month investments in the individual banks of ME Bank and Suncorp exceeded the adopted trading limits due to the following reasons:

- **ME Bank’s rating was downgraded to BBB from A-, which moved this bank from Tier 2 to Tier 3 and therefore the allowable trading limit reduced from 15% to 5%.

  As term deposits mature with the above bank the City will reallocate the funds to ensure that the bank is within the adopted limit going forward. It should be noted the final maturity date for the bank extend to 16 August 2019. Future investment of funds to the above bank will be assessed based on the updated trading limits to ensure compliance with the City’s investment policy.

- **Suncorp bank marginally exceeded the trading limit by 4% or $379,286 at the end of month. At the time of investing these funds the deposit with Suncorp was compliant with the investment portfolio thresholds. However as the total amount of the investment portfolio reduced it has resulted with Suncorp being outside of the threshold.

  It is expected that cash outflow will be more than cash inflow for the remainder of this financial year. As a result, the total portfolio balance will gradually reduce to meet the anticipated cash requirements. Therefore investments in individual banks may exceed the adopted trading limits even though the deposits were compliant at the time of making the investment.

3. **Portfolio Liquidity Indicator (as at 31 March 2019)**

The below graph provides details on the maturity timing of the City’s investment portfolio. Currently all investments will mature in one year or less.

Investments are to be made in a manner to ensure sufficient liquidity to meet all reasonably anticipated cash flow requirements, without incurring significant costs due to the unanticipated sale of an investment.
4. Portfolio Summary by Fossil Fuels Lending ADIs (As at 31 March 2019)

At the end of this month $32.32m (53.2%) of the portfolio was invested in “Green Investments”; authorised deposit taking institutions that do not lend to industries engaged in the exploration for, or production of, fossil fuels (Non Fossil Fuel lending ADI’s).

5. Interest Income for Matured Investments (For 1 March 2019 to 31 March 2019)

For this month $46,163.01 in interest was earnt from 2 matured term deposits.

6. Investing Activities (For 1 March 2019 to 31 March 2019)

During this month 2 term deposits were acquisitioned with a total value of $4m invested.

Full details of the institution invested in, interest rate, number of days and maturity date are provided in the attached report.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM C1904-3
(Officer recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Doug Thompson

Council receives the Investment Report for the month ending 31 March 2019.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton,
Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
The purpose of this report is to present to Council a list of accounts paid by the Chief Executive Officer under delegated authority for the month ending March 2019, as required by the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

BACKGROUND

Council has delegated, to the Chief Executive Officer, the exercise of its power to make payments from the City’s municipal or trust fund. In accordance with regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, a list of accounts paid under delegation for the month of March 2019, is provided within Attachment 1 and 2.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A total of $8,454,275.62 in payments were made this month from the City’s municipal and trust fund accounts.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 states:

13. Payments from municipal fund or trust fund by CEO, CEO’s duties as to etc.
   (1) If the local government has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the municipal fund or the trust fund, a list of accounts paid by the CEO is to be prepared each month showing for each account paid since the last such list was prepared —
       (a) the payee’s name; and
       (b) the amount of the payment; and
       (c) the date of the payment; and
       (d) sufficient information to identify the transaction.

   (2) A list of accounts for approval to be paid is to be prepared each month showing
       (a) for each account which requires council authorisation in that month —
           (i) the payee’s name; and
           (ii) the amount of the payment; and
           (iii) sufficient information to identify the transaction; and
       (b) the date of the meeting of the council to which the list is to be presented.
(3) A list prepared under sub-regulation (1) or (2) is to be —
(a) presented to the council at the next ordinary meeting of the council after the list is prepared; and
(b) recorded in the minutes of that meeting.

CONSULTATION
Nil

OFFICER COMMENT
The following table summarises the payments for the month ending March 2019 by payment type, with full details of the accounts paid contained within Attachment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheque / EFT / Direct Debit</td>
<td>$6,552,211.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase card transactions</td>
<td>$47,529.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary / Wages / Superannuation</td>
<td>$1,838,174.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other payments</td>
<td>$16,360.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,454,275.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contained within Attachment 2 is a detailed listing of the purchase card transactions for the month ending March 2019.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
Simple Majority Required

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM C1904-4
(Officer recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Doug Thompson

Council:

1. Accepts the list of payments made under delegated authority, totalling $8,454,275.62 for the month ending March 2019, as contained within Attachment 1.

2. Accepts the detailed transaction listing of credit card expenditure, for the month ending March 2019, as contained within Attachment 2.

Carried en bloc: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
15. LATE ITEMS

C1904-5 SUSTAINABLE CITIES OF TOMORROW CRC PROJECTS AND TRANSPORT TOUR - TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND MAYOR ATTENDANCE APPROVAL

Meeting Date: 17 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Manager Governance
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Nil

SUMMARY

To consider approval for the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to attend the Sustainable Cities of Tomorrow CRC Projects and Transport Tour - Transit Oriented Development in China in June 2019.

This report recommends that Council approve the attendance of the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer at the Sustainable Cities of Tomorrow CRC Projects and Transport Tour – Transit Oriented Development in China in June 2019.

BACKGROUND

The Chief Executive Officer and Mayor would like to attend the Sustainable Cities of Tomorrow CRC Projects and Transport Tour – Transit Oriented Development in China in June 2019. The Tour is intended to take place in both China and Europe; however the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor are aiming to attend only the portion of the tour taking place in China.

The cost of this portion of the tour will be approximately $2500 per person and will take place in June 2019.

“The purpose of the study Tour is to experience, view and evaluate the current and emerging global technologies in trackless tram systems (TTS) including vehicle design and autonomy, battery and charging technologies, communications and supporting infrastructure as well as how they are potentially linked to new Transit Oriented Developments (TOD’s). Conducted as part of a collaborative research project, the Tour will bring together representatives from across Australia working on trackless trams to evaluate the possible vehicles and technologies required for priority corridor transit. The Tour will go to China and to Europe to view and ride in trackless trams and for some to also visit some new Green TOD’s that are showing innovations of relevance to Australian cities.”
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
Nil.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
Nil.

CONSULTATION
Nil.

OFFICER COMMENT
The reason for this report appearing as a late item to council is because the deadline for registration has already passed. The organisers of the tour have agreed to delay registration for the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor pending Council determination but have asked that attendance be confirmed as soon as possible.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
Simple Majority Required

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION
Moved: Cr Dave Hume Seconded: Cr Ingrid Waltham

Council

1. Approve the attendance of the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer at the portion of the Sustainable Cities of Tomorrow CRC Projects and Transport Tour – Transit Oriented Development being held in China in June 2019.

AMENDMENT
Moved: Cr Rachel Pemberton Seconded: Cr Ingrid Waltham

To add parts 2 and 3, as shown below:

2. The total maximum cost of the Tour will be approximately $5000.

3. The funds will be taken from the Elected Member professional development budget and the Chief Executive Officer training and development budget.

Amendment carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
COUNCIL DECISION ITEM C1904-5
(Amended officer’s recommendation)

Moved: Cr Dave Hume  Seconded: Cr Ingrid Waltham

Council

1. Approve the attendance of the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer at the portion of the Sustainable Cities of Tomorrow CRC Projects and Transport Tour – Transit Oriented Development being held in China in June 2019.

2. The total maximum cost of the Tour will be approximately $5000.

3. The funds will be taken from the Elected Member professional development budget and the Chief Executive Officer training and development budget.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
16. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

PROCEDURAL MOTION

At 7.16 the following procedural motion was moved:

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

That the meeting be moved behind closed doors to consider the confidential item on the agenda.

Carried: 10/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume

At 7.16 members of the public were requested to vacate the meeting.

FPOL1904-16 CONFIDENTIAL REPORT - HIGH STREET UPGRADE PROJECT

Meeting Date: 10 April 2019
Responsible Officer: Director Infrastructure and Project Delivery
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: 1 High-level Golf Course Concept (October 2018)

REASON FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

This report is CONFIDENTIAL in accordance with Section 5.23(2) of the Local Government Act 1995 which permits the meeting to be closed to the public for business relating to the following:

(c) a contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting
Minutes - Ordinary Meeting of Council 17 April 2019

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM FPOL1904-16
(Committee recommendation)

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Ingrid Waltham

Council:

1. Request officers progress to engage consultants and commence the design process for the required redevelopment works for the golf course remediation, golf club and community facility to the value as defined in this report.

2. Approves the required budget amendment to the adopted budget for 2018/2019 as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Details</th>
<th>2018/19 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Expenditure (Increase)/ Decrease</th>
<th>2018/19 Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100383.6824</td>
<td>Lead Infrastructure and project directorate – consultants exp.</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(80,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100383.xxxx</td>
<td>Lead Infrastructure and project directorate – contribution income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer of funds as an initial contribution to a consultancy budget for the engagement of suitable consultants to progress the design of the golf course remediation, golf club and community facility.

3. Give consideration of a suitable budget allocation for the project, as part of the 2019/2020 budget deliberation process.

Carried by absolute majority: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume

PROCEDURAL MOTION

At 7.17 pm the following procedural motion was moved:

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt  Seconded: Cr Jon Strachan

That the meeting come out from behind closed doors.

Carried: 10/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Ingrid Waltham, Cr Doug Thompson, Cr Bryn Jones, Cr Jon Strachan, Cr Andrew Sullivan, Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Adin Lang, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Dave Hume
17. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7.17 pm.