



City of Stirling

Ordinary Meeting of the 41st Council

13 May 2025

Minutes

To: The Mayor and Councillors

Here within the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council of the City of Stirling held Tuesday 13 May 2025 in the City of Stirling Council Chamber, 25 Cedric Street, Stirling.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Rodic'.

Stevan Rodic | Chief Executive Officer

Our Vision, Mission and Values

Vision

A sustainable City with a local focus.

Mission

To serve our community by delivering efficient, responsive and sustainable service.

Values

The City of Stirling's core values are:

- Approachable
- Responsive
- Transparent
- Innovative.

Disclaimer

Members of the public should note that in any discussion regarding any planning or other application that any statement or intimation of approval made by any member or officer of the City during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not to be taken as notice of approval from the City. No action should be taken on any item discussed at a Council meeting prior to written advice on the resolution of the Council being received.

Any plans or documents contained in this document may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1998*, as amended) and the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to the reproduction.




TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	OFFICIAL OPENING	7
2.	ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES.....	7
3.	APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	9
4.	DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST.....	9
5.	PETITIONS.....	11
6.	RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	11
7.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	12
7.1	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M GIORGI	13
7.2	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M BOND.....	14
7.3	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A INMAN.....	16
7.4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - B RUSSELL	18
7.5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A GRAY	19
7.6	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - R HADLEY	19
7.7	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - B CRIDDLE.....	23
7.8	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - P FITZPATRICK.....	24
7.9	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - C MCLEAN	25
7.10	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M MASIELLO.....	27
7.11	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M ROZICH.....	29
7.12	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M MOLINARI.....	31

7.13	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - K KELLY	33
7.14	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M O'TOOLE (ON BEHALF OF M O'TOOLE).....	34
7.15	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - R MITCHELL.....	35
7.16	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A HEWITT	37
7.17	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - S ZORN.....	39
7.18	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - C CURTIS-DAVIS	40
7.19	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - S COATES.....	41
8.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	42
9.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	42
10.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER.....	43
10.1	WATERWISE GOLD AWARD	43
10.2	VALE EMERITUS CHIEF RABBI DR SHALOM COLEMAN.....	43
11.	UNRESOLVED BUSINESS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING	43
12.	REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES.....	44
12.1	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 6 MAY 2025	44
12.1/DS1	LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANELS) REGULATIONS 2025.....	44
12.1/DS2	PROPOSED SUBMISSION ON WALGA DRAFT ADVOCACY POSITION – STATE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND DECISION MAKING	50
12.1/DS3	TREE RETENTION AND PLANTING ON DEVELOPMENT SITES - PROGRESS REPORT.....	62
12.1/PCS1	WA GOLF CLUB - TEE NETTING	79
12.1/8.1	STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF BUSINESS INCUBATORS	84

13. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 4.2(4) OF THE MEETING PROCEDURES LOCAL LAW 2021.....	85
13.1 2023/2024 ELECTORS GENERAL MEETING 24 MARCH 2025.....	85
13.2 CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND REAFFIRMATION OF PRESIDING AND DEPUTY MEMBERS.....	186
13.3 COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM - ROUND 3 LARGE GRANTS.....	191
13.4 CEUF OPPORTUNITY	199
14. NOTICES OF MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION.....	210
14.1 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TERESA OLOW - BASKETBALL COURTS ON PUBLIC OPEN SPACES	210
14.2 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TONY KRSTICEVIC - SCARBOROUGH PRECINCT CROWDED PLACES ASSESSMENT UPDATE.....	215
14.3 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR ANDREA CREADO - MIRRABOOKA TOWN ACTIVITY CENTRE STATUS UPDATE	223
14.4 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - MAYOR MARK IRWIN - LAND ACQUISITION OPPORTUNITIES IN LOCAL CENTRES	227
14.5 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR KARLO PERKOV - TRAILS PROGRAM FOR TRIGG BUSHLAND	231
15. NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING	235
15.1 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR ANDREA CREADO - STIRLING LEISURE - BALGA PLANNED UPGRADES TIMEFRAME	235
15.2 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TONY KRSTICEVIC - PUBLIC OPEN SPACE FRAMEWORK AND PRIORITY AREAS.....	236
15.3 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR STEPHANIE PROUD JP - FUTURE PLANNING OF STIRLING COMMUNITY CENTRE - INNALOO	237
15.4 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION – COUNCILLOR ELIZABETH RE - WELFARE CHECKS	238
16. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	238

17. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE.....	238
18. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS	239
18.1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTER	240
19. CLOSURE	242

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL OF TUESDAY 13 MAY 2025 HELD IN CITY OF STIRLING COUNCIL
CHAMBER, 25 CEDRIC STREET, STIRLING**

1. OFFICIAL OPENING

The Presiding Member declared the Ordinary Meeting of Council open at 6.31pm.

2. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

ATTENDANCE

Mayor

Mayor Mark Irwin

Councillors

Councillor Andrea Creado
Councillor Michael Dudek
Councillor Joe Ferrante
Councillor Damien Giudici
Councillor Chris Hatton
Councillor Tony Krsticevic
Councillor David Lagan
Councillor Suzanne Migdale
Councillor Teresa Olow
Councillor Rob Paparde
Councillor Karlo Perkov
Councillor Stephanie Proud JP
Councillor Elizabeth Re

Employees

Chief Executive Officer - Stevan Rodic
Director Community Development - Michael Quirk
Director Corporate Services - Ingrid Hawkins
Director Infrastructure - Andrew Murphy
Director Planning and Development - Amanda Sheers
Manager City Future - Andrew Lefort
Manager Development Services - Giovanna Lumbaca
Manager Facilities, Projects and Assets - Paul Kellick
Manager Strategy and Performance - Michelle Wolsoncroft
Acting Manager Community Safety - Brent Stein
Acting Manager Governance - Jackson Mawby
Chief People Officer - Matthew Thomas
Service Lead Council & Civic - Candice D'Castro
Head of Community Engagement - James Murphy
Senior Governance Officer - Amorette Kerklaan
Senior Governance Officer - Sean McDiarmid
Senior Media Advisor - Liam Croy
Senior Sustainability Officer (Energy) - William Jeon
Acting Senior Elected Member Services Officer - Nathaniel McBain

Public

22

Press

0

APOLOGIES

Councillor Lisa Thornton.

3. APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

4. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Where a member has disclosed a financial or proximity interest in an item, they must leave the Chamber for consideration of that item.

Where a member has disclosed an impartiality interest in an item, they may remain in the Chamber. The member is required to bring an independent mind to the item and decide impartially on behalf of the City of Stirling and its community.

Planning and Development Committee - 6 May 2025

Nil.

Council - 13 May 2025

Councillor Michael Dudek disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as he is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Suzanne Migdale disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as she is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Teresa Olow disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as she is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Rob Paparde disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as he is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Michael Dudek disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as he is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Suzanne Migdale disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as she is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Teresa Olow disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as she is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Rob Paparde disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as he is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Mayor Mark Irwin disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as he has visited the Golf Club to discuss this issues and may still be an honorary member of WA Golf Club.

Councillor Joe Ferrante disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as he may still be an honorary member of WA Golf Club.

Councillor Damien Giudici disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as his father is a member of WA Golf Club.

Councillor Chris Hatton disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/8.1 as he is a judge for the Awards Night.

Councillor Karlo Perkov disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/8.1 as the board of directors are known to him; has attended events; and will be judging some awards.

Councillor Elizabeth Re disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 13.1 as she is a named in Attachment 1.

Director Community Development, Michael Quirk disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 14.1 as he is a Basketball WA (BWA) Board Member with the BWA strategic plan identifying 'places to play' as a key priority, including people being able to walk to a local basketball facility in their local park.

Acting Manager Governance, Jackson Mawby disclosed a Financial Interest in Item 18.1.

5. PETITIONS

Nil.

6. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TAKEN ON NOTICE

All Public Question Time responses from the previous Council meeting were published in the minutes of that meeting.

Nil.

7. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Councillor Michael Dudek left the meeting at 7.29pm during Item 7, and returned at 7.32pm.

Public Question Time is included in the live stream. Members of the public are only required to state their name and suburb when addressing the meeting.

Members of the public who wish to ask question/s at the Council meeting are requested to submit these through the City's online Public Question Time submission form ([click here](#)).

7.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M GIORGI

The following questions were submitted by M Giorgi, Hamersley WA 6022, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“My questions relate to my carried motion 9.15/1 at the recent EGM. Given that the City's May 2022 report already identified the Banksia Woodland as ecologically significant and recommended its reclassification as a locally significant natural area, why does the City now need to rely upon the Environmental Protection Authority's final assessment of the proposal before giving consideration to rezoning the site?”*
- A1. The Director Planning and Development advised that the application submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) is an application for clearing of the site. It is not under any planning legislation but rather the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, and is for the Minister to decide in conjunction with the EPA. Therefore, rezoning of the site has no bearing on that decision.
- Q2. *“Is the Council aware that the State Government's commitment to upgrading the Reid Highway and Erindale Road intersection will result in the clearing of several hectares of bushland in the suburb of Hammersley, making the protection of the remaining area even more critical?”*
- A2. The Mayor confirmed awareness of the matter.
- Q3. *“Mr Mayor, would you consider writing to the newly appointed State Minister for the Environment, the Honourable Matthew Swinbourn MP, to highlight the ecological significance of the site in question?”*
- A3. The Mayor confirmed that he would be happy to write a letter to the Minister for the Environment to ensure that the State Government is aware of the ecological significance of the area.

7.2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M BOND

The following questions were submitted by M Bond, Scarborough WA 6019, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *"I understand the City has allocated \$500,000 towards the feasibility study to assess a proposed coastal boardwalk through the vegetation dunes between Trigg and Scarborough. In the interest of transparency for ratepayers, can the City please provide a breakdown of what has been spent of the budgeted \$500,000 to date, including any approved quotes, pending orders and due or paid invoices? Please include details of which vendors the money has been paid to."*

A2. The Manager Strategy and Performance advised that the question would be taken on notice, and a response provided in writing.

Q2. *"Are City Administration staff working on the boardwalk feasibility assessment, community engagement and marketing included in the \$500,000 budget? In the interest of transparency for the ratepayers, please provide detail of the number of staff hours spent on the boardwalk proposal, including the web page, community, engagement, consultation, procurement of vendors, liaison with selected vendors, reviewing reports and assessments."*

A2. The Mayor advised that the question would be taken on notice, and a response provided in writing.

Q3. *"As of today, assuming that any orders and invoices are cleared, what is the balance of funds not yet allocated from the \$500,000 initially budgeted? How much more money and City staff hours will be required to perform all further required assessments and consultation to gain required approvals beyond the initial feasibility stage?"*

A3. The Mayor advised that the question would be taken on notice, and a response provided in writing.

Additional Information

A1. Of the \$500,000 budget for the Coastal Boardwalk Feasibility Study \$39,519 has been spent on external consultancy. The expenditure the following payments:

- \$23,370 (ex GST) to Coterra Environment for the Preliminary Environmental Constraints and Opportunities Assessment
- \$4,500 (ex GST) to Y Architecture Studio Pty Ltd for artists impressions
- \$9,234 (ex GST) to ADBird Engineering for surveying
- \$2,415 (ex GST) general marketing expenses

The current pending orders are:

- \$8,000 (ex GST) for geotechnical investigations
- \$92,900 (ex GST) for the concept design phase
- \$61,000 (ex GST) for the Economic Impact Assessment

- A2. Individual administration staff costs have not been allocated to this project and are captured within the City's overall employee costs. Delivering projects like the Coastal Boardwalk Feasibility Study is part of various employee regular duties and no further details are available.
- A3. The total current expenditure and pending orders total \$201,419 leaving a project balance of \$298,581. Additional funds will be spent for advertising and marketing during the community consultation phase however this estimated value has not been confirmed at this time. Any future spend will be in line with approved budget parameters.

7.3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A INMAN

The following questions were submitted by A Inman, Trigg WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“Could you please provide a list of the assessments that the City has identified that will need to be completed as part of the preliminary boardwalk feasibility study? And then, separately, any future assessments required for applications to the regulatory authorities to form part of the environmental and developmental approvals for a proposed boardwalk. Please provide an estimate and the cost of these if that is known.”*

A1. The Mayor advised that the question would be taken on notice, and a response provided in writing.

Q2. *“Could you please confirm whether the raw or unedited findings from all of these assessments will be made available to Elected Members and ratepayers ahead of the planned community engagement and consultation?”*

A2. The Manager Strategy and Performance confirmed that when available, copies of the report will be published on the City’s web page.

Q3. *“There are some inaccurate renders of boardwalks and images of boardwalks from other geographically different places that are being used on the Council website and other marketing materials from the City of Stirling. These images are vastly different from the South Trigg Beach reserve ecosystem and terrain. Please explain how this is not misleading to the community.”*

A3. The Mayor advised that the City’s website states that the images used are not reflective of any design concept for the proposed boardwalk; rather, they are examples of other boardwalks that are easily accessible to the public.

“I do understand that Mr Mayor, but to clarify my comment, there is a render that is proposed which looks like Trigg Beach, but the terrain is vastly different. So, my question is really around that - is that render not misleading?”

The Mayor advised that he believes the images are not misleading; they are artist impressions.

Additional Information

A1. In the Coastal Boardwalk Feasibility Study the City has conducted a Preliminary Environmental Opportunities and Constraints Assessment in Phase 1 of the project. In Phase 2, the City is currently undertaking further environmental and geotechnical surveys, a locational design plan, a concept design, a construction approach and capital and annual cost estimates. An economic impact assessment will also be conducted in this phase.

Through the Preliminary Environmental Opportunities and Constraints Assessment, the City was advised that if the project was to progress beyond the feasibility stage, the City will need to conduct further studies/surveys. This will likely include the development of detailed designs, a flora and vegetation survey, a fauna survey, a land quality assessment, a construction environmental management plan and a foreshore management plan before the City seeks approval through the relevant government agencies. This is estimated to cost \$250,000. There may also be further expertise and additional studies/approval requirements however the extent of this will not be known until the Coastal Boardwalk Feasibility Study is completed.

7.4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - B RUSSELL

The following questions were submitted by B Russell, Trigg WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“Over the past six months, a large group of ratepayers has shown support for alternative boardwalk options, including creating a separate walker’s lane at the elevated eastern edge of the reserve, adjacent to the existing path. We have heard this option has the support of over 1,600 path users in the form of a paper petition. The City has indicated through its website that it is now moving to the official community consultation in May/June 2025. Can the City rationalise marketing a boardwalk concept to the public now, prior to considering the alternative boardwalk pathways available, and running these options through a weighted multicriteria options assessment, especially given the potential economic and environmental constraints?”*
- A1. The Mayor advised that alternative options are part of ongoing preliminary investigations. Alternate routes may well be along the coastal path and have not yet been ruled out.
- Q2. *“The City has stated that one of the key drivers of the boardwalk is tourism. Has the City extensively consulted Tourism WA to get their objective feedback on the economic value of a boardwalk through the South Trigg Beach Class A Reserve? If so, can you please provide a summary of this consultation? If not, why has this not been done prior to planned community consultation?”*
- A2. The Mayor advised that is part of the ongoing conversations with Tourism WA. There will also be a cost benefit analysis that will be completed prior to consultation.
- Q3. *“In recent State and Federal elections, none of the successful State or Federal candidates showed any interest in supporting the proposed boardwalk. This suggests the boardwalk is unlikely to gain material financial support from State and Federal Government, as they are already over committed on delivering election promises. Has the City spoken to the State and Federal Government to find out why they have no interest in supporting the concept, and if so, what is the feedback?”*
- A3. The Mayor disagreed with the point that there is no support from State and Federal Government for the proposed boardwalk. He advised that it is too early to seek significant funding for a project, when community consultation has not yet taken place.

7.5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A GRAY

The following questions were submitted by A Gray, Trigg WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“This is regarding your wording of the ‘Welcome to Country’. I noticed tonight that one word was deleted from what is on the paper; the word ‘emerging’. Why do you use the words ‘and show our respect for elders past and present’? That seems to me to be a generalised statement. It is a bland, generalised statement which means all elders, past and present. Surely some should not be there? Can this be reworded? If you have to have one, can you please define what you mean by ‘the elders, past and present’?”*
- A1. The Mayor advised that Council is not required to deliver an ‘Acknowledgement of Country’, but chooses to do so. He agreed that the wording is indeed general. The Mayor further advised that during coming stages of the City’s Reconciliation Action Plan, Council may consider its understanding of why the Acknowledgement of Country is presented, and the way in which it is worded. This Council is proud to deliver an Acknowledgement of Country and believes it is the correct thing to do.

7.6 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - R HADLEY

The following questions were submitted by R Hadley, Woodlands WA 6018, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“The Ewen Street Community Group, together with other community groups, seeks lists of expenditure in the Scarborough Coastal Ward for the past two financial and current financial years. This includes all grants, funding for all musical, sporting and beach events, Sunset Markets, lifesaving events, Scarborough Beach Association and Mayor’s obstacle events”.*
- A1. The Director Corporate Services advised that the City does not conduct individual ward accounting, but can review costings for specific events and provide Mr Hadley with these figures in writing.
- Q2. *“We seek full financial details of the \$850,000 allocated for the redevelopment of the Stirling Civic Centre. This includes seating, garden beds, types of trees, LED lighting and shading, sculptural features, plants, a yarnning circle, new parking bays, etc. Has any State grant been provided to cover these costs once established, and will there be a timeframe for this centre to be closed to the public, and what security will be in place to reduce any vandalism, littering etc?”*
- A2. The Mayor advised that the redevelopment works are currently underway and are due to be completed by December 2025. He confirmed that there is no State Government grant allocated for the works, and that the costings would be provided in writing.

- Q3. *“Following the media report regarding one car ending up on Scarborough Beach, within 24 hours, a City spokesman had vowed to allocate \$700,000 of ratepayers’ money for the supply of bollards in this troublesome area. Who was the spokesperson who proposed this large amount of money? How was this figure arrived at? Please provide a breakdown of costs. Was this matter referred to Council for discussion?”*
- A3. The Mayor advised that work around mitigating the potential for harm in the Scarborough precinct through a Crowded Places Assessment well and truly predates the mentioned incident. Officers have been working on the assessment, and Council was extensively briefed over the past 12 months on the work towards making that area safer. The City will provide further information in writing.

Additional Information

- A1. The City does not undertake Ward Accounting as per the legislative requirements. An indication of the type of events and costs that have been held / will be held in 2024/2025 are shown below. A comprehensive list cannot be provided due to the reasons noted above.

Event Name	2024/25 FY Budget Spend
Red Dust OCR Series [\$35k sponsorship - \$30k attributed to Scarborough event]	\$30,000 ^
Scarborough Sunset Markets 2024 – 2025	\$70,000
Jazz Connect 2024	\$5,000
Groundswell 2024	\$80,000
ExPRO 2024	\$30,000
Variety Concert to celebrate 35 Years of A Cappella Go	\$4,900
Movies in the Hood Summer Series	\$5,000
Carols at Scarborough 2024	\$37,500
North Beach Community Carols 2024	\$10,000
Livid Fest 2024 - Summer Festival	\$10,000
Perth Festival 2025 [\$125k sponsorship - \$90k attributed to Scarborough event]	\$90,000 ^
Open Water Swimming Series Round 8 - City to Scarbs	\$6,000
King of the Point	\$10,000
Brazilian Beach Carnaval 2025	\$45,000
Jazz Connect Aug 2025	\$27,000
World Police & Fire Games 2027 [\$350k sponsorship across multiple wards \$70k attributed in 24/25]	\$70,000 ^
Business in Sport Summit	\$20,000
TOTAL	\$550,400 ^

^ Multiple wards – portion attributed to Coastal ward

A2. Full financial details are confidential however, the \$850,000 works include:

- New main entrance doors
- Programmable LED lighting of the Lena statue
- Yarning circle
- Bespoke seating
- Artwork

- Relocation of existing parking to create a pedestrian-only zone
- Native plantings including eucalypts and melaleucas

The project is fully funded by the City, with no grants applicable and the Administration will not be closed during the works. As a result, there is no additional security in place.

Works are expected to be completed prior to the local government elections in October 2025.

- A3. In consultation with law enforcement agencies, the City has recently completed a Crowded Places Assessment for the Scarborough Beach Precinct. A 'crowded place' is a location which is easily accessible by a high volume and concentration of people on predictable basis. This may include sports stadia, transport infrastructure, shopping centres, places of worship, tourist attractions and civic spaces. The Scarborough Beach Precinct meets the crowded place criteria, and as the Local Government Authority responsible, the City of Stirling has the primary role to implement appropriate infrastructure and management measures.

The Crowded Places Assessment identifies 11 key recommendations and a number of associated actions. This includes crowd counting technology, CCTV network improvements, public announcement system, and both permanent and removeable vehicle barriers. The cost to implement these recommendations is approximately \$1.5 million which has been included in Council's draft 2025/2025 budget for consideration with \$1 million to be grant funded. A specific breakdown of costs cannot be provided until procurement of the various actions. No City spokesperson has made any specific financial commitment towards this project with any such references likely to have been from recent Federal/State Government election candidates.

Preparation of the Crowded Places Assessment was included in Council's 2024/2025 budget and Corporate Business Plan with Elected Members engaged during preparation of the report. At the Council Meeting on 13 May 2025, Council noted that funding has been listed for consideration within the 2025/2026 budget and resolved to engage with relevant Federal/State Government agencies to seek grant funding for implementation.

7.7 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - B CRIDDLE

The following questions were submitted by B Criddle, Scarborough WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“I run or walk every morning along the stretch of West Coast Highway between North Scarborough and South Trigg. When the City of Stirling first sent out the ‘Feels Like Scarborough’ survey back when it was asking if the residents would support a boardwalk, I responded positively. Since then, I’ve become aware of the idea of widening the existing path instead of building a boardwalk through the sand dunes. As I’ve become better educated about the issues, I feel I was misled by the City of Stirling in the survey. Why did the City not put an alternate idea of widening the path in the original Feels Like Scarborough survey, so residents could actually give an educated response?”*
- A1. The Mayor advised that the question posed in the ‘Feels Like Scarborough’ survey was very general and is not being used as part of community consultation for the project. The need for an investigation into the feasibility of a boardwalk had originally stemmed from Councillor motions. More information will come to Council as environmental assessments are continued.
- Q2. *“Why, even now that you’ve had substantial pushback about the proposed boardwalk, does the City continue to spend our funds pushing a one-track idea of marketing a proposed boardwalk, rather than educating 230,000 people that there are alternatives - such as widening a path - which could be less costly and not as environmentally damaging? Why is all this money being spent on marketing?”*
- A2. The Mayor advised that he believes it has not been marketed widely; a lot of the media attention is not necessarily caused by the City issuing press releases for a proposed boardwalk, but rather, it’s brought about by community interest. There are plenty of alternative options, but the City’s Councillors have endorsed the City to investigate the feasibility of a potential boardwalk through the dune system.
- Q3. *“Why is the Council not running two feasibility studies in parallel, one for widening the path, if you already knew that was an option, and one for the proposed boardwalk? Why aren’t you running two parallel studies?”*
- A3. The Mayor advised that Council did not ask for a feasibility study to be conducted for each alternative option to the boardwalk. The City will be able to establish if there is a more suitable alternative option from the ongoing environmental assessments.

7.8 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - P FITZPATRICK

The following questions were submitted by P Fitzpatrick, Inglewood WA 6052, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“The City of Stirling, WA Police and Crime Stoppers currently operate a well-managed, well-established system of real time data sharing on police matters in the area. This information is also shared with the Department of Communities in the event a police report might corroborate a disruptive behaviour report. However, disruptive behaviour reports managed by the Department of Communities follow a separate investigation process before tenant strikes are issued, limiting visibility for local authorities.*

Greater visibility of disruptive behaviour cases would ensure a more proactive response to community concerns before they escalate into repeated offences, such as those happening in Inglewood lately. To improve coordination and ensure timely responses to community concerns, would Council consider formalising an information sharing memorandum with the Department of Communities, similar to existing frameworks for law enforcement collaboration?”

- A1. The Director Community Development advised that the City does have an information sharing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WA Police, and has offered that same MOU to the Department of Communities; they are yet to take up that offer.

- Q2. *“Council and the Inglewood community have reached out to several Ministers regarding the ongoing social housing crisis in Inglewood, highlighting urgent concerns about crime, tenant management and broader homelessness risks. Despite formal correspondence, key systemic concerns remain unaddressed, leading to ongoing safety risks for both housed and at-risk populations.*

Given that tenancy allocation and management decisions directly impact whether individuals transition into stable housing or face repeated cycles of homelessness, the community-led advocacy in relation to 157 Ninth Avenue has highlighted clear gaps in oversight. These include a lack of appropriate housing allocation, such as mixed tenancy, compared to the 100% social housing method, insufficient enforcement of disruptive behaviour policies, and an absence of integrated support services. Without immediate intervention, ongoing management risks worsening homelessness cycles and community instability.

Will the Council formally request the Minister for Homelessness to endorse and work alongside the community to strengthen more secure and reliable management policies, ensuring long term stability for both tenants and residents?”

- A2. The Mayor advised that the City is happy to advocate for the community on the mentioned issues and is awaiting a response from the Minister for Homelessness.

7.9 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - C MCLEAN

The following questions were submitted by C McLean, Scarborough WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“At the Electors’ General Meeting on 24 March, I moved a motion to ask the City of Stirling to immediately initiate the process required for adoption of the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention, which provides protection for healthy, mature trees on private property. In the response to EGM motion 9.10/1, the Council advises it has previously considered the merits of the WALGA Model Policy in a report presented to Council on 17 September 2024, and that at this time, it’s ultimately not looking to initiate the process to adopt the WALGA policy, saying that it’s already managing tree retention through the planning approval process. I do not think that this is the best way to ensure a consistent approach to protect healthy mature trees on private land, and I see that the WALGA Tree Retention Policy offers more of a fit for purpose framework to give the City of Stirling the best chance of meeting its canopy targets. WALGA has sought legal opinion on their policy, and it stands up with some six councils already adopting it. In the absence of State leadership on the protection of existing tree canopy, the WALGA Policy is, I believe, the next best plan we have to bring about effective action to protect our dwindling tree canopy in the City of Stirling. Can the Council please put the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention out for community consultation to ensure that community makes the decision here on whether to adopt it or not, rather than Council?”*
- A1. The Director Planning and Development advised that in the report presented to Council in September 2024, the City thoroughly reviewed the WALGA Policy and the implementation of that, and how that would work in the City’s Planning Framework. The City undertook quite a rigorous process and reviewed whether or not that would be an effective way of improving our urban canopy. In the City’s analysis and investigation, it was deemed that it would not be, because it would be a Policy. Following that decision from Council, there was a SAT case where it was deemed that local planning policies such as the WALGA model cannot override what the Residential Codes state; this means that essentially, it would not have the intended effect. It would also be very difficult to implement and manage for a City as large as Stirling. Officers also felt that it did not have the legal robustness that it may have been intended to have at the first drafting. Since then, the City is looking at other ways to continuously try to improve the canopy. The City had quite a successful program looking at the conditions placed on approvals, to make sure that applicants installed trees where they are conditioned to do so – there have been some good results with that as well.
- Q2. *“In relation to the biodiversity loss of urban bushland and critical wildlife corridors, there are instances where this is planned to occur in the Churchlands bushland that runs alongside Newman College and also Hertha Road Wetland, which has raised a bit of awareness in the community very recently. I know that both areas of land are on Main Roads highway reserves, and I’m told that is outside of Council’s jurisdiction, which is fair enough. But I do feel that Council is our voice and Council represents us as community; we have to live with the legacy issues of losing this biodiversity in these bushland areas, which are really important to us and are part of the reason why we live in these areas. What can Council do to start advocating more strongly for community to seek open and transparent consultation with Main Roads prior to works commencing and being carried out, particularly where they’re going to adversely affect our people who live directly near those areas?”*

A2. The Mayor advised that there are several instances, such as the Erindale Road bushland site mentioned during an earlier question. The City has been very strong in its support for the future of that site, writing to Ministers and seeking meetings with them to show the significance of it. The Churchlands site is an interesting one because it is part of the Stephenson Avenue Road Reserve, and the City has no control over it. The reality is that whilst it is frustrating and it seems risky, the process would be for the State Government to do some preliminary assessments on the road network to determine if the future road is still needed, and if a road network will go through there. If not, then that will be returned under Council control and the MRS removed from that site. That would then give the City control to be able to protect that site rather than when it is under the MRS scheme. In terms of the freeway, the City acknowledges that there have been some very poor outcomes - hectares and hectares of tree loss for a shared path that possibly could have been handled a lot differently in 2025. The City is happy to continue to advocate and write a letter to Main Roads to ask for better consultation. At an officer level, they are working really hard for better outcomes, and trying to work towards tree replacement schedules. When there are opportunities for a Local Government or Main Roads to do future planning or road networks, the City has replacement policies of 'five to one', which Main Roads does not have. So, the City will happily continue to work towards that.

At 7.08pm, in accordance with Clause 5.2(14) of the City of Stirling's Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021, Mayor Mark Irwin ruled that Public Question Time be EXTENDED.

7.10 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M MASIELLO

The following questions were submitted by M Masiello, Trigg WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“There's been a significant amount of press this week regarding the dire situation at Lancelin. For many years, Lancelin Coast was relatively stable. However, in recent times, things have changed. Some sections of the coast have lost 25m in five years. This is accelerating with an estimated 6m lost since January this year. The erosion is happening at a faster rate than experts initially forecast. Like South Trigg Beach, the shoreline at Lancelin is sand and the vegetated dunes provide the only buffer to surrounding residential areas and infrastructure. Interestingly, there is even a boardwalk, a path and a lookout that is getting engulfed by the ocean at the moment. There are theories to do with why this is happening, including the impact of climate change, building on the shoreline, the impacts of sand mining, and four-wheel drives damaging the vegetation. The recommended solution is ‘retreat’ for the whole town, given the cost of a sea wall is in excess of \$20 million. Given the South Trigg vegetated dunes is considered an extreme erosion risk by as early as 2045, what is the City taking from this unfolding critical situation in terms of planning the path for the proposed boardwalk?”*
- A1. The Mayor advised that this does highlight a concern that is happening around the coastlines of Australia. The City has been strongly advocating, at a national level, for funding - significant funding to ensure that towns like that do not necessarily have to just retreat. ‘CHRMAP’ is the mapping that the State Government asked this Council to undertake. It's been consulting since 2014, 2015. Part of CHRMAP is to understand the mapping of those lines of giving us the ability to review whether we accept the losses in some areas of perhaps sand or dune systems; whether we retreat completely; or whether we protect those areas. And that is happening - you would have seen it at some of those locations along the coast. All of that will be used, along with these environmental assessments, to determine if that is at risk. They are continually updated and assessments occur to allow informed decisions to be made. If the boardwalk was to go ahead, then it would be up to this Council to decide if they wanted to proceed with an investment that may potentially be gone in 100 years or whatever the case may be.
- Q2. *“In accordance with Local Government legislation, guidelines and policies, is it possible for the City Administration to act on a new motion that may vary the actions of an existing workflow that the City is performing that was initiated from a previously carried Elected Member’s motion if the motion that is put forth varies an existing workflow? So if there's a workflow happening, then is it possible for a new motion to vary that workflow?”*
- A2. The Chief Executive Officer advised in the affirmative.
- Q3. *“If the ratepayers and key stakeholders strongly believe that a specific assessment should be included in the boardwalk feasibility study to improve the robustness and probability of the City finding the optimal outcome for the study for the ratepayers, in terms of environmental, economic and social criteria, can the CEO please advise how this assessment could be nominated by either Councillors or Ratepayers?”*

- A3. The Mayor advised that Mr Masiello is welcome to send him an email. Mr Masiello has attended the CEO's office before and is welcome to send an email or ask for a phone conversation, and put that suggestion forward.

“The question was if the ratepayers and key stakeholders strongly believed that a specific assessment should be included in the boardwalk feasibility study to improve the robustness and probability of the City finding the optimal outcome for the study for the ratepayers. In terms of environmental, economic and social criteria, can the CEO please advise how this assessment could be nominated by either Councillors or ratepayers? Like the process - I'm asking for how it could be done.”

The Mayor advised that if Councillors, for example, wanted something put forward, or a community member wished to, they could put a suggestion forward. This does not guarantee that the City's Administration would implement whatever was being requested. It is important to note that whilst this Council asked for a review of the potential for a boardwalk, the Council does not decide on each of those studies. A lot of those are legislative studies, and Council cannot get involved in operational matters.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that anyone can approach him or the relevant staff. What the City would do with any of those situations, which may not just be about the boardwalk, but with anything the City does, is to consider those suggestions. If the City believed it to have merit, it would be put to Council - especially in regards to a matter like the boardwalk, which is a project the Council has endorsed and which has a specific project timeline. Matters and concerns also come through formal consultation, and the City has processes in place for that. But in the end, it will be Council making any decision if it wanted to change or increase scope.

The Chief Executive Officer further advised that the City prides itself on community consultation and its democratic process is to seek information from people. He reiterated that the City has a scope and a timeline for the boardwalk project and any change to that will be a Council decision.

7.11 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M ROZICH

The following questions were submitted by M Rozich, Inglewood WA 6052, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

- Q1. *“Mr Mayor, firstly I'd like to thank the Council and Police for the continued support of the Inglewood community regarding the ongoing problems associated with the 100% social housing complex at 157 Ninth Avenue, Inglewood. In particular, I'd like to thank you, Mr Mayor, our local Councillors, David Lagan and Damien Guidici, local resident Melissa Molinari and local business owner Marnee Rinaldi for fiercely advocating for the safety and wellbeing of the Inglewood community. An assault took place last Saturday night, where a local was kicked, punched, picked up and slammed to the ground in a random and unprovoked attack by a resident of the 100% social housing complex who police arrested today. The media coverage that followed has brought to light an issue that the community has been struggling with since September last year, that of the Department of Communities' refusal to manage the 100% social housing complex and its residents safely and effectively. This lack of management resulting in the same cycle of crime and anti-social behaviour that residents in the vicinity have been repeatedly experiencing. The Department of Communities' refuse to remove, rehouse or evict offending tenants, repeatedly saying that it's only a small number of tenants creating problems. Communities, what do you consider a small number to be? Because this small number of tenants has made their area in and around the complex a no-go zone after dark and has been terrorising the Inglewood community, as well as fellow tenants of the 100% social housing complex, with extreme behaviours, the latest being the unprovoked attack last Saturday night. It's obvious that Communities does not care about the issues that it has brought to the Inglewood community through poor planning. However, where is their duty of care for its own tenants, when you have five tenants reaching out to the wider community in desperation because they fear for their lives? Communities, you have a problem. Why haven't the offending individuals been evicted? If Communities needs corroborating evidence, take my phone, ask the community, talk to the police. There's enough footage to evict the offending tenants via the Residential Tenancies Act, using Section 73 'when a tenant intentionally or recklessly causes damage or injury to people or property' or Section 75A regarding 'objectional behaviour that interferes with the reasonable peace, comfort, or privacy of anyone who resides in the immediate vicinity', or even Section 64, the 'No cause eviction', which does not require reason to be specified. Does the Council have any indication as to why the Department of Communities is flat out refusing to adequately address the issues at the 100% social housing complex at 157 Ninth Avenue and evict tenants that continually create issues for their fellow residents and wider community?”*
- A1. The Mayor advised that it has been a very disappointing response to date. The Chief Executive Officer has reached out directly to the Department of Communities at the highest levels, and a meeting is scheduled to have those discussions.

Q2. *“Adding further frustration to locals and businesses is Minister John Carey MLA’s refusal to acknowledge the situation by refusing to respond to emails sent by affected residents and businesses; or Assistant Minister Patrick Gorman’s refusal to acknowledge the situation by making appointments with him impossible to get by feigning ignorance, and then finally saying it’s not his problem because he’s a Federal Minister and to go find someone else to tell your problems to - almost as if they are waiting until we give up on our community, but we won’t. Has John Carey MLA finally bothered to respond to the email that the Council sent on behalf of the Inglewood community on 4 March, 10 weeks ago? If so, when?”*

A2. The Mayor advised that he believes it was a second letter. The City has not had a response from any of the Ministers. Emails were also sent to other Ministers thought to be applicable, including the Minister for Small Business, because of the effect it was having on small business. That one was the only response received, saying it was not an issue for that Minister. The City continues to be disappointed, and has been very clear about this.

This is not a Council that is unsupportive of development, and although it can be used as a term of endearment, ‘NIMBY’ has possibly been used in relation to opposition this Council had to a development in that area. But the Council and the City need the local community to care about their neighbourhoods and where they live. The reason Councils operate is to give the community context, and the only way Council can make a decision is to understand and listen to the wider community and how they feel about their local area. The opposition to this particular complex is not about NIMBY-ism, it is about protecting against something that everyone in State Government and Local Government knows – and that is that 100% social housing complexes are a thing of the 70s and 80s. This was seen in Cromer Way in North Beach, when the State Government demolished the complex; and in Stirling Towers when that complex was demolished because those outcomes were not the sort needed. This Council is currently supporting a fantastic development in Balcatta for the Step Up, Step Down, 100% complex for people who need wrap around services – it will have those wrap around services actually there. The other models the City looks at are models where there is activation on the ground floor, plus mixed tenancies of one bedroom, two bedroom and family apartments, because they provide much better outcomes. That knowledge is available in 2025, so the outcomes currently being experienced at Inglewood are not okay. And that is why this Council will continue to support those residents.

Q3. *“Do you have any indication as to why they’ve chosen to do that in Inglewood then, despite the fact that it doesn’t work?”*

A3. The Mayor advised that the likely reason is housing supply, but he could not be sure and felt that it did not make sense.

7.12 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M MOLINARI

The following questions were submitted by M Molinari, Inglewood WA 6052, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“The recent merger of the Dianella and Inglewood Child Healthcare Centres, are both now working from the Inglewood Centre located at the Civic Centre on Beaufort Street, Inglewood? After speaking to local new mothers in the area attending sessions there, they are very concerned about their safety given the amount of anti-social behaviour in that area. They are now avoiding walking down Beaufort Street to the Centre. They no longer feel safe to catch the bus or the train to the area. They avoid going early, so they don't have to wait outside for a long time. They avoid having coffee together in the area after visits, and now mostly drive to the centre parking on the street, not in the car park, to avoid anti-social behaviour or suspicious characters loitering in the area. How can the Government justify placing vulnerable mothers with newborn babies in direct proximity to criminal behaviour and an area known for daily drug deals, and people known to police for serious criminal issues? It's reckless to say the least and brings huge concern from members of the public to the safety of our most vulnerable in the community. Is the Council aware of this and what measures have been put in place, if any, to ensure safety while attending with newborn babies?”*

A1. The Mayor advised that there is not just one demographic that is experiencing this whole situation, and confirmed that Council is aware of the community concerns.

The Acting Manager Community Safety also advised that patrols have been set up around Ninth Avenue and the Inglewood Hub, both at the front and at the rear. Mobile CCTV cameras have been installed as well, and permanent solutions will be installed in the coming months.

Q2. *“The recent proposal of a unit complex to be built at 872 Beaufort Street in Inglewood - is there any consideration given to the local businesses that currently occupy that site? If the proposal is given the green light, what happens to the businesses in the complex and is there any support offered by the Council for relocation into the area as these businesses have suffered greatly from loss of business due to the housing complex located behind them?”*

A2. The Manager Development Services advised that the City would not have been involved in those discussions. The City can ask the Department of Communities that question. The proposal has been received, with advertising to commence on 15 May 2025. The community will have the opportunity to comment on that proposal.

- Q3. *“The Cook Labour Government has allocated an additional \$260 million in its 2024-2025 budget for Mental Health and Drug Related issues in Western Australia. Does the Council receive any of this allocated funding to assist problem areas or mental health facilities located in its precinct and if so, would the Mayor provide a list of allocated monies and projects that they intend to spend this allocation on?”*
- A3. The Mayor advised that he could do this. The City has a unique role in terms of service finding and collaborating with lots of agencies who operate in that space, whether it be mental health, right through to domestic violence. The City receives a significant amount of funding for the work it does, but is also aware of those other agencies that operate throughout the City; we will be able to provide some of that in writing to you.

At 7.27pm, in accordance with Clause 5.2(14) of the City of Stirling’s Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021, Mayor Mark Irwin ruled that Public Question Time be EXTENDED.

7.13 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - K KELLY

The following questions were submitted by K Kelly, Scarborough WA 6029, at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“Last week I read with interest in the West Australian newspaper that number 202 and 204 The Esplanade in Scarborough are up for sale. The ad noted that the site was fit for an eight to 12 storey development. In the Scarborough Master Plan, these sites were allocated a four storey zone. With the Scarborough Development Area now under the control of the City of Stirling, will the City insist that these zoning rules be kept as per the Master Plan?”*

A1. The Director Planning and Development advised that when the City normalised Scarborough back into the City of Stirling, it brought all the planning framework. The City still operates a performance-based planning framework, which means that additional height can be argued and if sufficient, it can be worthy of approval as well. The City is reviewing part of the Scarborough Beach foreshore in the Master Plan and the framework that sits alongside that, and the City will be bringing reports to Council in the future as to what that looks like in terms of any amendments.

“So will the Council be adopting the original Master Plan, and if not, will you be doing another Master Plan?”

The City has adopted it.

Q2. *“I noted that the Stirling Civic Gardens across the road were showing signs of a decline. While I was walking through, I noted a Council sign stating that the irrigation system was having problems. It is now very obvious that the gardens/grounds are in even more despair. Knowing a little bit about irrigation systems, can the Council inform me what is the problem with the irrigation system and why has it taken so long to rectify?”*

A2. The Director Infrastructure advised that the water was found to be contaminated with E. coli, so the City has switched off the irrigation. The City is planning to have the issue fixed before next summer.

“Have you notified anyone else around the area that may have bores?”

It is not coming from the bore system. Some of that contaminated water would be coming from other water sources.

Q3. *“Are there any plans to try to keep at least the trees alive whilst you sort out your irrigation problems?”*

A3. The Mayor advised that they are monitored on a very regular basis and there is hand watering occurring for the trees.

7.14 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - M O'TOOLE (ON BEHALF OF M O'TOOLE)

The following questions were submitted by M O'Toole, Joondalup WA 6027, on behalf of M O'Toole, Carine WA 6020 at the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *"I'm an experienced environmental scientist with over 20 years' experience in environmental impact assessment and environmental approvals. This has been gained across industry and government construction, mining and infrastructure. My questions relate to motion 9.20/1 from the EGM. Can the Council please provide justification as to why a boardwalk has been selected as a priority project when no other options have been considered, and alternative options have been identified? Justification in the form of objectives and goals should be provided to the ratepayers prior to expenditure of their funds. Can the Council please provide this?"*

A1. The Mayor advised that Council has determined that one of those options, being 'do nothing' is not necessarily an option at this stage. The proposal was to investigate a boardwalk. Those current preliminary investigations, including all those environmental considerations which will highlight the best location for the boardwalk if it was to proceed, will be given to Council and it will go out for public consultation.

"So what is the justification for selecting a boardwalk when there are other alternatives available?"

The Mayor advised that Council resolved to investigate a boardwalk.

Q2. *"The only way to determine the best option that is available to meet the identified goals and objectives, which obviously weren't defined, is to carry out a weighted multi criteria options analysis prior to any stakeholder consultation on any specific option being undertaken by the Council. Can the Council please advise that they will undertake a weighted MCA prior to stakeholder consultation on any specific option?"*

A2. The Manager Strategy and Performance advised that the City is currently investigating feasibility of a boardwalk as directed by Council. The City is looking at what the best option is and that is to look at the current path and where the best alignment of a boardwalk would be, so there will be some consideration as part of the feasibility. Before the City heads into detailed design, it first needs to understand whether the proposal put forward by Council is even an option to be considered.

Q3. *"Are the Council and ratepayers aware that the costs of the environmental assessment and approvals for a project of this nature are likely to extend into seven figures and potentially take up to two years? How does the Council propose to meet these costs with significant ratepayer opposition and no State or Federal political support?"*

A3. The Mayor advised that Council will progress with it, and it will go out for community consultation to determine if there is significant community support, and then Federal and State Government funding towards this project will be sought if it is an option.

7.15 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - R MITCHELL

The following questions were submitted by R Mitchell, Karrinyup WA 6018, prior to the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *"I have attached the answer to Question 1 of my question, 4 March 2025, regarding the installation of a checkerboard pattern for the paving installation of the forecourt at the Karrinyup Shopping Centre. The answer followed, via an email I received, mentioning the forecourt may include the following from that email.*

Now, I find it strange that the rectification of broken and cracked paving slabs is to be followed by apparently the wishes of the Karrinyup Shopping Centre Management.

That is an insult to this Council and its ratepayers:

- a. *That being bad enough we have this extraordinary waste of funds on Christmas lights.*
- b. *Waste on some type of electronic strobe lighting to the Scarborough Clock and roundabout.*
- c. *Waste on the proposed weird want of a boardwalk structure of I assume eventually, steel and composite type timbering under foot. Basically, a hideous blot on an otherwise beautiful and satisfying landscape.*
- d. *Strange extension of tender contract \$1,333,333 by tender for tree maintenance, tender already being carried out.*

Is there any chance things enjoyable and worthwhile can be forthcoming and built for the benefit of ratepayers in lieu of catering for tourists?"

A1. The works to the Karrinyup Shopping Centre forecourt (referred to in the answer to the previous question) are primarily focused on making the area safe and renewing the broken paving slabs with a direct path from the library into the shopping centre. These works do not reflect the wishes of the shopping centre in that they are, in basic terms, a simple renewal of City infrastructure.

Q2. *"The Trigg Heritage Trail signage is in very poor condition and needs replacement. Its content is no longer relevant to our community and could be updated to appeal to locals and visitors alike.*

The City commenced preliminary consultation for the updated Trigg Heritage Trail in 2021. As part of the planning, City Officers organised guided walks with Friends of Trigg Bushland, Aboriginal Elders and RAP group members to discuss the themes for the trail. There was strong interest in the project from all stakeholders.

In 2022, the Rotary Club of Karrinyup approached the City to commemorate their 50th anniversary in 2024. With the agreement and support of the Friends of Trigg Bushland, the Trigg Heritage Trail was postponed allowing the Lake Gwelup Heritage Trail to be constructed in 2024. In 2024-25, the City commenced developing content for the Trigg Trail signage with a view to install it in the 2025/26 financial year – subject to Council budget approval.

I have read the background to this upgrade of signage and wish to commend all those involved including Councillor Perkov for bringing and assembling the report and plans to carryout envisaged.

In projects like this of value to the City of Stirling, preserving nature is and must be our number one priority.”

A2. The City recognises the success of the Lake Gwelup Heritage Trail and is grateful for the support from Rotary in delivering the project. Similar work has begun for the Trigg Bushland and as noted, the delivery timeline of that project will be subject to Council budget approval.

Q3. *“I ask this question regarding the Karrinyup Child minding Centre in Blackdown Way Karrinyup. Initially this was a pre-school centre, and the building leased to the Education Department. Following the amalgamation of pre-school children into the mainstream primary schools, this and other buildings belong to the City of Stirling languished un-utilised or used for years.*

This building was severely vandalized over many years, until it was placed for tender for use as a child-minding centre. Interest was shown by two tenders. The one being awarded and selected took it upon themselves to carry out repairs to the property and add a considerable addition to the activity area thus increasing the buildings potential occupancy.

Conditions were initially per tender option of 5 x 5 year lease. Noting the considerable extension size of the built form on the property and the near mid-tier of the lease. What percentage increase in the rent tier has been made out of step with any holdings in the tender contract? Considering the tenderer renovated and extended the built form of the property building, of their own volition.”

A3. Since 2016 this property has been leased to Dalkeith ELC Pty Ltd. The initial term commenced on 1 June 2016 for five years, with three x five year extension options. Annual rent reviews are in line with the lease terms and are the higher of 4% or CPI.

7.16 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - A HEWITT

The following questions were submitted by A Hewitt, Woodlands WA 6018, prior to the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“In the lead-up to the 2025 Federal Election, I submitted multiple complaints regarding signage by the Tom White campaign breaching the City’s Election Signs Policy, particularly signs exceeding the 1.2m width limit. While the City enforced location breaches (e.g. signage in public parks), it declined to act on the sign size breaches, despite clear photographic and measurement evidence submitted while voting was underway.*

In response to my formal correspondence, the City cited its Compliance Enforcement Policy and noted a new WALGA Political Signage Guideline, but did not explain why clear breaches of the current policy were not enforced during the active voting period, nor whether the policy was formally paused or deprioritised.

Was there an internal decision or directive to deprioritise or suspend enforcement of the 1.2m size rule during the 2025 Federal Election campaign? If so, who made that decision and was it formally documented?”

A1. The City enforced the Election Signs Policy based upon the seriousness of the alleged breach to ensure a suitable balance between enforcement, potential harm caused, and the City’s capability to undertake other important community safety tasks.

Given the number of signs erected by candidates across 105km² and 30 suburbs, it was necessary for City Officers to prioritise any investigation into a breach of this Policy based upon the seriousness of the alleged offence and the potential harm caused on community amenity, environment, public health and safety.

Q2. *“What specific aspect of the City’s current Compliance Enforcement Policy justified inaction on a clearly defined, measurable breach of the Election Signs Policy?”*

A2. As per ‘Section 2 – Enforcement’ within the Compliance Enforcement Policy, the City will apply the following principles in deciding whether enforcement action is appropriate:

- a. Enforcement action will be commensurate to the seriousness of the alleged breach or offence and consistent with legal requirements.
- b. In determining the seriousness of an alleged breach or offence resulting from a complaint or proactive compliance action, the City will have regard to:
 - ii. the potential harm caused by, or effect of, the breach/offence on public health and safety, environment (built and natural) or the amenity of the district.

- Q3. *“Will the City commit to a public review of its enforcement approach, including whether its decisions during this election period were consistent with its published policies and how it will ensure equal treatment of all candidates in future campaigns?”*
- A3. A review of the City’s enforcement approach regarding election signage is not considered necessary at this time. The Western Australian Local Government Association has recently released a ‘Political Signage Guideline’ which the City will review to determine whether any changes are required to the framework and enforcement approach in the future.

7.17 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - S ZORN

The following questions were submitted by S Zorn, Karrinyup WA 6018, prior to the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“The Electors’ General Meeting (EGM) typically sees much higher public attendance than regular Council Meetings. A key difference is that residents can actively participate in EGMs by proposing and voting on motions, whereas in Council Meetings they can only ask questions.*

- a. *Does Council acknowledge that this indicates a desire from residents to be more actively involved in Council matters?*
- b. *Would Council consider holding more EGMs throughout the year—for example, on a quarterly basis?*

A1. Based on the past 10 years, attendance at the annual Electors’ General Meeting (EGM) is, on average, around 30 people. The 184 attendees in March 2025 represented by far the highest EGM attendance in the last decade – more than three times greater than the next highest attendance, which was 55 people in 2017. The majority of this year’s 184 attendees appeared to be in attendance for one very specific issue (the Coastal Boardwalk), rather than a general interest in being involved in all Council matters.

For those residents who do have a general interest in City and Council matters, there are numerous ways to contact the City, raise concerns, and be involved. This includes engagement events; direct contact with the City via phone, email, or the website; attending Council and Committee meetings; and contacting relevant Ward Councillors.

The City would not consider holding quarterly EGMs. Local Governments are legislatively required to hold one EGM per financial year, as the primary purpose of the EGM is to receive the annual report, the annual financial statements and the auditor's report for the previous financial year.

Q2. *“At this year’s EGM, residents were asked to raise a blue card to vote. This method caused confusion and inefficiencies, especially when vote results were close. Could Council consider using electronic voting methods in the future, such as QR codes and mobile phones, to streamline the voting process and make it more transparent?”*

A2. The City will be reviewing its procedures for the annual EGM, with a view to creating a more streamlined and efficient process for participants at future EGMs.

Q3. *“Voter turnout in Council elections is currently below 30%, which is concerning. Has the Council investigated the reasons behind this low participation? If so, what were the findings and if not, will it explore whether increasing resident involvement in Council decision-making might help boost the voting rate?”*

- A3. Across Western Australian, the turnout for local government elections continues to hover around the 30% rate. While this can be attributed to several factors (the most notable being the non-compulsory nature of the elections) the City actively engages with residents and encourages participation at its elections.

The Western Australian Electoral Commission publishes informative, comprehensive reports on its website after each Local Government Ordinary Election. These reports contain statistics, comparisons, potential reasons for increased or decreased voter turnout, specific issues that may have impacted a particular election, and many other insights. The reports can be viewed at www.elections.wa.gov.au/elections/local-government-elections/reports

7.18 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - C CURTIS-DAVIS

The following questions were submitted by C Curtis-Davis, Innaloo WA 6018, prior to the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“Where is the road traffic report from Main Roads about the proposed work at Churchlands bushland?”*

A1. The City understands that Main Roads WA was planning to undertake a Road Network Review of the surrounding precinct. This review was needed before an amendment to the Metropolitan Regional Scheme (MRS) and removal of the Primary Regional Road reservation could be considered by the West Australian Planning Commission. The City is not aware of the timing of this review and has not received any report regarding this review at this stage.

Q2. *“Where are the flora, fauna reports about Hertha Road wetland?”*

A2. Any environmental reports undertaken by Main Roads WA as part of their works associated with upgrades to the Cedric Street northbound on-ramp should be requested directly to Main Roads WA. The City previously requested Main Roads WA to provide copies of these reports, however they have not been provided.

7.19 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - S COATES

The following questions were submitted by S Coates, Churchlands WA 6018, prior to the Council Meeting held Tuesday 13 May 2025.

Q1. *“You encourage ratepayers to have verge trees planted & give free native trees in an effort to increase tree canopy but do little to protect existing trees. An example being the Churchlands Bushland area and the recent death of a 450 plus year old tree as well as the destruction of other endangered native species and exposed chemicals on a public reserve within your boundaries. Yes, the contractors cleaned up the cement bags before you arrived to check as ABC radio reported on this issue that morning but the destruction, they have caused by driving heavy machinery through this area is still evident. The comment, in a recently received email, “the City doesn’t have the legislative authority to investigate damage” appears an excuse as the CEO of the City of Stirling has significant legislative authority vested in him under the Environmental Protection Act 1986. Why are you so reluctant to investigate ratepayers concerns and to protect what we have?”*

A1. The City of Stirling is committed to protecting and enhancing its urban tree canopy, and understands the community’s deep concern when mature or significant trees are impacted. However, it’s important to clarify that the area in question is not under the City’s management. The land is a Primary Road Reserve vested in the State Government and managed by Main Roads WA, which is the responsible authority for any activities and investigations related to that site.

While the City does have certain powers under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, these powers are limited to land under the City’s care and control. In cases involving State-managed land, the appropriate course of action is for the responsible State agency to investigate and respond.

Q2. *“Where is the City of Stirling at with introduction of FOGO bins?”*

A2. A business case for the adoption of a three-bin Food Organics, Garden Organics (FOGO) system was presented at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held Tuesday 30 April 2024. The Council decision was to not introduce a FOGO service at that time.

The City is keeping a close eye on developments in all strategic waste matters and that includes the potential for introduction of a FOGO service at some point in the future.

8. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

9. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

0525/001

Moved Councillor Krsticevic, seconded Councillor Migdale

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council of 1 April 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record of proceedings.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papatde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER

10.1 WATERWISE GOLD AWARD

Councillor Karlo Perkov made the following announcement:

"I am pleased to advise that the City has been successfully re-endorsed as a Gold Waterwise Council, for the 2023/24 financial year. This was despite having a challenging season with an increased number of hot days and reduced rainfall which led to the City watering to retain much cherished sports fields, the Hamersley Golf Course and prime parklands.

City wide actions undertaken in 2023/24 leading to the Gold endorsement focused on groundwater conservation and alternative water source investigations, scheme water efficiency and monitoring, and improved management of stormwater and water quality. Key actions undertaken as part of engaging and supporting our community included waterwise education and demonstration sites, the annual Sustainable Verge Program, Plant Giveaway, and the Home Sustainability Support Program. Several additional actions were also completed, including groundwater conservation strategy development and scenario planning, several irrigation upgrades and development of a new water quality sampling program.

I wish to acknowledge the team of dedicated officers led by Director Infrastructure, Andrew Murphy and Manager Parks and Environment, Ian Hunter for their hard work and commitment to ensuring the City of Stirling continues to be a waterwise Council."

10.2 VALE EMERITUS CHIEF RABBI DR SHALOM COLEMAN

Deputy Mayor Suzanne Migdale made the following announcement:

"It is with deep sadness that I announce the passing of Emeritus Chief Rabbi, Dr Shalom Coleman. Rabbi Coleman's boundless compassion, and unwavering commitment to Jewish life and values left an indelible mark on all who had the privilege of knowing him. He was a veteran of World War II for the British Military and in Vietnam for the Australian Military. We simply would not have the vibrant, resilient, and dynamic community we cherish today without his leadership, innovation and strength. At 106 years old, his influence extended far beyond the walls of his synagogue, touching countless lives through his teaching, outreach, and advocacy.

On behalf of the City of Stirling, I extend our heartfelt condolences to his loving children, Romaine and Martin, to his grandchildren, and to his wider extended family."

11. UNRESOLVED BUSINESS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Nil.

12. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES

12.1 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 6 MAY 2025

Councillor Michael Dudek disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as he is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Suzanne Migdale disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as she is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Teresa Olow disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as she is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Rob Paparde disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS1 as he is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

12.1/DS1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANELS) REGULATIONS 2025

Business Unit:	Development Services	Service: Planning Services
Ward:	City Wide	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Information - *Receiving information about the City or its community.*

Council Resolution

0525/002

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Migdale

That Council NOTES the amendments to the Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

Committee Recommendation

That Council NOTES the amendments to the Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015.

Officer's Recommendation

That Council NOTES the amendments to the Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015.

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to advise Council of amendments to the Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015 and the implications on the preparation of the City's Responsible Authority Reports (RARs) to the Metro Inner Development Assessment Panel (DAP).

Details

Key changes to DAP Regulations were gazetted in March 2024. The changes included the removal of mandatory application thresholds, effectively enabling all applications with a monetary value in excess of \$2 million to pursue a DAP pathway, excluding the following:

- a) Construction of a single house and any associated carport, patio, outbuilding and incidental development; or
- b) Development in an improvement scheme area; or
- c) A public work; or
- d) Development wholly within an area identified as a regional reserve under a Region Planning Scheme.

On 2 April 2025, the WA State Government released amendments to the [Local Government \(Development Assessment Panels\) Regulations 2025](#), making it clear that the Local Government administration will be entirely responsible for the preparation and submission of RARs to the DAP.

Officers have identified the following key matters for consideration:

- Key Changes to Legislation
- DAP Process for Preparation of RAR
- Referral Responses for Significant Development Applications
- Impact of the Changes to Legislation.

Key Changes to Legislation

The key changes to legislation were included in the 2024 reforms of the *Local Government Act 1995*. This was achieved through the addition of a new section, s. 9.69 B, which states:

(2) Regulations under section 9.59 may —

(a) provide that a DAP function of a local government —

(i) must be performed for and on behalf of the local government by the CEO or employees authorised by the CEO; and

(ii) cannot be performed by the local government in any other manner (for example, by the council or a committee of the council)

Clarifying the establishment of regulations mandating that DAP functions be executed by the CEO or an authorised officer on behalf of the Local Government, this is further reinforced by Regulation 5 Clause 3 of Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2025 outlining:

(3) In relation to the performance of a relevant DAP function, including the preparation of a responsible authority report, none of the following is subject to the direction of the council or a committee of the council —

- (a) the CEO;
- (b) an authorised employee;
- (c) a person engaged under sub-regulation (2)(b).

The proposed legislation came into effect on 1 May 2025. Prior to the announcement on 2 April 2025, there was no formal consultation with the Local Government industry relating to the proposed amendments.

DAP Process for Preparation of RAR

Upon formal lodgement of a DAP application, in accordance with Council Resolution Number 0714/035, officers will continue to notify Council of DAP applications through an internal memorandum. Additionally, development applications advertised in accordance with relevant planning legislation, including Local Planning Policy 6.18 Public Consultation (LPP6.18), may include notification of Ward Councillors.

Officers will continue to prepare a RAR on behalf of the City, with recommendations based on a detailed planning assessment of the proposal against all relevant legislation and consideration of the proposal.

Referral Responses for Significant Development Applications

The process for the City's referral response for Significant Development Applications is different to DAP applications as its assessed under Part 11B of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*. This process remains unaffected by the amended legislation. Councillors may still request these referral responses be referred to Council for consideration.

Impact of the Changes to Legislation

Of the 22 DAP applications referred to the City in the two-year period from 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024, three DAP applications have been called before Council for consideration, those being:

- 21 March 2023 and 4 July 2023 - Mixed Use Development - 33 Multiple Dwellings and Six Commercial Tenancies at Lot 2, House Number 2, and Lot 1, House Number 8, Adair Parade, Coolbinia (Council Resolution Number 0323/032 and Council Resolution Number 0723/008).
- 3 October 2023 - Warehouse - 12 Warehouses at Lot 10, House Number 88, Roberts Street, Osborne Park (Council Resolution Number 1023/007).
- 5 December 2023 and 30 April 2024 Multiple Dwelling Development - 35 Multiple Dwellings at Lot 201, House Number 39, Chester Avenue, Dianella (Council Resolution Number 1223/014 and Council Resolution Number 0424/018).

Of these five Council meetings, an alternative recommendation to the administration prepared RAR was resolved for the development applications on two occasions.

The City has prepared referral comments to the Draft Advocacy Position - State Development Applications and Decision Making, which was prepared by the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA). The proposed submission is considered as a separate item within this agenda for Committee and Council consideration.

Financial Assessment and Implications

All costs associated with the processing of the Development Assessment Panel applications are covered within the Development Services Business Unit budget.

Stakeholder Engagement

The proposed legislation will take effect as of 1 May 2025. There was no formal consultation with Local Governments regarding the proposed amendments before the announcement on 2 April 2025.

Recommended Action

That Council notes the amendments to Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015 and notes the implications on the preparation of the City's RARs to the Metro Inner DAP.

Council will consider the annual review of the Delegated Authority register at the Community and Resources Committee meeting to be held 20 May 2025. The City's Delegated Authority Register will be reviewed to ensure the ability to 'call in' Development Assessment Panel applications aligns with the changes to legislation.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

[Local Government \(Development Assessment Panels\) Regulations 2025](#)
[Local Government Act 1995](#)

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our leadership

Objective: A well-governed City

Priority: Comply with legislation, standards and obligations

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Governance	The City will act with integrity and implement appropriate processes and controls to avoid breach of legislation.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

Councillor Michael Dudek disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as he is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Suzanne Migdale disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as she is a Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Teresa Olow disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as she is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

Councillor Rob Paparde disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/DS2 as he is a Deputy Member on the Metro-Inner Development Assessment Panel.

12.1/DS2 PROPOSED SUBMISSION ON WALGA DRAFT ADVOCACY POSITION – STATE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND DECISION MAKING

Business Unit:	Development Services	Service: Planning Services
Ward:	Not Applicable	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Advocacy - Advocating to government or other organisations.

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Migdale

That Council ENDORSES the City’s submission to the Western Australian Local Government Association on its Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, as shown in Attachment 1.

During debate, Council suggested that three additional points be included within the committee recommendation and an additional recommendation 2 be added.

At the request of Council, the Presiding Member put the recommendations and additional points separately.

Council Resolution**0525/003****Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Migdale**

1. That Council **ENDORSES** the City's submission to the Western Australian Local Government Association on its Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, as shown in Attachment 1, including any additions separately resolved.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).**For:** Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

- a. That Council **ENDORSES** further commentary to be included within Attachment 1 advocating for WALGA to seek clarification from the State Solicitor's Office, or their own legal representation, that the reforms to the Development Assessment Panel regulations have effect as a legitimate legislative pathway.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).**For:** Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

- b. That Council **ENDORSES** further commentary to be included within Attachment 1 advocating for greater access to the Development Assessment Panel process for members of the City of Stirling community by advocating for meetings to be outside of normal working hours to improve accessibility.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).**For:** Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

- c. That Council **ENDORSES** the existing relevant commentary to be amended within Attachment 1 to strongly **ADVOCATE** Council's position that there should be three Local Government members and two Specialist Members (including the Presiding Member) on a Development Assessment Panel.

The motion was put and declared **CARRIED (11/3)**.

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov and Re.

Against: Councillors Krsticevic, Proud and Mayor Irwin.

2. That the Mayor **WRITES** to the Minister for Planning and Lands; Housing and Works; Health Infrastructure expressing Council's disappointment in the lack of consultation with Local Governments regarding the changes to the Local Government Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2025, which came into effect on 1 May 2025.

The motion was put and declared **CARRIED (14/0)**.

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

Committee Recommendation

That Council **ENDORSES** the City's submission to the Western Australian Local Government Association on its Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, as shown in Attachment 1.

Officer's Recommendation

That Council **ENDORSES** the City's submission to the Western Australian Local Government Association on its Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, as shown in Attachment 1.

Purpose

To enable Council to consider and endorse the City's submission on the Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, prepared by the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA).

Background

In 2011, the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) introduced Development Assessment Panels (DAPs), under the *Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011* (DAP Regulations). This introduced a mandatory determination pathway for applicable developments with a cost of works over \$10 million and opt in over \$2 million. On 1 March 2024, the DAP regulations were amended to remove the mandatory threshold, allowing proposed developments with an estimated development cost of works over \$2 million to opt for determination by the DAP instead of the local government.

In 2020, the WAPC introduced the Significant Development Applications (SDA) pathway as a temporary initiative to encourage major developments as part of its COVID-19 economic recovery program.

Subsequently, the state planning legislation has been amended to introduce Part 11B in the *Planning and Development Act 2005* (the Act), which establishes a permanent significant development pathway. This provides decision-making powers and discretion to the WAPC for all significant development proposals. Further amendments to the Act were introduced in 2023, to include Division 2 – Determination of significant development applications (section 171R (1)(a)).

In response to discussions with Local Governments, WALGA has prepared a Draft Advocacy Position (Attachment 2), calling on the State Government to reform the DAP and SDA pathways, and ensure that decision making on all applications is consistent, accountable and accessible to local communities, and respects and appropriately applies local planning frameworks in line with their statutory weight. WALGA has requested that Local Governments provide feedback on this document with the intention to present the feedback to WALGA State Council in July 2025.

WALGA's Draft Advocacy Position includes the following range of recommendations:

- Increasing the minimum development cost threshold to be considered by the DAP or SDA pathways, which will reduce the range and quantity of applications able to be considered by these pathways;
- Modifying the DAP panel composition, reviewing processes and functions of the DAP pathway;
- Removing special abilities for the Premier to authorise and determine SDA applications;
- Removing mandatory requirements for the SDA pathway; and
- Aligning DAP and SDA applications with the statutory timeframes.

WALGA has undertaken data collection and analysis, preparing the following reports:

- The DAP Report examines data from its commencement in 2011 to end of June 2024.
- The Significant Development Pathway report examines data from its commencement in 2020 until April 2025.

As noted in the DAP report, over 13 years the City of Stirling has received the most applications determined by a DAP with 302 determinations. As the City of Stirling has processed the highest number of applications, City officers have extensive experience and expertise in the DAP process.

City officers have reviewed the WALGA Draft Advocacy Position. On balance, the City agrees with the position, however, does not support a number of items contained within the position for the reasons outlined in Attachment 1. Specifically, further rationale and investigations into several recommendations is required, such as increases of the cost of development thresholds for pathways, modifying the composition of the DAP, and changes to the power of the Premier.

WALGA is seeking comments on this Draft Advocacy Position by 23 May 2025.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Nil.

Stakeholder Engagement

Nil.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that Council endorses the City's submission to WALGA on the Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making, as detailed in Attachment 1.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

Local Government (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2015

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our built environment

Objective: A liveable City

Priority: Improve the quality, liveability and identity of local areas

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Governance	The City will act with integrity and implement appropriate processes and controls to avoid breach of legislation.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Attachment 1 - City of Stirling Response to WALGA Draft Advocacy Position [↓](#)

Attachment 2 - WALGA Draft Advocacy Position - State Development Applications and Decision Making [↓](#)

Available for viewing at meeting

Nil

Linked Documents

[WALGA Development Assessment Panels 2011 - 2024 Review](#)

[WALGA Significant Development Pathway 2020 - 2025 Review](#)



Administration Centre
25 Cedric Street Stirling WA 6021

Telephone (08) 9205 8555
Enquiries www.stirling.wa.gov.au/enquiries
Web www.stirling.wa.gov.au

 /citystirlingwa

14 May 2025

Chris Hossen
Policy Manager, Planning and Building
Western Australian Local Government Association
ONE70, LVL1
170 Railway Parade
West Leederville WA 6007

Submitted via email: planning@walga.asn.au

Dear Chris Hossen

Submission from the City of Stirling to WALGA on the Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission in relation to Draft Advocacy Position – State Development Applications and Decision Making.

The City supports the following position points:

- 1a. Ensure that decision making on development applications (DAs) is consistent and accountable;
- 1b. Ensure that decision making on DAs is accessible to local communities;
- 1c. Ensure that decision making on DAs respects and appropriately applies local planning frameworks in line with their statutory weight;
- 2c. review Development Assessment Panel (DAP) processes to ensure proponents provide necessary information in a timely manner;
- 3 ii. align statutory timeframes with DAP and Local Government determined development applications;
- 3iii. Should the significant development assessment pathway continue to operate it should be reformed to: ensure all developments are consistent with applicable statutory planning instruments, specifically local planning schemes or planning instruments that have been reviewed in the last 10 years, or at a minimum provide comprehensive guidelines for applying extraordinary discretion; and

- 3iv. Should the significant development assessment pathway continue to operate it should be reformed to: delete references to 'mandatory significant development' to ensure the Part 11B Pathway remains entirely opt-in.

The below comments are provided in relation to these position points.

Transparency is one of the City's organisational values, and this should be reflected in all determinations occurring within the Local Government area. This includes transparency between the determining authority and the City, and with the impacted residents and wider community. The City supports greater transparency in the assessments undertaken and the decision making process, for both the local community and the City.

In relation to DAP applications, the City is heavily involved in assessing these applications, and provides a recommendation contained within the Responsible Authority Report (RAR). During the assessment process, the City is able to liaise with the applicant to directly address areas of concern.

In contrast, relating to SDA applications, the City has less involvement in the process, is requested not to provide a full planning assessment, is not invited to meetings with the applicant, and is generally requested to provide only one referral response. The City is not requested to make a recommendation or provide conditions if the development is to be approved. There is little to guide or outline the role or expectations of the City in the SDA process. City officers have requested the DPLH provide guidance material to support Local Governments.

The limited involvement of the City in the SDA assessment process impacts the City's visibility of the information of the planning framework and consistency in decision making, and how it may align to the application of the City's strategic planning framework.

As the SDA agendas do not contain a full planning assessment, the detailed planning merit and principles cannot be observed publicly. At a minimum, the full planning assessment should be shared with the relevant Local Government so that there is an understanding of the assessment against the planning framework.

The City supports the SDA pathway as being an opt-in pathway, similar to DAP. The amendment to the DAP pathway to remove mandatory applications has resulted in a reduction of DAP applications lodged with the City (as based on applications that would qualify for the DAP system). The City has assessed developments with a cost of \$20 million and above in the past, and is of the view that not all developments of this scale can be considered 'significant'. The City is supportive of removing the mandatory requirements from the SDA process, to provide a range of options for developments to be considered by the pathway most appropriate for the proposal.

The City has previously provided submissions in response to consultation regarding the SDA Pathway Applicants Guide and Public Interest Considerations, in which the City expressed a need for engagement with Local Government and further clarification of the role of Local Government in the SDA Pathway. The City also expressed a concern that the requirements of State or Regional importance may not be

consistently applied, or it may not be clear to all parties involved if they have been met, and that 'public interest' included an express view of the Local Government, which needs to be considered.

It is considered that the Local Government should have a more involved role in the SDA process, to ensure development is consistent with the applicable statutory planning instruments, as applied by Local Government.

The City does not support the following position points:

- 2a. raise the DAP threshold from the current \$2 million to \$5 million and mandate periodic reviews of the threshold;
- 2b. modify the composition of DAPs to provide equal representation of Specialist Members and Local Government Members;
- 2d. provide clear guidance on the roles and functions of Local Government officers at DAP meetings;
- 2e. allow the use of the State Referral Coordination Unit for DAP applications to ensure timely and adequate referral responses from State Government agencies are provided to Local Governments;
3. Abolish the state significant development assessment pathway (Part 11B of the Planning and Development Act 2005);
- 3i. Should the significant development assessment pathway continue to operate it should be reformed to: raise the cost threshold to \$50 million; and
- 3v. Should the significant development assessment pathway continue to operate it should be reformed to: remove the ability for the Premier to give authorisation for the lodgement and determination of an application.

The below comments are provided in relation to these position points.

The City acknowledges the reasons for the introduction of the SDA pathway. The Draft Advocacy Position does not contain any reasoning to support the removal of the SDA pathway. The supporting document, 'WALGA Significant Development Pathway 2020 – 2025 Review' discusses the lack of tangible impact of the SDA process on boosting housing supply and efficiency of the process. The City does not disagree that the SDA pathway has removed Local Government from decision making, and expresses concerns over the effectiveness of the pathway in delivering housing. However, the SDA pathway has increased in scope since it was changed from Part 17 Significant Development Pathway to Part 11B Significant Development Pathway. The purpose of the pathway, as stated in the Part 11B State Development Assessment Unit Application Guide is:

The Significant Development Pathway was established to cater for:

- *Significant applications presenting issues of State or regional importance benefiting from the technical expertise of the WAPC;*
- *Complex applications requiring referral to and input from multiple State Government agencies and stakeholders; and*
- *Applications aligned with State Government policies and priorities which are unreasonably constrained by an out of date local planning framework.*

The City is unable to consider the merits of removing this pathway without a detailed analysis of if the pathway has, or is satisfying the abovementioned development types.

The City acknowledges the substantial increases in development costs since the last DAP threshold change to \$2 million in 2015. The City supports the thresholds being reviewed and updated; however, the City does not support the proposed threshold increases without rationale on how the proposed thresholds were determined and further considered in subsequent DAP reform. The proposed increases need to be justified with reference to developments considered through these pathways, the intent of the pathways and the cost of construction over the lifetime of the DAP and SDA pathways.

The DAP panel currently comprises of three Specialist Members and two Local Government Members. This results in an imbalance of power against the Local Government Members, who bring local knowledge and insights of the local community, as well as any relevant expertise to the panel. The City supports a greater representation of Local Government interests in the DAP pathway. However, a panel of six members creates potential conflict for decision making, notwithstanding the Presiding Member acts as a deciding vote. The operational practicalities of a six member panel needs to be further explored and a range of operational or assessment based practices investigated.

A rationale is required for the proposed removal of the Premier's authorisation for the lodgement and determination a SDA application, noting similar powers exist in other planning legislation.

The City does acknowledge that external referral agencies are sometimes the cause of delays in the DAP process. The State Referral Coordination Unit is currently used for SDA applications only. Further evidence is needed of how the State Referral Coordination Unit would benefit the City.

In relation to 2d, the City's experience with the DAP process to date is that the role of Local Government is clearly identified.

The City notes that Stirling receives a large quantity of DAPs, comparatively to other Local Government Authorities, and in terms of impact and weight, the DAP system and changes to the process have significant impacts on the City operationally due to the additional administrative burden, and in part duplication of processes.

On balance, Officers agree with the position taken by WALGA. However, Officers are not supportive of a number of items contained within the position as further rationale and investigations into several of the positions is required.

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact the City.

Yours sincerely,

Giovanna Lumbaca
ACTING DIRECTOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT



Draft Advocacy Position

State development applications and decision making

WALGA calls on the State Government to:

1. Ensure that decision making on development applications (DAs) is:
 - a. consistent and accountable
 - b. accessible to local communities
 - c. respects and appropriately applies local planning frameworks in line with their statutory weight.
2. Reform the Development Assessment Panel (DAP) system to:
 - a. raise the DAP threshold from the current \$2 million to \$5 million and mandate periodic reviews of the threshold
 - b. modify the composition of DAPs to provide equal representation of Specialist Members and Local Government Members
 - c. review DAP processes to ensure proponents provide necessary information in a timely manner
 - d. provide clear guidance on the roles and functions of Local Government officers at DAP meetings
 - e. allow the use of the State Referral Coordination Unit for DAP applications to ensure timely and adequate referral responses from State Government agencies are provided to Local Governments.
3. Abolish the state significant development assessment pathway (Part 11B of *the Planning and Development Act 2005*). Should the significant development assessment pathway continue to operate it should be reformed to:
 - i) raise the cost threshold to \$50 million
 - ii) align statutory timeframes with DAP and Local Government determined development applications
 - iii) ensure all developments are consistent with applicable statutory planning instruments, specifically local planning schemes or planning instruments that have been reviewed in the last 10 years, or at a minimum provide comprehensive guidelines for applying extraordinary discretion
 - iv) delete references to 'mandatory significant development' to ensure the Part 11B Pathway remains entirely opt-in
 - v) remove the ability for the Premier to give authorisation for the lodgment and determination of an application.

Councillor Karlo Perkov left the meeting at 8.26pm during Item 12.1/DS3, and returned at 8.28pm.

12.1/DS3 TREE RETENTION AND PLANTING ON DEVELOPMENT SITES - PROGRESS REPORT

Business Unit:	Development Services	Service: Planning Services
Ward:	Not Applicable	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Moved Councillor Proud, Seconded Councillor Migdale

1. That Council NOTES the progress of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project.
2. That Council SUPPORTS the action and improvements contained within Attachment 2.
3. That Council CONSIDERS the inclusion of a budget allocation for the additional project officer as a permanent position within the 2025/2026 financial year to support the ongoing implementation of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project as part of normal service delivery.

At the request of the Council, the Presiding Member put the motions separately.

Council Resolution

0525/004

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Migdale

- 1. That Council NOTES the progress of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papatde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

- 2. That Council SUPPORTS the action and improvements contained within Attachment 2.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papatde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

- 3. That Council CONSIDERS the inclusion of a budget allocation for the additional project officer as a permanent position within the 2025/2026 financial year to support the ongoing implementation of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project as part of normal service delivery.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (10/4).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Migdale, Papatde, Proud and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Councillors Lagan, Olow, Perkov and Re.

Committee Recommendation

1. That Council NOTES the progress of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project.
2. That Council SUPPORTS the action and improvements contained within Attachment 2.
3. That Council CONSIDERS the inclusion of a budget allocation for the additional project officer as a permanent position within the 2025/2026 financial year to support the ongoing implementation of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project as part of normal service delivery.

Officer's Recommendation

1. That Council NOTES the progress of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project.
2. That Council SUPPORTS the action and improvements contained within Attachment 2.
3. That Council CONSIDERS the inclusion of a budget allocation for the additional project officer as a permanent position within the 2025/2026 financial year to support the ongoing implementation of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project as part of normal service delivery

Purpose

At its meeting held 25 June 2024 Council resolved (Council Resolution Number 0624/029) to approve the City of Stirling Corporate Business Plan 2024-2028. Within the Corporate Business Plan is the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project (the project), which is the focus of this report.

Details

The aim of the project is to raise awareness in the community about the benefits of retaining and planting trees on residential properties and ensure tree compliance obligations are met for new developments.

Tree planting and retention requirements for these developments stem from three key planning instruments, being the City of Stirling Local Planning Scheme No.3, the Residential Design Codes of Western Australia (R-Codes), and the City of Stirling Local Policy 6.11 – Trees and Development (LPP 6.11).

The project is aligned with the City's Urban Forest Plan which highlights the need to identify sites where tree retention or planting as part of a development approval is being undertaken. The aim of this objective is to assist in increasing the proportion of residential land with trees planted and retained via proactive compliance measures.

The project has four key overarching milestones:

- Identify residential sites required to retain existing significant tree(s) or plant advanced tree(s) as part of the conditions.
- Commence communication with relevant landowners.
- Identify and investigate residential sites which did not retain existing significant tree(s) or plant advanced tree(s) as part of the conditions.
- Complete a sample of follow-up inspections to determine if trial has been successful.

Planning Assessment

The project has built on previous efforts undertaken by officers to ensure that tree planting and retention requirements of development approvals are being met. However, due to the dedicated 'Project Officer – Trees' position for the project, the progress has been more effective since the commencement of the project than previous efforts. Having a dedicated officer for the project offers several benefits, which are discussed later in this report.

Project Approach and Findings

The approach to undertaking the project has been logical and methodical and is summarised in the below general steps to completing the necessary tasks:

1. Research, data collection and refinement;
2. Cyclical communication with landowners;
3. Verification and inspection; and
4. Compliance and reporting.

1. Research, data collection and refinement

The Project Officer – Trees undertook a review of all development approvals and building permits that were issued between 1 January 2021 and 31 December 2023. Due to construction timeframes, properties approved after 31 December 2023 were largely unlikely to have been completed and were therefore excluded from the research and data collection exercise at that point of review. The subsequent data was refined to include properties relevant to the scope of the project only, resulting in a total of 1,094 properties for investigation. Further research has been undertaken as each property is investigated to confirm the specific number of trees to be retained or planted on that property. It would be beneficial to occur continuously over time, ensuring that developments are captured as construction is completed.

2. Cyclical communication with landowners

Communication with landowners for the project began with initial correspondence that their property had been identified by the City as having tree planting or retention requirements as part of their development approval. The Project Officer – Trees has observed a limited degree of awareness of planting and retention requirements by landowners relating to their development approvals, and that many landowners believed that by fulfilling any street tree planting, they had met the obligations of their development approval. Throughout the project it has been observed that the limited degree of awareness appears to generally stem from one of the following key points:

- The landowner is a recent purchaser post-development approvals process, and the obligations have not been communicated onward; or
- The landowner is removed from the development approvals process, where an agent such as a consultant or builder has acted on their behalf, and the obligations have not been communicated onward.

3. Verification and inspection

Tree planting and retention requirements have been verified through a combination of methods such as aerial imagery, landowner verification via photographic evidence, and site inspections undertaken by the Project Officer – Trees. Cross-referencing approved planting locations with aerial imagery provides for a good approximation of compliance, either via the landowner or a City officer. Site inspections by the Project Officer – Trees has been one of the primary tools in verifying tree sizes and planting areas. Given the observations and findings during initial touchpoints and communication with landowners, the City has adopted a pragmatic and realistic approach to enforcing these requirements which has produced successful outcomes.

4. Compliance and reporting

Since the commencement of project work in September 2024 a pragmatic approach to compliance has been employed, factoring in various matters such as the cost-of-living crisis and balancing sustainability principles noting a significant number of properties have additional hardscaped areas in place compared to those indicated in their approvals. Working with landowners, City officers sought alternative planting arrangements where necessary and aided with possible alternative species that can be accommodated in smaller planting areas.

Monthly reporting has been undertaken on the progress of the project. As of 14 April 2025, the progress of the project is summarised as 1,094 properties investigated, 479 of which confirmed as closed out with verified 17 significant trees retained (where identified as part of a development approval) and 778 trees planted. Refer Attachment 1 for a summary of the key data.

During the monthly reporting of the project, City officers have identified key repeat challenges such as:

- Landowners being unaware of their tree planting requirements;
- Tree planting areas and sizes are often not met, particularly in grouped dwelling developments in suburban areas that would be considered 'medium density'; and
- Confusion around street tree planting and private land planting obligations.

Throughout the course of the project, City officers have encountered a disconnect between the Advanced tree definition and tree species that will contribute to canopy cover. For example, a landowner can meet their tree planting requirements by the planting of a *Cupressus sempervirens* (Italian Cyprus Pine) however due to the disposition of the tree, it does not contribute significantly to canopy cover.

Refer to Attachment 3 for photos of key challenges and successes of the project.

Project Officer - Trees

With limitations in the City's ability to retain trees on private land and acknowledging the opportunities for infill in the City, the benefits of a dedicated officer for the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites Project are as follows:

1. Focused expertise and experience - a dedicated officer can develop specialised knowledge about tree retention and planting, ensuring that best practices are followed, draw on previous experience to implement innovative solutions.
2. Consistent oversight - with a primary responsible officer, there is consistent monitoring and enforcement of tree compliance obligations, reducing the risk of error or inconsistency.
3. Efficient communication - a single point of contact simplifies communication with landowners, developers, and the community, making it easier to raise awareness and address concerns promptly.
4. Accountability - having a primary dedicated officer ensures clear accountability for the project's progress and outcomes, making it easier to track milestones and measure success.
5. Proactive problem-solving - a dedicated officer can identify and address potential issues early, preventing small problems from becoming larger, more costly ones.
6. Community engagement - this role can focus on educating the community about the benefits of tree retention and planting, fostering a culture of environmental stewardship.

The dedicated Project Officer - Trees sits within the Planning Services team, ensuring that the efforts are consistent with planning practices, sufficient support is provided, and that the broader team are aware of the project in the interests of continuity. Having a primary dedicated officer responsible for the project helps ensure the objectives relating to trees on private land are met efficiently and effectively, benefiting both the environment and the community.

Financial Assessment and Implications

A budget allocation amount of \$132,476 for the additional project officer position on a permanent basis will be recommended within the 2025/2026 financial year to support the ongoing implementation of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project as part of normal service delivery within the Development Services Business Unit.

Stakeholder Engagement

Extensive communication with relevant landowners has been undertaken throughout the duration of the project and continues to be undertaken.

Recommended Action

Council is recommended to note the progress on the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project, support the action and improvements outlined in Attachment 2, and consider including a budget allocation for an additional project officer position on a permanent basis in the 2025/2026 financial year to ensure the ongoing implementation of the project as part of normal service delivery.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

Meeting Date	Council Resolution Number	Council Resolution
25 June 2024	0624/029	That Council APPROVES the updated City of Stirling Corporate Business Plan 2024-2028 as shown in Attachment 1

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our natural environment

Objective: A biodiverse City

Priority: Increase tree planting and retention of trees across the City

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Environment	The City will prioritise protection, enhancement and sustainability of the natural environment unless this cannot be achieved without significantly compromising the City's economic or social sustainability.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Attachment 1 - Data Summary [↓](#)

Attachment 2 - Recommended Action and Improvements [↓](#)

Attachment 3 - Challenges and Successes [↓](#)

Available for viewing at meeting


Nil


Linked Documents

[City of Stirling Urban Forest Plan](#)



Data Summary – Tree Retention of Private Land Project





Tree Planting and Closed Cases on Private Land


The data demonstrates an upward trend in tree planting numbers from 262 in November 2024 to 774 in March 2025.

This data also correlated with the upward trend of closed cases, being 224 in November 2024 and 470 in March 2025.

This data demonstrated that proactive compliance measures as part of Tree Retention on Private Land on 470 properties has resulted in the planting of 774 trees.



Tree Planting By Ward on Private Land




Tree Planting by Ward on Private Land

This data demonstrates the tree planting requirements identified to date, with the trees planted to date, broken down by City of Stirling Wards.

When viewing this data set it must be noted that, the data capture by City officers is recorded by suburb. Many of the City's wards share suburbs, as such, the trees planted in this data will appear greater than what has occurred due to the difficulty in refining the data by ward boundaries.



Tree Planting Catalyst on Private Land



Tree Planting Catalyst on Private Land

The collected in this regard is an ongoing matter and is likely subject to change.

The current data indicates that more than half, being 55% of trees planted (426 trees) are a direct result of the proactive compliance measures undertaken by the Project Officer Trees.



Recommended Action and Improvements – Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites Project

On review of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project, the below action is recommended.

No.	Action	Comments
1	Extend the scope of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project to non-residential land.	<p>The City's commercial and industrial areas have some of the lowest canopy cover percentages within the City.</p> <p>Proactive compliance on non-residential development on private land is an opportunity to see canopy cover growth and significant tree retention in areas of the City that have the least canopy cover.</p>

On review of the Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites project, the below improvements are recommended.

No.	Improvements	Comments
1	Investigating the inclusion of a checklist at building permit stage of development to ensure tree planting and retention is appropriately considered.	Implementing the inclusion of a tree planting or retention checklist at the building permit stage is an identified opportunity to put tree planting and/or retention at the forefront of considerations in development and is an additional touch point for the City to track the progress of development with planting or retention requirements.
2	Revise standardised advice notes placed on development approvals to encourage tree species that will contribute to canopy cover.	City officers have identified an opportunity to address the minor gaps between the Advanced tree definition in the City's local planning framework and the delivery of tree species that will contribute to canopy cover. By revising the standard advice notes placed on development approvals the City can encourage the planting of tree species that will contribute to future canopy cover.



3	Revise or include an advice note on development approvals requiring tree planting that photographic evidence of tree planting is to be provided upon occupation of development.	To address the confusion that City officers have observed between street tree planting and planting on private land, and opportunity has been identified to either revise existing, or produce a new advice note relating to tree planting. This advice note would require photographic evidence of tree planting to be provided upon occupation of a development.
4	Project Officer Trees to accompany the City's Building Surveyors on occupancy inspections relating to development where tree planting and/or retention is a condition of development approval.	While not all residential development will require an occupancy permit, City officers have identified an opportunity to assist with proactive compliance by attending occupancy inspections with the City's Building Surveyors where there is a tree planting and/or retention condition on a development approval.



Challenges and Successes – Tree Retention and Planting on Development Sites

Common challenges encountered enforcing tree planting requirements.



Inadequate planting sizes.



Limited space to retrospectively plant trees.



Species choice not being adequate to contribute to canopy cover




Owners unaware of planting obligations.



Examples of success in the tree planting requirements.



Avocado Tree
~12-18m height
~9m canopy
~15 years to full maturity



Olive Trees
~6-9m height
~4.5-6m canopy
~15 years to full maturity



Snow Pear
~6-9m height
~4.5-6m canopy
~10 years to full maturity

Mayor Mark Irwin disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as he has visited the Golf Club to discuss this issues and may still be an honorary member of WA Golf Club.

Councillor Joe Ferrante disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as he may still be an honorary member of WA Golf Club.

Councillor Damien Giudici disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/PCS1 as his father is a member of WA Golf Club.

12.1/PCS1 WA GOLF CLUB - TEE NETTING

Business Unit:	Property and Commercial Services	Service: Property Services
Ward:	Lawley	Location: 50 Hayes Avenue, YOKINE WA 6060
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Information - *Receiving information about the City or its community.*

Council Resolution

0525/005

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Migdale

1. That Council **NOTES** the information within the report with regards to the cost of tee netting and alternative options that could be pursued by the WA Golf Club to minimise the safety risk from errant golf balls.
2. That Council **NOTES** that the WA Golf Club has committed to providing the preferred option and associated cost to the City by 31 July 2025.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkovic, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

Committee Recommendation

That Council NOTES the information within the report with regards to the cost of tee netting and alternative options that could be pursued by the WA Golf Club to minimise the safety risk from errant golf balls.

Officer's Recommendation

That Council NOTES the information within the report with regards to the cost of tee netting and alternative options that could be pursued by the WA Golf Club to minimise the safety risk from errant golf balls.

Purpose

Based on the City's recent experience at the Hamersley Public Golf Course, this report provides Council with information on the estimated cost of netting to the tee abutting Raymond Street, Yokine on the WA Golf Club course, along with alternative options that could be pursued with regards to errant golf balls that have not already been considered by the WA Golf Club.

Details

The WA Golf Club is a private golf club which holds a lease with the City to 31 July 2046 over a portion of crown land at 50 Hayes Avenue, Yokine. Due to concerns from residents with regards to errant golf balls, a Notice of Motion was raised for the City to provide information on netting or other measures to assist in managing these balls.

City officers met with the WA Golf Club in October 2024 to understand the actions being taken by the Club to mitigate the potential risks. The Club confirmed that it was also aware of the concern from residents with regards to the tee abutting Raymond Street, receiving reports of one ball per week being found outside the course, and has implemented several strategies to date. These include:

- Removed the garden bed to ensure an unrestricted view of the hole.
- Moved the hole as far as possible to encourage the ball away from Raymond Street and Thurlow Avenue.
- Moved tees forward (when not in competition) to help with trajectory of the ball.
- Added a QR code at each tee to encourage / improve reporting of stray balls (this helps identify reasons for stray balls and therefore any measures that can be taken).
- Reduced the number of rounds being played.

The City notes all the actions already taken by the WA Golf Club, and acknowledges that there are few other short-term options available. From the City's management of the golf course at Hamersley, the only other suggestions would be to place a bunker on the property side of the fairway to further force the direction of play away from the properties and possible pruning to clear the direction of the club's preferred trajectory. The WA Golf Club confirmed that these actions have already been taken.

The City installed two different types of netting at Hamersley Public Golf Club as follows (all figures exclusive of GST):

- Netting for the driving range which is 30m high. The cost of this netting included groundworks, piling, structural steel, netting and timber barrier. Following groundworks, galvanised steel posts were inset into mass concrete footing and mesh installed between posts. The cost of installing this netting was \$101.53 per square metre.
- Chainmesh fencing at the 7th tee. The cost of this netting included concreted posts with black PVC coated chain mesh and Helicoil cables. The cost of installing this netting was \$190.87 per square metre.

Based on the requirements and options available to the WA Golf Club, the cost of the netting is likely to be between \$500,000 to \$700,000.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Based on the requirements and options available to the WA Golf Club, the cost of the netting is likely to be between \$500,000 to \$700,000.

Stakeholder Engagement

City officers met with the WA Golf Club in October 2024 to understand the actions being taken by the club to mitigate the potential risks of errant golf balls. The City continues to engage with the club to look for additional strategies to those that have already been implemented. This includes sharing information on the likely cost of netting to understand if that is a viable option.

Community consultation would be undertaken by the WA Golf Club if netting was to be considered.

Recommended Action

For Council to note the information provided within this report.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

Nil.

Local Government Act 1995

Meeting Date	Council Resolution Number	Council Resolution
18 March 2025	0325/037	That a report be PRESENTED to the Planning and Development Committee meeting to be held 6 May 2025 outlining height and length cost options for netting to the tee abutting Raymond Street, Yokine on the WA Golf Club course. Report to be based on the City's experience at Hamersley Public Golf Course and various sporting fields, and include high-level alternative options that could be pursued by the WA Golf Club.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our economy

Objective: A smart and prosperous City

Priority: Advocate, lobby and partner with stakeholders to benefit the community

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Community	The City will ensure that it engages with the community in accordance with its Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

Councillor Chris Hatton disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/8.1 as he is a judge for the Awards Night.

Councillor Karlo Perkov disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 12.1/8.1 as the board of directors are known to him; has attended events; and will be judging some awards.

Councillor Damien Giudici left the meeting at 8.39pm prior to Item 12.1/8.1, and returned at 8.42pm.

Councillor Suzanne Migdale left the meeting at 8.39pm prior to Item 12.1/8.1.

12.1/8.1 STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF BUSINESS INCUBATORS

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.*

Council Resolution

0525/006

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Hatton

That Council RECEIVES the strategic direction regarding business incubators.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (13/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

13. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 4.2(4) OF THE MEETING PROCEDURES LOCAL LAW 2021

In accordance with Clause 4.2(4) of the City of Stirling Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021, the Chief Executive Officer may include on the agenda of a Council meeting, in an appropriate place within the order of business, any matter which must be decided, or which he considers is appropriate to be decided, by that meeting.

Councillor Elizabeth Re disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 13.1 as she is a named in Attachment 2.

Councillor Joe Ferrante left the meeting at 8.44pm during Item 13.1, and returned at 8.45pm.

13.1 2023/2024 ELECTORS GENERAL MEETING 24 MARCH 2025

Business Unit:	Governance	Service: Council Governance
Ward:	City Wide	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/007

Moved Councillor Krsticevic, seconded Councillor Dudek

1. That the minutes of the Electors' General Meeting 2023/2024 (as shown in Attachment 2) held Monday 24 March 2025, be RECEIVED.
2. That Council PROCEEDS with the recommendations as outlined in Attachment 1.

The motion was put and declared **CARRIED (12/1)**.

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Councillor Re.

Recommendation

1. That the minutes of the Electors' General Meeting 2023/2024 (as shown in Attachment 2) held Monday 24 March 2025, be RECEIVED.
2. That Council PROCEEDS with the recommendations as outlined in Attachment 1.

Purpose

To enable Council to consider the outcome of the Electors' General Meeting 2023/2024 (EGM) held 24 March 2025.

Details

In accordance with Section 5.33 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, Council is required to consider any decisions that result from the Electors' General Meeting.

There were 184 attendees at the 2023/2024 EGM. There were 24 motions moved; 17 of these were carried, four were lost and three were ruled out of order. Each motion that was carried has been considered by the City. Comments on the motions have been provided from the relevant business units (refer to Attachment 1). For each of these motions, an officer's recommendation is also included for Council's consideration.

Each member of the public who moved or seconded a motion that was voted on at the EGM has been contacted to advise that their motions will be considered as part of a report being presented at the Council meeting to be held 13 May 2025.

Financial Assessment and Implications

The costs of advertising the EGM were absorbed by utilising methods within the City's existing operational resources. Other related costs to hold the meeting were akin to that of an Ordinary Council Meeting.

Stakeholder Engagement

In accordance with Section 5.29 of the *Local Government Act 1995* there is a statutory obligation to give local public notice of the date, place, time and purpose of the annual EGM for at least 14 days prior to the meeting. The required local public notice was given for the 2023/2024 EGM. Additional promotion was also undertaken, further to the requirements within the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Advertising and promotion for the EGM included the below:

- Public notices were displayed at Libraries and the Administration Centre.
- Public notice was posted on the City's website from 5 February 2025 up to day of the EGM (24 March 2025).
- A news article was added to the City's website on 5 February 2025.
- An event listing was added to the City website calendar, and showcased on the website's homepage
- Social media posts were published on 5 February 2025:
 - LinkedIn
 - Instagram
- A social media story countdown (Facebook and Instagram) occurred two weeks, one week and three days prior to the EGM, as well as on the day of the meeting.
- E-newsletters were sent in February 2025 to previous attendees.
- The Annual Report and Financial Statements were added to the City's website on 5 February 2025.
- A web banner was displayed on the City's website homepage from 5 February 2025 up to the day of EGM.
- A digital display was added to external screens within City facilities from 5 February 2025 up to the day of EGM.
- Two articles were published in the Stirling Scene e-newsletter on 12 February 2025 and 5 March 2025.

On publication of the EGM minutes, attendees were emailed with a link to these minutes, and provided details of the Council meeting where the electors' motions would be considered.

Recommended Action

That Council receives the minutes of the 2023/2024 EGM held on Monday 24 March 2025 and proceeds with the recommendations as outlined in Attachment 1.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

Section 5.27 of the *Local Government Act 1995* states that a general meeting of electors is to be held once every financial year to consider the contents of the Annual Report for the previous year, and to consider other general business.

Section 5.29 of the *Local Government Act 1995* states that local public notice must be given.

Section 5.33 of the *Local Government Act 1995* states that all decisions made at an Electors' meeting are to be considered at a Council meeting.

[Local Government Act 1995](#)

Meeting Date	Council Resolution Number	Council Resolution
4 February 2025	0225/017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council ACCEPTS the Annual Report for the City of Stirling for the financial year 2023/2024, incorporating the 2023/2024 Annual Financial Statements and the 2023/2024 Auditor's Report, subject to the correction of figures in 'Table 4: Fees, expenses and allowances', on page 40 of the Annual Report (with subsequent amendments to the Audited Financial Statements). That Council SCHEDULES the 2023/2024 Electors' General Meeting to be held at 6.00pm on Monday 24 March 2025 in the City's Council Chambers.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our leadership

Objective: A customer-focused City

Priority: Involve, engage and inform our community

Priority: Provide consistent, responsive and efficient customer service

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Community	The City will ensure that it engages with the community in accordance with its Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
Governance	The City will act with integrity and implement appropriate processes and controls to avoid breach of legislation.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Attachment 1 - 2023-2024 EGM Motions and Officer Comment [↓](#)

Attachment 2 - 2023-2024 Electors General Meeting Minutes 24 March 2025 [↓](#)

Available for viewing at meeting

Nil

Linked Documents

Nil.

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.2/1	<p>Moved Kieran Kelly, seconded Felicity Farrelly</p> <p>That the City CONSIDERS developing a world-class civic garden or harbour region within the City boundaries, either by upgrading already developed sites or a new greenfield site.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>Given high demand for existing public open space for recreation, nature and social spaces any future civic garden or harbour region would be guided by the framework, principles and actions within the City's Public Open Space Strategy 2021 – 2031. Should a suitable site become available for this purpose it may then be considered further based on the 'nature' function and 'regional' hierarchy classification within the Strategy.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.2/1 and NOTES that that a world-class civic garden or harbour region will not be pursued at this time but may be considered in the future should a suitable site become available that aligns with the City's Public Open Space Strategy 2021-2031.</p>
Motion 9.2/2	<p>Moved Kieran Kelly, seconded Felicity Farrelly</p> <p>That the Council INVESTIGATES what can be done to manage on-road parking around Scarborough so as to make roads safe for vehicles and pedestrian traffic and also DELIVERS a management plan or strategy plan for the future road use and parking within the greater Scarborough area.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The control and management of on-street parking has been considered extensively by Council. The Control and Management of On-Street Parking Policy was endorsed by Council in October 2024. The objective of this policy is to provide a consistent and orderly approach in determining the need for on-street parking controls on local roads in the City.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.2/2 and AFFIRMS its decision of 29 October 2024 (Council Resolution Number 1024/018) to adopt an updated Control and Management of On-Street Parking Policy.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.3/1	<p>Moved Deane Pieters, seconded Chas Paridis</p> <p>That the City PRIORITISES the coastal boardwalk project, ensuring it considers environmental factors, community needs and safety concerns. This should be supported by community consultation with funding opportunities explored through partnerships between the City of Stirling and the State and Federal Governments.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The City of Stirling will continue to progress the coastal boardwalk feasibility study this financial year. This will include various environmental and economic assessments together with extensive community consultation and updates provided on the City's website.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.3/1, which expresses community support of the project, and NOTES that the boardwalk is subject to a feasibility study, and community consultation on the proposed boardwalk will occur at a future date.</p>
Motion 9.5/1	<p>Moved Mike Masiello, seconded Thomas Cameron</p> <p>1. That the City of Stirling PREPARES a report for Council to investigate the potential costs and options, in conjunction with Main Roads, the Road Safety Commission, and other key stakeholders and the State Government, for securing and widening the existing shared path positioned between West Coast Highway and South Trigg Beach Reserve, providing separation for foot and cycle rideable traffic, a project that has demonstratable community support evidenced by a petition with over 1,500 signatures.</p>	<p>1. The City of Stirling will continue to progress the coastal boardwalk feasibility study this financial year. This will include various environmental and economic assessments together with extensive community consultation. As part of this project.</p> <p>2. The City will work with all government stakeholders to understand approval requirements.</p>	<p>1. That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.5/1 (1) which expresses community concern around the project and a desire for other options to be considered.</p> <p>2. That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.5/1 (2) and NOTES that the boardwalk is subject to a feasibility study, and community consultation on the proposed boardwalk will occur at a future date.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>2. Given the lack of community support for a standalone boardwalk through the dunes both now and in the past, the extremely low likelihood of being granted the necessary environmental approvals, and the prohibitively high cost of construction, ongoing maintenance, combined with suitable alternative solution being available, we call on the Council to request that the City CEASES further expenditure on the concept through the dunes and classify this option as unviable.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>		
Motion 9.6/1	<p>Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Beverley Muir</p> <p>That the beach hubs at Scarborough Beach NOT BE put out to tender or be built upon, and that they be GRASSED for community benefit and beautification of our landscape in Scarborough.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The City is considering options for the two beach hub sites at Scarborough Beach which will be presented to Elected Members at a future workshop.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.6/1 and NOTES that all options, including recreation options for the hubs to activate the site, will be considered.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.6/2	<p>Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Thomas Cameron</p> <p>That the City of Stirling INITIATE the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Widen footpaths to 1.5m on primary roads in localities of e-scooter hire or install cycle lanes within major roads; b. Install brick paved parking bays in verges allowing more off-street parking and put trees between parking bays; and c. Install entry statements into residential streets in these congested areas. <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>Upgrades and widening of footpaths may be considered on a case-by-case basis based on asset condition and path usage.</p> <p>The provision of cycle lanes is not always feasible for primary roads, however suitable alternative cycling routes can be investigated.</p> <p>The City does not typically provide brick paving on verges abutting private properties for the purpose of public parking, as this would remove the abutting owner's exclusive rights to utilise the verge as they consider appropriate.</p> <p>The provision of entry statements can be considered on a case-by-case basis where it is determined that they will provide a justifiable benefit to road safety.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.6/2 and NOTES that verge trees and entry statements will be considered in conjunction with the comments made in relation to the widening of footpaths.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.6/3	<p>Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Damien Kelly</p> <p>That the City INSTIGATE the approval of a parking space in the City owned block on West Coast Highway near Brighton Beach.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>At its meeting held 13 February 2024 Council did not support the Committee recommendation to approve design and planning requirements for a car park at 273 West Coast Highway, but to consider all options to increase availability of parking within the Scarborough Beach precinct. Council also resolved to discuss the potential uses and opportunities for the site at a future workshop.</p> <p>This workshop was held on 24 June 2024, where the City recommended an EOI process to advertise the land holding for a Ground Lease opportunity. An EOI was advertised on 23 October 2024, this has now closed and a report on the results will be presented to a future Council meeting.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.6/3 and NOTES that while on 13 February 2024, Council did not support the Committee recommendation to approve design and planning requirements for a car park at 273 West Coast Highway, it did resolve to consider all options to increase availability of parking within the Scarborough Beach precinct.</p>
Motion 9.7/1	<p>Moved Daniela Ion, seconded Leisha Jack</p> <p>That the City PLANTS a greater diversity of street trees, large trees and more species.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The City's preference is to plant the largest size and widest variety of species on verges and POS. Species diversity is one of the Long Term Canopy Targets in the City's Urban Forest Plan (page 28).</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.7/1 and AFFIRMS its recent decision of 4 March 2025 (Council Resolution Number 0325/014) to endorse a 30% average tree canopy target for City-managed land to be achieved by 2040 and NOTES that the City currently plants a diverse range of large tree species.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.8/1	<p>Moved Jefferson Allan, seconded Caroline McLean</p> <p>That the City of Stirling's Street Tree Policy is REVIEWED and AMENDED to reflect current issues, and to be aligned with current best practice, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requests for street tree removal should be minimised through policy, and where removal of a street tree cannot be avoided, the amenity value paid by the adjoining land owner to be allocated to the street tree budget; b. Authorisation for removal of street trees being removed from the CEO's delegations and instead be a decision of Council; and c. That the town develop a register of significant trees on public land, including trees used for habitat, foraging, and day and night roosting by native bird species. <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>As part of the new City Trees Policy, a Tree Appeals Panel is being created to provide a process to review decisions made by Council's Tree Delegate.</p> <p>Of the total street tree population of 113,000, over the last 12 months, 660 mature trees were removed (0.58% of the population) – for a range of reasons, such as pest and diseases (including biosecurity), vandalism, drought, development conflicts, storm damage, death and senescence (old age), etc.</p> <p>All street trees are located, named and stated on the City's IntraMap (GIS) program on the City's website. This can be accessed via Stirling property maps here with the Trees and Vegetation Module selected.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.8/1 and AFFIRMS Council's previous resolutions which have considered these matters, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review of the City's Street Tree and Reserves Tree Policy (Council Resolution Number 0423/016). b. Elected Member Tree Policy Workshop held 5 August 2024. c. Adoption of City Trees Policy on 15 October 2024 (Council Resolution Number 1024/003).

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.10/1	<p>Moved Caroline McLean, seconded Jan Barrie</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the City of Stirling under Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Local Planning Schemes Regulations of 2015 immediately INITIATES the process required for adoption of the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention, which provides protection for mature trees on private property by defining the removal of a regulated tree or trees as works which requires development approval. The Council should consider bringing this as a standalone item by the end of financial year 2025. That the City of Stirling EXPLORES initiatives for owner, builder and/or property developers for keeping trees on developed sites. This should be a separate adoption of the above mentioned WALGA template. <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council has previously considered the merits of the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention in a report presented to Council on 17 September 2024. That report noted the challenges in attempting to regulate tree removal from private land through reliance on a Local Planning Policy. Given those challenges, officers support continuing to monitor the success of the WALGA Model Policy, while also monitoring the success of a proactive compliance approach to tree planting on development sites. The City's officers have investigated initiatives for tree retention on private land on several occasions. None of those investigations found any practical initiatives that would assist in incentivising tree retention on private land. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.10/1 (1) and AFFIRMS its decision of 17 September 2024 (Council Resolution Number 0924/020) noting outcomes of investigations into tree retention, and NOTES that a report is on this agenda from the Planning and Development Committee detailing the proactive approach to tree retention and planning through the planning approval process trial outcomes. That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.10/1 (2) and NOTES that initiatives to retain trees on private land have previously been investigated, with no practical incentives identified at this time. The City will continue to investigate planning-based incentives that can be practically implemented throughout review and development of the local planning framework.

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.13/1	<p>Moved Justin Juracich, seconded Mike Masiello</p> <p>That the City, as part of the boardwalk Feasibility study, PROVIDES for public examination the projected initial construction cost and anticipated annual ongoing costs of the boardwalk, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintenance; b. Rubbish collection; c. Lighting; d. CCTV installation and monitoring; e. Ongoing security; f. Fire prevention strategies; and g. Weeding vegetation and the watering of that vegetation. <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>As part of the feasibility study, the City will develop a concept design and an estimated cost, which will also include an estimated annual cost for maintenance etc. More detailed costings will be further refined if the project extends beyond the feasibility stage.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.13/1 and NOTES that the boardwalk is subject to a feasibility study and community consultation on the proposed boardwalk will occur at a future date.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.14/1	<p>Moved Bradley Maguire, seconded Leisha Jack</p> <p>That Council temporarily DEFERS proposed works at corner Clifton Crescent and Central Avenue (see Council Resolution 0523/025) and REFERS proposed works to the Community and Resources Committee (see CRC Minutes 16 May 2023, ES1) to investigate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether subsequent crash data for 2023, 2024, and 2025 calendar years (not available at the time of Council's resolution 0523/025) continues to support the proposed works; b. Whether the crash data up to 2022, which informed Council's resolution 0523/025, when viewed in light of crash data for subsequent years supports the conclusion that the spike in traffic incidents at the intersection was the result of the 9-month temporary closure of Beaufort Street by Water Corporation; c. Whether funding would be better reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling (irrespective of whether it 'can' be under the State Government funding programme's rules); 	<p>When the project was presented to Council in 2023, crash data showed 20 reported crashes over a 5-year period (between 2017 and 2021).</p> <p>The most recent data available shows a spike in crash frequency, with 42 reported crashes over a 5-year period (between 2020 and 2024).</p> <p>The data would therefore indicate that there is increased justification for this project, and works are scheduled imminently to begin in May.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.14/1 and REAFFIRMS its decision of 30 May 2023 (Council Resolution Number 0523/025) to proceed with the preferred treatment for the intersection of Central Avenue and Clifton Crescent, Mount Lawley.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>d. Whether funding can be reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling consistent with the State Government funding programme's rules or whether funding must be surrendered;</p> <p>e. Whether the changed conditions at the intersection since Council's resolution 0523/025 was passed (40km/hr school crossing speed zone during morning peak hour and a portion of afternoon peak hour when previously MRWA resisted any 40km/h speed limit on Central Avenue) mean the modification proposed two-three years ago is any longer necessary; and</p> <p>f. In light of the existing intermittent 40km/h speed limit, whether a more cost-effective solution would be extending the hours of the 40km/h speed limit to include afternoon peak hour.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>		

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.15/1	<p>Moved Marie Giorgi, seconded Dylan Riddell</p> <p>That the City RECLASSIFIES Lot 802 and part Lot 803, 179 Erindale Road, Hamersley to a Locally Significant Natural Area and REZONES the bushland from Public Use Commonwealth to Environmental Conservation in the City's local planning scheme to ensure its protection into the future.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>This site was subject to a request to amend LPS3 to rezone the land 'Development' that Council considered in May 2022.</p> <p>Prior to this request, the Environmental Protection Authority was asked separately by the applicant to review its proposal to clear the site.</p> <p>Council resolved not to proceed with the amendment, as insufficient information had been provided to understand the full environmental impact of developing the site. The Environmental Protection Authority assessment continues regardless, and, to date, sufficient information to assess the impact of clearing the site has not been provided. The City has not been made aware of any update on their assessment.</p> <p>While re-classification of the site's local reservation designation warrants investigation due to its biodiversity significance, this should occur once the EPA has finalised its assessment.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.15/1 and NOTES that any consideration to rezone these lots will not occur until the Environmental Protection Authority has finalised its assessment.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.20/1	<p>Moved Melissa O'Toole, seconded Arriadne Bradley</p> <p>That the City UNDERTAKES a weighted, multi criteria options analysis of the options available to the Council in terms of a boardwalk or an upgraded pathway or do nothing approach prior to further spending of ratepayer funds.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The City is conducting a preliminary investigation on whether a coastal boardwalk between Scarborough and Trigg beaches is feasible. Options to improve pedestrian connectivity and address safety concerns will be considered as part of this process.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.20/1 and NOTES that the boardwalk is subject to a feasibility study and community consultation on the boardwalk will occur at a future date.</p>
Motion 9.25/1	<p>Moved Margaret Bond, seconded Mike Masiello</p> <p>That the City ENGAGES an independent parking specialist to assess and report on the current parking situation at Scarborough and Trigg, during events such as the Sunset Markets. The report is to include an investigation of the number of cars overflowing into surrounding residential roads. Then forecast the impact that the proposed boardwalk will have on the baseline parking situation through the anticipated increased visitation of local, national and international tourists. This report is to be shared with the ratepayers.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The City has initiated several measures to manage parking in Scarborough and Trigg, including a review of current parking restrictions, the introduction of electronic parking wayfinding signage, additional public transport options during the Thursday night Scarborough Sunset Markets and regular monitoring of parking by Rangers.</p> <p>The State Government recently announced a \$14 million investment to introduce a free Surf CAT bus service to alleviate parking pressure and traffic at Scarborough Beach. This funding also includes improvements to the intersection of West Coast Highway and Scarborough Beach Road to facilitate better entry and exit into the precinct.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.25/1 and NOTES that the boardwalk is subject to a feasibility study; that community consultation will occur at a future date; and that the City shall continue to investigate and implement a range of parking management initiatives at Scarborough and Trigg.</p>

MOTIONS CARRIED AT THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		OFFICER COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Motion 9.27/1	<p>Moved Lisa Thompson, seconded Thomas Cameron</p> <p>That the City REMOVES the unrealistic artist rendering of the proposed boardwalk from their website.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The artists impressions of a boardwalk on the City's website are based on examples of boardwalks in coastal settings across Australia. These are for illustrative purposes only and are not indicative of a final design. These will be updated as the project progresses through the concept design phase.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.27/1 and NOTES that the artist impressions are reflective of other boardwalks, and do not reflect any specific design.</p>
Motion 9.27/2	<p>Moved Lisa Thompson, seconded Robyn Murphy</p> <p>That the City LOBBIES the Road Safety Commission to install a fixed speed camera on the northbound traffic on West Coast Highway adjacent to the South Trigg Beach Reserve to improve pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared CARRIED.</p>	<p>The installation and positioning of fixed and mobile speed cameras is determined solely by the WA Police. Fixed speed cameras are not typically installed at midblock locations, however the City understands that there has already been significant police presence monitoring travel speeds along this road.</p>	<p>That Council NOTES Elector Motion 9.27/2 and NOTES that there has been a significant police presence monitoring traffic speed recently in Scarborough.</p>

MOTIONS LOST 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		Officer Comment
Motion 9.1/1	<p>Moved Robyn Murphy, seconded Annalisa Orselli-Dickson</p> <p>That the City immediately STOP spending hundreds of thousands of ratepayers' dollars and the City's time and resources on an unnecessary, unwanted and environmentally damaging coastal boardwalk between car parks at Scarborough and Trigg Beach and REDIRECT the budget allocation to the restoration and rehabilitation of the remnant Class A Trigg Beach reserve, and the protection of the threatened ecological community of Rottnest Island pines that's within it.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared LOST.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for Council to consider Motion 9.1/1 as it did not obtain a simple majority of votes in favour of the motion.</p>
Motion 9.4/1	<p>Moved Leisha Jack, seconded Robert Madden</p> <p>That the City STOP promoting the boardwalk as a tourist attraction.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared LOST.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for Council to consider Motion 9.4/1 as it did not obtain a simple majority of votes in favour of the motion.</p>
Motion 9.11/1	<p>Moved Robert Mitchell, seconded Mark Thompson</p> <p>That the City BUILDS a gazebo at the top of the bike path at South Trigg Beach.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared LOST.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for Council to consider Motion 9.11/1 as it did not obtain a simple majority of votes in favour of the motion.</p>

MOTIONS LOST 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING HELD 24 MARCH 2025		Officer Comment
Motion 9.11/2	<p>Moved Robert Mitchell, seconded Thomas Cameron</p> <p>That the City of Stirling OFFERS to lease a fenced off portion of the car park at Lot 3, Davenport Street, Karrinyup to the builder owner for their construction workers. The lease from the beginning of the construction of the towers until practical completion.</p> <p>The motion was put and declared LOST.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for Council to consider Motion 9.11/2 as it did not obtain a simple majority of votes in favour of the motion.</p>



City of Stirling

2023/2024 Electors' General Meeting

24 March 2025

Minutes

To: The Mayor and Councillors

Here within the Minutes of the 2023/2024 Electors' General Meeting of the City of Stirling held Monday 24 March 2025 in the City of Stirling Council Chamber, 25 Cedric Street, Stirling.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Rodic'.

Stevan Rodic | Chief Executive Officer

Our Vision, Mission and Values

Vision

A sustainable City with a local focus.

Mission

To serve our community by delivering efficient, responsive and sustainable service.

Values

The City of Stirling's core values are:

- Approachable
- Responsive
- Transparent
- Innovative.

Disclaimer

Members of the public should note that in any discussion regarding any planning or other application that any statement or intimation of approval made by any member or officer of the City during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not to be taken as notice of approval from the City. No action should be taken on any item discussed at a Council meeting prior to written advice on the resolution of the Council being received.

Any plans or documents contained in this document may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1998*, as amended) and the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to the reproduction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	OFFICIAL OPENING	6
2.	ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES.....	6
3.	APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	8
4.	MAYOR'S REPORT	8
5.	ANNUAL REPORT INCORPORATING ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2024 ...	8
6.	AUDITORS REPORT	14
7.	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT	14
8.	ACCEPTANCE OF THE ANNUAL REPORT INCORPORATING ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2024	14
8.1	R BARRETT.....	15
8.2	L JACK	16
8.3	T DYMOND	18
8.4	R BARRETT.....	19
8.5	R MITCHELL.....	22
9.	GENERAL BUSINESS	24
9.1	R MURPHY	24
9.2	K KELLY	28
9.3	D PIETERS	30
9.4	L JACK	34

9.5	M MASIELLO	35
9.6	F FARRELLY	38
9.7	D ION	42
9.8	J ALLAN	46
9.9	L THOMPSON (ON BEHALF OF M INMAN)	47
9.10	C MCLEAN	49
9.11	R MITCHELL.....	52
9.12	J HAWKES	54
9.13	J JURACICH.....	55
9.14	B MAGUIRE.....	56
9.15	M GIORGI	58
9.16	D KELLY	59
9.17	A OSELLI DICKSON	60
9.18	T CAMERON.....	60
9.19	B STONE	61
9.20	M O'TOOLE (ON BEHALF OF M O'TOOLE).....	62
9.21	A BRADLEY	64
9.22	P MAGARAGGIA.....	65
9.23	D HOMSANY	66
9.24	P SCHLITTER	67
9.25	M BOND.....	68
9.26	P SMITH.....	70
9.27	L THOMPSON	71
9.28	R HADLEY	73



MINUTES OF THE ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING
24 MARCH 2025

9.29	H DYMOND.....	75
9.30	R SAVAGE-JONES	76
9.31	S COATES	77
9.32	R GEORGE	79
9.33	M INMAN.....	80
10.	CLOSURE	81

**MINUTES OF THE 2023/2024 ELECTORS' GENERAL MEETING OF MONDAY 24 MARCH 2025
HELD IN THE CITY OF STIRLING COUNCIL CHAMBER, 25 CEDRIC STREET, STIRLING**

In accordance with Section 5.27 of the *Local Government Act 1995* and the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, the Order of Business will be as follows:

1. OFFICIAL OPENING

The Mayor welcomed the public and attendees to the City of Stirling 2023/2024 Electors' General Meeting and declared the meeting open at 6.10pm.

2. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

ATTENDANCE

Mayor	Mark Irwin
Councillors	Councillor Andrea Creado Councillor Michael Dudek Councillor Joe Ferrante Councillor Damien Giudici Councillor Chris Hatton Councillor Tony Krsticevic Councillor David Lagan (until 7.53pm) Councillor Suzanne Migdale Councillor Teresa Olow Councillor Rob Papparde Councillor Karlo Perkovic Councillor Stephanie Proud JP Councillor Elizabeth Re Councillor Lisa Thornton

Employees

- Chief Executive Officer - Stevan Rodic
- Director Community Development - Michael Quirk
- Director Corporate Services - Ingrid Hawkins
- Director Infrastructure - Andrew Murphy
- Director Planning and Development - Amanda Sheers
- Manager City Future - Andrew Lefort
- Manager Community Safety - Peter Mullins
- Manager Development Services - Giovanna Lumbaca
- Manager Facilities, Projects and Assets - Paul Kellick
- Manager Finance - Dan Richards
- Acting Manager Governance - Jackson Mawby
- Head Community Engagement - James Murphy
- Service Lead Council and Civic - Candice D'Castro
- Service Lead Marketing and Communications - Caitlin Tiller
- Lead Governance Officer - Regan Clyde
- Senior Elected Member Services Officer - Sean McDiarmid
- Senior Governance Officer - Amorette Kerklaan
- Senior Media Advisor - Liam Croy
- Governance Officer - Katya Bennet

Guests

- Office of the Auditor General - Tim Sanya
- Ernst & Young - Fiona Drummond

Public 184

Press Nil.

APOLOGIES

Nil.

3. APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

4. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Mark Irwin read the Mayor's report for the Financial Year ended June 2024.

5. ANNUAL REPORT INCORPORATING ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2024

The Director Corporate Services presented the following extract to the meeting regarding the Annual Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2024.




Summary Overview

Where we collect the money from	\$'m
Rates	160.1
Operating revenue	110.0
Capital grants	12.0
Proceeds from disposal of assets	4.1
Share of profit and equity of associates	18.3
Revenue	304.5
Where we spend the money	\$'m
Operating expenditure excluding non-cash amounts	(284.1)
Capital expenditure	(72.4)
Expenditure	(356.5)
Reserves, Town Planning Scheme, Trust monies and other movements	\$'m
Net transfers to Reserves, Town Planning Scheme and Trust	(4.1)
Other balance sheet movements	51.7
Net movement	47.6
Net opening and closing funds	4.4
Balanced Bottom line	0.0




Operating Revenue






Operating Expenditure





Capital Expenditure

City of Stirling





How each \$100 is spent



6. AUDITORS REPORT

Tim Sanya from the Office of the Auditor General provided a summary of the Auditor General's Report regarding the City of Stirling Annual Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2024.

7. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

The Chief Executive Officer's report was included within the 'Year in Review' presentation, outlining the City's achievements and projects for the 2023/2024 Financial Year.

8. ACCEPTANCE OF THE ANNUAL REPORT INCORPORATING ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2024

The Mayor advised that a submission of written questions had been received in relation to the 2023/2024 Annual Report or Financial Statements.

8.1 R BARRETT

The following questions and comments were put forward by R Barrett, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

- R Barrett:** My first question relates to the Urban Forest Strategy component of the Annual Report. The Annual Report says that the Urban Forest Strategy aims to increase tree retention, planting and canopy maximisation, and is reported to be, quote, "progressing according to schedule and achieved anticipated milestones". So, there's three parts to my question. How does Council reach this conclusion when it is recorded on pages 181 and 182 that the strategy is not on track to achieve the comparatively modest canopy target of 18% by 2040? Currently, a target deficit of 30,600 mature trees, and that nearly 2.8 million square metres of significant canopy has been lost since 2012.
- Director Infrastructure:** The City did meet its goals for tree planting on City-managed land. There is a nuance to trees that are planted on City land and trees that are not on City land, because the City has less ability to control tree canopy on state and privately managed land. The majority of canopy loss you refer to is from private land, and the gains on City land is what is focused on as part of the report.
- R Barrett:** How does Council plan to address the reported current trend, albeit on private land, that some suburbs could lose about 50% of existing canopy in the next 10 years?
- Director Infrastructure:** For clarification, that prediction is based on some suburbs losing significant canopy, it is about referring to private properties and residential land, not City land. It is expected that canopy cover will increase on City managed land on all suburbs over the next 10 years.
- R Barrett:** Why doesn't the Annual Report include any commentary on the significant risk to the Urban Forest Strategy posed by the polyphagous shot hole borer?
- Director Infrastructure:** The City is very aware of the risks around the polyphagous shot hole borer. The reason it is not in the Annual Report 2023/2024 is that it had no significant impact last year, but you will find that next year's Annual Report will have commentary on that because there is an impact that the City is finding right now.

The Mayor then called for any further questions related to the Annual Report and Financial Statements.

8.2 L JACK

The following questions and comments were put forward by L Jack, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

L Jack: I have a problem with the Annual Report for a couple of reasons, primarily the outrageous greenwashing. Greenwashing is trying to make an organisation seem more green and sustainable than it really is. It's a form of misleading and deceptive conduct and fraud. It's illegal for businesses. Is that a little smile, Mr Mayor?

The Mayor: It might have been a smirk, it is a fairly serious allegation, Ms Jack.

L Jack: And I'm more than happy to make them.

The Mayor: We have the State's Office of the Auditor General here tonight.

L Jack: Yes, thank you and they know from Treasury that greenwashing is not allowed any more, I happen to know that. So, coming up with a title like the Million Trees Initiative, which I've been telling you for years, you did stop for a while, but it started again a couple of years ago, is misleading. Titles, you're not allowed to use titles that are misleading and then hide the information in the document or fine print. As that gentleman pointed out, the canopy is in, yes, you're talking about planting trees, but you're not looking after trees properly, and you're not going to the State Government and really lobbying them to do something about tree protection laws like local governments in the eastern states, and you know one has to wonder what you know.

The Mayor: I will ask you to get back on track for the Annual Report, because you are talking about lobbying the State Government on another issue.

L Jack: Yes, so the Annual Report is full of greenwashing, ok, yes. When will the City of Stirling change that title of that tree program and stop greenwashing?

The Mayor: The City does not greenwash.

- Director Infrastructure:** I think the question refers to the Million Trees Initiative. Definitely in the past, the Million Trees Initiative was the title of that initiative, and it has been changed to Million Trees and Shrubs. I am sure that is what is in the Annual Report. Without referring to any pages I think that is something that has already been changed, as you quite rightly described that is for the reasons of honesty, it is not just trees.
- L Jack:** My second question about the Annual Report relates to safety, which should be the most important thing this Council is concerned about. Safety, the word safety is mentioned 159 times in relation to crime and roads, couple of things to do with work safety etc, of that, heat is only mentioned three times and as I've been saying to this Council over many years, heat is not recorded on death certificates in Australia. And I've been pointing out to you that the scientists today in new science are saying...
- The Mayor:** I am going to ask you to get to a question relating to the Annual Report; we have got a gallery of hundreds of people here.
- L Jack:** When will the City of Stirling recognise how dangerous heat is and really do something about reducing urban temperatures, mitigating against urban temperatures and taking the urban tree canopy seriously to reduce temperatures and deaths?
- The Mayor:** Thank you for that question. The City does take urban canopy and its targets very seriously and they are quite often an item of this Council's agenda, as Council discusses those in a very transparent manner with the community.
- L Jack:** Again, that's misleading in the way you've worded it, sorry, but I'm more than happy to go on the record saying that sir.
- The Mayor:** You are welcome to.

8.3 T DYMOND

The following questions and comments were put forward by T Dymond, of Yokine WA 6060 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

T Dymond:

Thank you very much, Mr Mayor, Councillors and ratepayers. Now, the City's Annual Report 2023/2024 talks about respecting the traditions of the Wadjak and Nyoongar peoples, as custodians of the land. This meeting started off with a very similar declaration and yet the Council is proceeding with designing a boardwalk that would require the clearing and disturbance of native vegetation and the digging of hundreds of holes for footings and sand hills upon which the very same indigenous people walked, foraged, hunted and fished before Europeans came. The Council, without any reported consultation with local indigenous people or research into the heritage values of this significant remnant coastal reserve in South Trigg Beach, has allocated half a million dollars to design a boardwalk through the sand hills. So why has the Council not instructed the City to engage with the Wadjak Nyoongar people, as it says in your Annual Report and with qualified, culturally appropriate anthropologists to thoroughly survey the pre-European history and occupation of that remnant coastal reserve in South Trigg before proceeding with planning for this boardwalk?

The Mayor:

I appreciate that question, and not to minimise it, but we are getting off topic, this is about the 2023/2024 Annual Report. I will get some commentary on the City's involvement with the Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group and Indigenous Elders, but consultation certainly is not over with this piece of work.

Director Community Development:

Thank you for the question, Mr Dymond. The City has a really strong relationship with our Wadjak Nyoongar Elders. The City has a Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group and engages with them on all major projects. The boardwalk will include extensive consultation with the traditional owners.

8.4 R BARRETT

The following questions and comments were put forward by R Barrett, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

R Barrett:

This is related to the Annual Report, the waste management strategy. The Report records that the Council's waste management strategy falls well short of several key targets. Diverting municipal waste from landfill, diverting commercial and industrial waste from landfill, achieving 70% material recovery by 2025 and achieving 20% reduction per capita waste generation by 2030. How does Council plan to respond and why was the proposal for FOGO (Food Organics Garden Organics) implementation not supported by Council, despite it being successfully implemented in other Council areas and its potential to significantly contribute to waste management targets?

Director Infrastructure:

There are two parts to that question. The first is about how the City is responding. The City's very active, along with its partners in Mindarie Regional Council, in looking at alternative waste treatment options. The City accepts that it is very reliant on landfill and is looking for options that will remove that reliance and allow it to divert and recover more waste, which is how targets would be achieved. There is extensive work going on in that area, some of this activity is not public because of the requirement for commercial confidentiality, but you can be assured that work is going on. On the other side of things, the City has a very a good three bin system and recycling centre in Balcatta, which recovers and recycles lots of waste. The City is working hard to optimise the current system and that is through a big education program that we have.

The second question is about FOGO, and you rightly refer to a previous Council report where Council made the decision not to introduce FOGO, but I will be clear that the decision was made not to introduce FOGO service at that time. The City is keeping a close eye on developments in all strategic waste matters and that includes the introduction of a future FOGO service at some point in the future.

R Barrett:

Is it possible to clarify why it was decided not to implement it at this time?

The Mayor:

I can probably cover that from a Council point of view. One of the things we hear often is 'why don't we do it, because it is a State Government mandate or because there are other councils that do it.' I think it is important to look at things like waste, which is an interaction that everyone in this gallery has with the City of Stirling on a weekly basis, hundreds of thousands of lifts a week of your waste. The City is currently looking at all its waste streams, and with the change from landfill sites going into waste to energy, to implement FOGO across a population equivalent to the Northern Territory is an extreme risk to this City. Those other councils quite often maybe have 2,000 residents, so it is not that hard to divert. For the City to go to a FOGO stream at the same time has significant cost implications for ratepayers, where you would see your waste levy quite possibly double, that is a huge risk. There is also the problem with red bins, the City would then have to change everyone's collection services so your red bins only get collected every second week and distribute green bins to the 30,000-odd mixed dwellings or shared dwellings that do not already have green bins. There are many things to be considered.

At this time, the Council was not comfortable enough that FOGO could be implemented in a risk-free approach that would not significantly impact ratepayers financially, and that there is an end use for that volume of food organics to go into the system.

R Barrett:

Yep, thank you. I did also submit another question on climate emergency. Can I ask that now? It's related to the Annual Report.

The Mayor:

Yes.

- R Barrett:** The Annual Report refers to several trends that verify predictions of international climate scientists in the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and our own CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation) and confirm that we're not using resources in a manner that will enable future generations to meet their needs, the commonly accepted definition of sustainability. It mentions rapid and significant decline in precipitation over south-west Australia, including this area, significant increase in the use of groundwater and extended periods of heat waves and drought leading to depletion and salinisation of a finite resource. Rapid, sustained increase in temperature and increasing number of heat waves and violent storms and also increasing erosion of coastal areas through stormwater surge and rising sea levels. In order to raise public awareness of the rapidly closing window for limiting the extent of global warming, will Council consider joining 11 other WA local government jurisdictions in declaring a climate emergency? That's the first part, shall I go into the other two parts?
- The Mayor:** Yes maybe, if you could summarise, in the interest of time.
- R Barrett:** Has Council joined 40 other local government jurisdictions in signing the WALGA climate change declaration? If not, why not? And why has Council decided not to join a nationwide alliance of 43 LGAs that have formed the Climate Emergency Australia?
- The Mayor:** Council considered this. There was an e-petition back in about 2020, it was an item that came to Council. This Council has always had the approach not to declare climate emergencies or anything that can be seen, without being disrespectful to those who do it, as virtue signalling, without backing it up with any plan. This Council has ensured that it has a Sustainability Energy Action Plan, follows through with its commitments and works closely with WALGA and has alliances with organisations such as the Cities Power Partnerships. It has traditionally steered clear from declaring emergencies or joining with other councils to write letters to a Federal Parliament.

8.5 R MITCHELL

The following questions and comments were put forward by R Mitchell, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

- R Mitchell:** This is supplementary to the two motions I've got. In relation to the Annual Financial Statement, this year, the Council took it upon themselves, not as a Council I believe it was a Committee, to commit \$350,000 for Christmas lights in seven wards, and I haven't seen a thing about it anywhere. Is this type of throwaway of money going to continue?
- The Mayor:** There is no current decision, that normally goes through a budget process. Moving into this year's budget, Council will decide if Christmas lights are warranted. There was a fair bit of publicity, and the City can certainly share some links with you if you want to see some of the pictures of the Christmas lights.
- R Mitchell:** I did mention, Mayor that it wasn't Council that decided it, it was a Committee.
- The Mayor:** It was Council, through a budget process, Mr Mitchell.

There being no further questions relating to the Annual Report and Financial Statements, the Mayor called for a mover and seconder to accept the 2023/2024 Annual Report.

Moved Bradley Maguire, seconded Mitch Whalan

That the 2023/2024 City of Stirling Annual Report incorporating the 2023/2024 Annual Financial Statements and the 2023/2024 Auditor's Report, be ACCEPTED.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9. GENERAL BUSINESS

The Mayor called for any items of general business from the floor.

The Mayor also advised that while any motions moved by electors are non-binding on the Council, the City will ensure that each motion is addressed within a report for Council's consideration.

9.1 R MURPHY

The following comments and motion were put forward by R Murphy, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

R Murphy: Good evening, Mr Mayor, Councillors and other ratepayers. Mr Mayor, just taking on board your statement about how we should present the motions, I was going to move the motion and then speak to it.

The Mayor: That is quite all right as well. If you have got a question that may lead into something you are about to say, you are welcome to ask that prior if it helps.

R Murphy: No, I'm not asking a question, just moving a motion.

The Mayor: I'm happy for you to move a motion then speak to it, that is fine as well.

Moved Robyn Murphy

That the Council immediately STOP spending hundreds of thousands of ratepayers' dollars and the City's time and resources on an unnecessary, unwanted and environmentally damaging coastal boardwalk between car parks at Scarborough and Trigg Beach and REDIRECT the budget allocation to the restoration and rehabilitation of the remnant Class A Trigg Beach reserve, and the protection of the Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) of Rottnest Island pines that is within it.

R Murphy:

Speaking to that motion, The City of Stirling has been given considerable responsibility for the management of the South Trigg Beach Class A reserve by the State Government on behalf of the people of Western Australia. Class A is the highest level of protection for crown land reserves, and this is the only Class A reserve in the seven kilometres of coastline in the City of Stirling and it took a lot of work by the Friends of Trigg Bushland in 1998 to have this coastal reserve reclassified due to its conservation value and its regional significance. It is also a Bush Forever area because it meets the criteria of a regionally significant bushland and it is the only location on the City's coastline where there remains a complete complex of foredunes swale and secondary dunes connected to inland and significant Tuart and Marri bushland for 2km east of Karrinyup.

Doctor Judy Fisher, respected and internationally recognised expert on ecosystems, states in her report to the City that *'this coastal reserve should not be fragmented, and that any disturbance would bring change and damage to each of the different plant communities that exist on the vegetative dunes and swales that range from five to 12m high and are subject to erosion.'* Dr Fisher and Professor Vic Semeniuk, both internationally recognised experts on coastal ecosystems and dune morphology, recommend in the strongest terms that no development, including infrastructure such as a boardwalk, should be built on this fragile, mobile dune system that is increasingly under threat from climate change induced ocean warming and erosion from increased intensity of storms.

There is also the findings of the City's Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Plan, which recommends that no development take place on the undeveloped coastal dunes at South Trigg Beach, where erosion is also significant. This reserve is a buffer for coastal assets such as the road and residences on West Coast Highway. There is evidence that the vegetation on this 13 hectare dune reserve is deteriorating, and weeds are spreading. This is not good enough when the City has a responsibility to maintain the area on behalf of the state. Vegetation on the coastal dunes south of Brighton Beach is in much better condition. We need to know why the City is not putting the time and effort into rehabilitation and restoration of the vegetation on the South Trigg Beach reserve. Surely it cannot be because the Council sees this dune reserve as potentially a tourist area with a boardwalk and other facilities. This is where any spare money that the City obviously has, given how much time, money and resources have been devoted to planning an unwanted, unnecessary and environmentally destructive coastal boardwalk, should be spent.

The Mayor:

Thank you, now can I ask you to read the first sentence of your motion because we are going to vote on it.

R Murphy: I need a seconder, don't I?

The Mayor: Yes, that is why I would like you to read it again, so everyone understands the main intent of it.

R Murphy: We are calling upon the Council:

MOTION 9.1/1

Moved Robyn Murphy, seconded Annalisa Orselli-Dickson

That the Council immediately STOP spending hundreds of thousands of ratepayers' dollars and the City's time and resources on an unnecessary, unwanted and environmentally damaging coastal boardwalk between car parks at Scarborough and Trigg Beach and REDIRECT the budget allocation to the restoration and rehabilitation of the remnant Class A Trigg Beach reserve, and the protection of the Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) of Rottnest Island pines that is within it.

The motion was put and declared LOST.

R Murphy: Mr Mayor, as the mover of the motion I would like to ask were only people with blue cards counted?

The Mayor: I am not sure.

R Murphy: Because I understood that only residents and ratepayers within the City of Stirling could vote on motions. I need that confirmation.

The Mayor: I cannot give that confirmation unless everyone has driver's licences here tonight.

R Murphy: We were all given blue cards when we arrived as being eligible to vote.

The Mayor: Could anyone let us know if they voted and they do not have a blue card?

R Murphy: Could I ask the person who counted the vote whether only people with blue cards were counted?

The Mayor: I do not think it was double checked if everyone had blue cards.

- R Murphy:** Well, then we need to do a recount.
- The Mayor:** I am happy with the process to date.
- R Murphy:** This is not valid, Mr Mayor, I'm sorry. We were told that we could only vote if we had a blue card. Why were we given blue cards?
- The Mayor:** Thank you, Ms Murphy, please take a seat while we get clarification. We have understood you and we have heard you. The Manager Governance is comfortable that there are only 10 non-electors in the room. Even if all 10 voted for it and were taken out, the motion would still be lost.

Additional Information

It was subsequently verified that 11 non-electors were in attendance. Attendance records and the vote count (82 For; 94 Against) would indicate that the potential participation of non-electors would not have changed the outcome of this motion.

9.2 K KELLY

The following comments and motions were put forward by K Kelly, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

K Kelly: Welcome everyone, and wouldn't it be great to see this many people at a meeting every second week, I do urge you all to come along to many Council meetings, not just this one. This is the only opportunity that we get to ask questions to the Council really.

The Mayor: You can call me any time, Mr Kelly.

K Kelly: I know I can, Mr Mayor, but it's great to see people here. My first motion is, with the dwindling tree canopy within the Stirling Council and the continuing urban infill that is spreading throughout City boundaries, it is most beneficial for residents to have open space to recreate. This is why it is important for the Council to develop and, most importantly, maintain these open spaces. Garden space has been a proven positive to our health and wellbeing. Good public recreational gardens are not abundant within the Perth metro area. We have Kings Park, Araluen, Hyde Park, Queens Park, just to name a few. At the moment, the Civic Gardens across the road here is probably the Council's premium or premier garden site, even though signage at the garden is alerting the public of current reticulation problems. So, my motion tonight is...

MOTION 9.2/1

Moved Kieran Kelly, seconded Felicity Farrelly

That the City CONSIDERS developing a world-class civic garden or harbour region within the City boundaries, either by upgrading already developed sites or a new greenfield site.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

K Kelly:

My second one is, Scarborough over the past 10 years has gone through a major redevelopment through the push by local and state government to increase housing by the use of infill housing. This has changed the face of Scarborough from one house per block to two, three, four or more houses per block. With this increase has come the extra pressure put on to the existing infrastructure, but it's also added to the increased usage of the road system and most inconveniently, the use of the roads for car parking. It is also almost impossible to drive safely on these roads due to cars being parked on the road. Scarborough has a laneway system throughout the area, which has been used to access the many new houses that are built facing the laneway. Unfortunately, many residents living in these laneway facing houses are, for convenience sake, parking on the road instead of using their garage and parking apron. My motion is...

MOTION 9.2/2

Moved Kieran Kelly, seconded Felicity Farrelly

That the Council INVESTIGATES what can be done to manage on-road parking around Scarborough so as to make roads safe for vehicles and pedestrian traffic and also DELIVERS a management plan or strategy plan for the future road use and parking within the greater Scarborough area.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.3 D PIETERS

The following comments and motion were put forward by D Pieters, of Trigg WA 6029 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

D Pieters:

Good evening Mr Mayor, Councillors, City officers, fellow community members, thank you for your patience this evening. My name is Deane Pieters from Trigg and I'm here to present a motion regarding the coastal boardwalk project, with a preamble.

As an opening remark - may we respect each other's views, as individuals are allowed to have a different position. Especially when the Councillors have repeatedly heard from the same voices and the same agenda opposing the coastal boardwalk, at Council meetings since December 2023. Tonight, I would like to speak on behalf of the Trigg Scarborough Coastal Boardwalk Group, an independent community-led group, advocating for the coastal boardwalk, a project that has been discussed for the last two decades. This initiative goes beyond providing quality infrastructure for the community. It's about safety, connectivity, enhanced tourism, community wellbeing and responsible coastal enjoyment, all while redirecting pedestrians who currently walk less than a metre from 40,000 daily commuters, including 20 tonne trucks, with a figure projected to grow to 50,000 people daily, commuters in the next decade.

The voice of the community is clear and compelling. A recent survey conducted between October and November 2024 gathered 630 individual responses, revealing the following key findings:

- 82% support the coastal boardwalk project;
- 81% support the City of Stirling funding this project;
- 84% of respondents are likely to use the boardwalk; and
- 77% of the community feel unsafe on the current shared path along West Coast Highway.

The potential for this boardwalk between Scarborough and Trigg has been identified as a top five local priority in both suburbs. Before outlining the reasons why this project is important, I would like to debunk the claim made by opponents suggesting the boardwalk will cost \$20 million to construct. During Public Question Time in October last year, a member of the Bush Not Boardwalk Group, inquired about the proposed cost, offering his own estimate of around \$10 million, citing the current high costs of building materials and labour.

The Mayor responded by stating there was no current price tag for the boardwalk and in a light-hearted exchange joked that that he wouldn't be surprised if the cost ended up being double. The community, and make this very clear, have never asked for a boardwalk that's going to cost a \$20 million investment to build this. This claim is false, misleading and a clear attempt at skulduggery by the opposing group. This actual cost will be determined through a proper process, including a cost-benefit analysis, once the design is completed and the design hasn't been completed.

Now I'd like to explain why this project is important, addressing five key points.

1. Safety and accessibility.

The existing shared path along West Coast Highway is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists due to the high traffic volume. As stated previously, 40,000 daily commuters, including 20 tonne trucks, travel often at speed along this highway. In fact, 77% of the community considered the current shared cycle pedestrian path is unsafe.

2. Environmental consideration and preservation.

While the project requires legislative scrutiny and careful consideration of the key recommendations of the City's preliminary environmental opportunities and constraints assessment, there are no significant barriers to success. Provided we design a practical solution located east of the 2070 Coastal Erosion Hazard Line as a guide while minimising impacts on landforms, stability, vegetation and fauna habitats. A boardwalk located east of the 2070, most of us won't be here in 2070, so we won't be able to enjoy it. But a coastal boardwalk located east of the 2070 Coastal Erosion Hazard Line should also be designed to avoid the threatened ecological community which they refer to as TEC, concentrated on the southeast pocket, as outlined in the City's Coastal Hazard Management and Adaption Planning Guidelines with a suitable buffer zone applied during the design process. We are confident that this boardwalk can be designed in a way that ensures a safe and sustainable user experience, aligning with the best practise environmental planning.

3. Connectivity and tourism.

Linking Trigg and Scarborough with an award winning environmentally friendly boardwalk will encourage sustainable coastal access, benefiting both businesses and tourism, while maintaining the area's natural beauty and access. Investing in high-quality world-class infrastructure that supports tourism and the local economy should not be hindered by the objections of a group of local residents and environmental groups.

The Mayor: Can I ask that you get to the motion sir?

D Pieters: The motion is...

Moved Deane Pieters, seconded Chas Paridis

That the City PRIORITISES the coastal boardwalk project, ensuring it considers environmental factors, community needs and safety concerns. This should be supported by community consultation with funding opportunities explored through partnerships between the City of Stirling and the State and Federal Governments.

The Mayor: Have you wrapped up? Can we put that to the vote or have you got a quick statement?

D Pieters: I actually wouldn't mind just finishing if I could. As we know it's often the loudest voices that get the most attention, especially when it's a group making the noise. A widened footpath along West Coast Highway as proposed by the Bush Not Boardwalk and the Friends of Trigg group is flawed and a conflicting alternative. This approach would require extensive retaining and remediation of an A Class Reserve, which is part of the threatened ecological community impacting on the most densely established vegetation adjacent to the path, contradicting key conservation objectives proposed.

The solution will also involve disruption to more than 40,000 daily commuters during the construction along a busy highway requiring intervention with Main Roads. The solution also fails to address safety concerns of the users, and this solution increases the hazards to pedestrians and cyclists due to limited space in close proximity to vehicles.

The Mayor: Mr Pieters I might ask you to wrap it up if you can.

D Pieters: The motion, which I repeat...

MOTION 9.3/1

Moved Deane Pieters, seconded Chas Paridis

That the City PRIORITISES the coastal boardwalk project, ensuring it considers environmental factors, community needs and safety concerns. This should be supported by community consultation with funding opportunities explored through partnerships between the City of Stirling and the State and Federal Governments.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

The Mayor: To the members of the gallery, I think it is prudent as we move through the meeting, if you have a very similar motion there is no need to repeat it, but if you have a separate motion relating to the boardwalk I would ask that you put your hand up and we get through these first.

9.4 L JACK

The following comments and motion were put forward by L Jack, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

L Jack:

I'd like to talk to the motion first. It's in regard to the boardwalk being promoted by the City and yourself, Mr Mayor, as a tourist attraction. The fact is, research from Tourism Research Australia shows that, and I have said this before, the most important thing for tourists is nature and pristine beaches, pristine natural areas. The Scarborough Beach foreshore is already overdeveloped and, as many people have pointed out in surveys, lacking vegetation and trees. There isn't a lot of natural dune area there. So it's really important that the area is kept natural for tourists. The bigger spending category of tourists is still international tourists. They're the big spenders, and the Chinese are still the biggest group. All tourists, whether they're... and the Chinese in particular, want natural areas. To put a man-made piece of infrastructure across that protected dune will reduce the environmental value of that area, and therefore its tourism value. Sure, we have tourists, mass tourism, where people go to Hillarys, and so on. Well, as I said, we already have all the man-made infrastructure we could possibly want in Scarborough already. What is important to preserve the value of that area as a tourist destination is the pristine nature parts of it. So my motion is...

MOTION 9.4/1

Moved Leisha Jack, seconded Robert Madden

That the City STOP promoting the boardwalk as a tourist attraction.

The motion was put and declared LOST.

9.5 M MASIELLO

The following comments and motion were put forward by M Masiello, of Trigg WA 6029 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

M Masiello:

Firstly, I just wanted to debunk the situation regarding the traffic on West Coast Highway. If you refer to the stats, the northbound traffic, which is the concern given that there is an island in the middle of the road, is 18,000, which is not dissimilar to West Coast Drive. The fact that there are two lanes there also means the same amount of traffic drives south of Scarborough. And that zone is 70. Obviously, that whole section is 60, so I just wanted to shed some light there.

I'm going to move a couple of motions. I just want to have a preamble. Through the process of elimination and recent comments by the City's Acting Director Infrastructure last week at the meeting, which you weren't present at, Mr Mayor, we confidently established that the primary driver for a proposed boardwalk through the dunes is not pedestrian safety, but the perception by the City that a boardwalk would lead to an explosive number of international tourists visiting Scarborough. According to the City's Economic and Tourism Development Strategy 2021 - 2025, tourism only comprises near 2.3% of the City's GDP and 3.7% of jobs, meaning tourism is relatively insignificant when the whole City is considered. Those numbers are really concentrated in a handful of businesses in the Scarborough foreshore, which I'm sure are well represented here tonight.

Since this report was published, the City has implemented a range of initiatives to drive tourism, such as the Scarborough markets and other events run successfully through an annual \$40,000 grant to the Scarborough Business Association. However, this success has clearly demonstrated Scarborough's inability to handle large numbers of visitors, with significant parking and congestion flooding onto surrounding residential areas and footpaths within a surrounding kilometre radius.

The latest boardwalk concept stemmed from Councillor Papatde's election promise. Scarborough Local Convos then provided support with, you know, a Convo is basically 10 to 20 people getting together and sticking a blue dot on a motive statement. The question is, do ratepayers really want a boardwalk through the dunes, or would they be happy with a simple alternative solution that involves widening the existing path or creating a meandering walkers' lane next to the current path at the top of the dunes?

Our experience over the last six months is that the City has not and is determined not to ask ratepayers this question. Instead, they have scraped the surface with a handful of local engagement sessions attended by 10 to 20 people and let the opposing groups perform the City's community engagement, given that Facebook group numbers and online surveys can easily be manipulated, means the results and group numbers need to be taken with a pinch of salt. There's a huge demographic that does not even use Facebook. Mayor Irwin, you've indicated to the media on recent occasions that the proportion of people that object to the boardwalk is a minority. What information are you basing this opinion on, and what proportion of path users do you estimate to oppose a boardwalk through the middle of the dunes?

The Mayor:

I have made it very clear at any and every stage that consultation has not occurred for this project yet.

M Masiello:

You had to the media said 'this minority' anyway, over the past few months, our group members have invested considerable time performing our own community engagement. Rather than engaging Facebook and LinkedIn business contacts and local businesses that stand to financially benefit from a boardwalk, we spoke to over 1,500 ratepayers, local, national, and international tourists that use the path and interact with the reserve and allowed those people to put their names down in the form of a petition. The petition calls upon the City not to build a standalone boardwalk through the dunes and instead widen the existing path.

I'm pleased to inform the Council that we have collected 1,500 signatures on this petition, which looks to be a City record. I can share with you that the vast majority of path users would prefer to see the path widened to take the elevated view over the vegetated dunes to the ocean, which is a simple, cost-effective solution that preserves the natural environment that is already very accessible.

Therefore, I propose to move two motions. Bush Not Boardwalk calls upon the Council to request...

MOTION 9.5/1

Moved Mike Masiello, seconded Thomas Cameron

- 1. That the City of Stirling PREPARES a report for Council to investigate the potential costs and options, in conjunction with Main Roads, the Road Safety Commission, and other key stakeholders and the State Government, for securing and widening the existing shared path positioned between West Coast Highway and South Trigg Beach Reserve, providing separation for foot and cycle rideable traffic, a project that has demonstratable community support evidenced by a petition with over 1,500 signatures.**
- 2. Given the lack of community support for a standalone boardwalk through the dunes both now and in the past, the extremely low likelihood of being granted the necessary environmental approvals, and the prohibitively high cost of construction, ongoing maintenance, combined with suitable alternative solution being available, we call on the Council to request that the City CEASES further expenditure on the concept through the dunes and classify this option as unviable.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

M Masiello: Just be clear that there's two motions there. Can I read those motions again?

The Mayor: No, the motions have been read sir.

M Masiello: So both motions are being carried.

The Mayor: Yes they were put together, as the same motion.

M Masiello: They're not the same motion, there's two separate motions.

The Mayor: I understand that sir, you read them out.

M Masiello: I just want a confirmation that there's two motions that I read out and that both of them are carried.

The Mayor: I can say it for a third time, yes.

Please everyone, we can spend all night going backwards and forwards with motions on the boardwalk. The intent is clear that we have got half the room supporting it and half do not. There is no point in getting angry at each other, you are allowed to have different views.

9.6 F FARRELLY

The following comments and motions were put forward by F Farrelly, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

F Farrelly:

Look, I'm not going to... I've stood up and shown my support for the boardwalk. This is probably the opposite to what I would have done 20 years ago, well it certainly was the opposite, but I want to leave it at that. There's a lot of information behind it. I thank the officers, when I was a Councillor they were diligent in the information they obtained, and they were comprehensive in understanding the complexities. I do trust, as having been a Councillor, that the work undertaken by the City Officers is above board, is not secretive, and they do try and save our money as ratepayers. I know and I really would like to say as well that to be a Councillor is a wonderful opportunity to see how the City works and I would really like to see more opportunities given to more people to do that because you do come out with much more exposure and a better understanding, anyway that's an aside.

I've got a couple of things that relate to where I live. The beach hubs at Scarborough Beach should not be put out to tender or be built upon, and they should be grassed for community benefit and beautification of our landscape in Scarborough. The two hubs I'm referring to have been a very contentious issue. They went out for potential lease when I first came on Council, that was already in operation without a great deal of community consultation. So, I do take on board that I think community consultation needs to improve

The fact is, though, that the vista from what I'd like to see would be historically protected sandbar façade, that vista is incredibly important to the cultural heritage of Scarborough. When you also come down Scarborough Beach Road from the third hill and you see the ocean. If you have buildings across that, even if they're two to three storeys, you will lose the ocean. Then people will come to the beach like they do in New South Wales at different spots, where you don't see the ocean you see concrete barriers to keep the traffic from seeing the ocean. I actually don't understand why they do that. So, if I can put that as a motion.

MOTION 9.6/1

Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Beverley Muir

That the beach hubs at Scarborough Beach NOT BE put out to tender or be built upon, and that they BE grassed for community benefit and beautification of our landscape in Scarborough.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

F Farrelly: Thank you very much to the community. Look, I know some of you, probably don't even know what I'm talking about, so thank you.

The Mayor: Hopefully they did!

F Farrelly: It's been on the agenda for a long time and it always comes up, but I just want to keep pushing it. The other side is actually probably regard to Kieran Kelly. It is the urban planning in congested spaces and I'd like to, if I may, add to his motion that the City of Stirling initiate the following: that they widen footpaths to 1.5 metres on primary roads in localities of e-scooter hire, or install cycle lanes within major roads. I'm not talking about every single road, which was thrown at me as a Councillor, you may recall, it's the major roads. The lack of parking, install brick parking bays in verges allowing more off-street parking. Brick paving because you need percolation through rainwater and things like that, and also it's beautification within those, between those, put trees of course. I know the City's good on trees so I don't think I have to say that, in your public land not on the private land. Install entry statements into residential streets in these congested areas. I have probably spoken about these in Council and you're probably bored to tears by them, but all of that makes a residential realm that gives people feeling of safety, of home, and of being able to have a community. At the moment, I live in Scarborough it's an incredibly congested space, every Thursday night my verge is like a potential parking lot. I also see the problems with the garbage trucks coming in on a Tuesday morning and they can't get through so most of the time our bins don't get emptied and in between that we have a real problem with people parking on roads because there's nowhere else to park.

The Mayor: So, the main part of your motion is to widen the footpaths?

F Farrelly: Yeah to 1.5m, you know why.

- The Mayor:** I am just trying to make it clear, so we get a seconder.
- F Farrelly:** Okay, can I just add that though, if Kieren Kelly is willing to...
- The Mayor:** I think they are separate motions. I think it is just cleaner so, to widen the footpaths on the primary roads to provide better accessibility.
- F Farrelly:** Yeah or otherwise put a cycle lane like they do in Copenhagen.

MOTION 9.6/2

Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Thomas Cameron

That the City of Stirling INITIATE the following:

- a. Widen footpaths to 1.5m on primary roads in localities of e-scooter hire or install cycle lanes within major roads;**
- b. Install brick paved parking bays in verges allowing more off-street parking and put trees between parking bays; and**
- c. Install entry statements into residential streets in these congested areas.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

- F Farrelly:** Thank you very much to those that agreed, the final one is that the City...
- The Mayor:** If it is a quick one.
- F Farrelly:** Instigate the approval of a parking space in the City-owned block in West Coast Highway near Brighton Beach. When I was a Councillor, we found out that since the development of Scarborough there are a third less of parking bays, we've also got the development that's occurring on Reserve Street down at 1 Reserve Street that is meant to be replacing those 100 parking bays that are not available at the moment. However, at the moment they aren't there, so we've really got a loss of parking bays on the beach and that's having a real impact on the surrounding streets and also on people coming down to the beach, but particularly on the surrounding streets, we're ending up with parking in the streets on those beach days and it's becoming quite dangerous.

- The Mayor:** So that was the lot on West Coast Highway, 273?
- F Farrelly:** The one the City of Stirling owns.
- The Mayor:** Yes.
- F Farrelly:** The one the Council voted against supporting last year.
- The Mayor:** The one the City owns, so you are moving that we put a car park on it.
- F Farrelly:** Yeah.

MOTION 9.6/3

Moved Felicity Farrelly, seconded Damien Kelly

That the City INSTIGATE the approval of a parking space in the City owned block on West Coast Highway near Brighton Beach.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.7 D ION

The following comments and motion were put forward by D Ion, of Nollamara WA 6061 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

D Ion:

Our street trees make a significant contribution to the City of Stirling's ongoing development as a liveable, sustainable, and prosperous City. Trees bring colour, shade, and human scale to our streets, helping to make them great places for people to be. Distinctive patterns and high-quality planting can also reinforce cultural heritage and natural character. Street trees create valuable habitats for our local flora and fauna and provide a range of other intangible ecosystem services, including carbon storage, improved air quality, stormwater management, and energy saving. As our Cities get hotter, the cooling effects provided by large, healthy tree canopies will make a critical contribution to our City. So, the motion asks for the following...

1. A shift away from the traditional street tree theme approach in order to provide biodiversity and resilience to pests and diseases;
2. Maximisation of canopy;
3. Aiming for continuous canopy coverage after 20 years of moderate growth, and the combined value of all trees on average to be one point five; and
4. Street tree planting to identify default species as large trees endemic to the LGA.

So, one of my friends who is a gardener with over 25 years of experience said that he strongly believes that diversity is a key risk management strategy. I was very short because I know it's late and everybody wants to go home.

The Mayor:

Can you succinctly put your motion?

MOTION 9.7/1

Moved Daniela Ion, seconded Leisha Jack

That the City PLANTS a greater diversity of street trees, large trees and more species.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

The following questions were submitted by D Ion of Nollamara WA 6061 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025 in writing but were not asked.

D Ion:

Vapes include embedded lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) and are prone to improper disposal. Most vapes end up in general waste and recycling bins or are discarded as litter. Vapes with LIBs pose multifaceted risks, encompassing fire hazards, environmental degradation, human health concerns, and economic impacts. Improperly disposed of vapes and LIBs have caused many fire incidents in Australia, including in trucks and at recycling facilities, endangering lives and causing significant pollution events to the air, waterways and land. The residents can dispose of just 10 vapes/e-cigarettes at the Recycling Centre Balcatta.

Why can't the residents dispose more than 10 vapes/e-cigarettes? Is there any possibility that the residents to receive any refund back?

Additional Information

E-cigarettes are indeed a problematic and hazardous waste to deal with, as they contain embedded lithium batteries and hazardous substances such as nicotine.

Local government has historically been responsible for managing many of the products consumed by society. Unfortunately, a rapidly changing waste stream has turned the process of managing end-of-life products into an expensive and complicated activity for local governments.

From November 2023 to August 2024, the City of Stirling's Recycling Centre in Balcatta (RCB) hosted a collection of e-cigarettes (vapes) to supply materials for a WA Local Government Association (WALGA) study, with funding support from the Waste Authority WA.

The study was undertaken to provide Local Governments with valuable information on the types of e-cigarettes being disposed of, the materials they are made from and the recovery pathways for each constituent part.

The RCB collection point was only available for this limited period for the purpose of the study, with a limit of 10 vapes per person in place to ensure the study was not overwhelmed with materials and to make the drop-off available to a wide range of vape users, thereby providing a wider sample of products available on the market. The collection is now closed and RCB does not accept e-cigarettes for drop-off.

The study results will also be used to inform local government and WALGA's advocacy for a product stewardship scheme for these products. Such a scheme would mean that producers of e-cigarettes/vapes cover the costs associated with recycling these products and provide an easy and convenient way for consumers to recycle these products (at end of life).

The final E-cigarette Collection Study Report was published in February 2025 and can be found here:
<https://walga.asn.au/awcontent/Web/Documents/Waste/WALGA-E-cigarette-Collection-Study-Report.pdf>

New national and state laws to strengthen controls on the importation, manufacture, and supply of all vaping products (with or without nicotine) are now in place. Vapes for smoking cessation, or managing nicotine dependence continue to be available from pharmacies if they meet [Therapeutic Goods Administration \(TGA\) regulatory requirements](#), including: Flavours limited to mint, menthol and tobacco; and plain pharmaceutical-like packaging.

Note: Disposable vapes cannot be supplied, regardless of whether they include nicotine, so it is unlikely that any refund will be made available for this waste stream.

From 31 October 2024, Western Australian law requires nicotine vapes to be supplied only on prescription. Pharmacists in WA cannot supply nicotine vapes over the counter (without a prescription), regardless of the nicotine concentration. Full details can be found on the Department of Health website here: https://www.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/A_E/Electronic-cigarettes-in-Western-Australia.

Despite these new laws, we are aware that there continues to be a black market for vapes and the issue of disposing of these products still exists, without a safe disposal option. Department of Health (DoH) are not currently supportive of normalising public collections for illegal products, however WALGA continues to raise with them that they are still out there and are being disposed of through predominantly local government waste collections or littered. This represents an increased cost and risk to local government from truck and facility fires when the lithium batteries are crushed, as well as to the community and the local environment.

Currently WALGA is pursuing an amnesty collection trial for WA, for the illegally sourced vapes. As the legally sourced vapes are sold at pharmacies, the most sensible option would be for users to take vapes back to a pharmacy for disposal, as a temporary extension of the [Return Unwanted Medicines \(RUM\) Program](#). There is still a long way to go and hurdles in place before any potential trial may get off the ground.

In the meantime, due to DoH's advice, local governments have not set up public collections. Advice is also being sought from the TGA on this issue and we are still awaiting their formal response. We remain in regular contact with WALGA and will act promptly on any changes to collection availability.

State and Federal governments are actively enforcing the new laws and have seized huge shipments of illegal vapes coming into the country. We would encourage anyone with knowledge of a person or business selling vapes to report this confidentially to DoH via this dedicated email: vape.report@health.wa.gov.au.

D Ion: On 5 February, I received an email from the Governance Team that hard copies of the 2023/2024 Annual Report will be available for collection from the City's libraries and the main administration centre from Tuesday 18 February 2025. I went to Osborne Park Library to collect a hard copy, and after I left the library, the Manager called me and told me that they have one copy and that you have to read it there. I had to go back to the library to show the Manager the email that I received from the COS, but he was surprised because he did not know that residents could go and collect the Annual Report from them. Could you please have better communication next year.

Additional Information

Letters emailed to previous EGM attendees inviting them to attend the 2023/2024 EGM incorrectly advised that copies of the Annual Report would be available for collection at the City's libraries from Tuesday 18 February 2025. This was an administrative error which will be corrected for future EGMs. The City apologises for any inconvenience this may have caused and appreciates that Ms Ion brought this to the City's attention.

D Ion: In the City Trees Policy that it was reviewed on October 2024 at point 6 "Bonds and payments" it is written that a bond for the protection of the tree will be held by the City prior to the commencement of development. How does the City determine the value of a tree?

Additional Information

The City (re)values its street trees every three years – using an independent arboricultural contractor experienced in the Helliwell Tree Amenity valuation system. The Helliwell valuations for street trees are available on-line on the City's website under planning and development tab which can be accessed [here](#).

9.8 J ALLAN

The following comments and motion were put forward by J Allan, of Tuart Hill WA 6061 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

J Allan: As previously outlined by others, trees are an important public amenity in the City of Stirling, as are in all Councils. We need trees for shade to cool our suburbs, for the benefit of birds and other wildlife and to make this area an appealing place to live. This is why I propose the following motion for the protection of trees on public land:

MOTION 9.8/1

Moved Jefferson Allan, seconded Caroline McLean

That the City of Stirling's Street Tree Policy is REVIEWED and AMENDED to reflect current issues, and to be aligned with current best practice, including:

- a. Requests for street tree removal should be minimised through policy, and where removal of a street tree cannot be avoided, the amenity value paid by the adjoining landowner to be allocated to the street tree budget;
- b. Authorisation for removal of street trees being removed from the CEO's delegations and instead be a decision of Council; and
- c. That the town develop a register of significant trees on public land, including trees used for habitat, foraging, and day and night roosting by native bird species.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

J Allan: To briefly explain this, the first part attempts to ensure that trees on public land are only removed with good reason. Street trees should not be removed because a bit of leaf litter is blown into a nearby yard. If a tree is to be removed for frivolous reasons at the behest of the resident, the value provided to the community should be compensated by that resident. This is not to prevent the removal of trees where there are safety concerns or other serious grounds for their removal. The second part ensures that there is room for deliberation and discussion around the removal of trees. Decisions to remove public trees, some of which could be many decades old, should not be a tick and flick exercise left to a single individual. Whether this individual is the Council CEO or a delegate of theirs, there should be a group decision made by the entire Council as a matter of public interest. The last part aims to create a significant tree register for public land in addition to the significant tree register that already exists on private land. There are many large old trees on public land that we need to protect. Having a register to keep track of these trees will raise their profile and help the Council to protect them.

9.9 L THOMPSON (ON BEHALF OF M INMAN)

The following questions, comments and motion were put forward by L Thompson, of Trigg WA 6029, on behalf of M Inman, of Trigg 6029 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

L Thompson: Now that the real reason for the multimillion-dollar coastal boardwalk has been exposed as a tourism venture, not a dual path safety issue, we call upon the Council to...

MOTION 9.9/1

Moved Lisa Thompson

That the City seriously consider whether the claim that an environmentally destructive boardwalk would attract international visitors to Scarborough Beach is valid or viable, and given the absence of evidence that a boardwalk is a tourist attraction, reject any further expenditure on this ill-advised proposal.

The Mayor ruled the motion out of order.

Reason

This motion has already been put forward.

The Mayor: Thank you, and with all due respect, I am going to rule that out of order. It is exactly the same motion that was done first up. We have got a lot of stuff to get through tonight and I think the point has been made about the boardwalk.

L Thompson: But can I come back later for my questions? And there's a few others.

The Mayor: Certainly, I am also conscious that while there are plenty of people here for the boardwalk, there are probably some people in the room who have just come to ask a question about something else.

[Member of the Gallery]: That was a motion that needs to be voted on.

- The Mayor:** As the presiding member I have ruled it out of order and given my reason. This is all a matter for public record, but I have ruled it out of order. It is effectively the same motion that has been asked before, not to spend money on the boardwalk, and the motion has been clear. It has been put in four different ways, so I have ruled it out of order.
- [Member of the Gallery]:** Can we dissent from the ruling?
- The Mayor:** I am the presiding member at this meeting. I am sorry but my ruling is final.
- [Member of the Gallery]:** This is a dictatorship.
- The Mayor:** Seriously people, to call this a dictatorship when I am presiding over one of the most democratic and transparent processes where you all have the right to come out of your homes and spend your Monday nights here. I am sure many of you have better things to do. I would hardly call that a dictatorship.

9.10 C MCLEAN

The following comments and motions were put forward by C McLean, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

C McLean: I have two motions this evening, what I'll do is I'll talk to the motion first and then give my rationale and then I can repeat the motion if that assists.

The first motion is relating to local planning and tree retention. I propose...

Moved Caroline McLean, seconded Jan Barrie

1. That the City of Stirling under Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Local Planning Schemes Regulations of 2015 immediately INITIATES the process required for adoption of the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention, which provides protection for mature trees on private property by defining the removal of a regulated tree or trees as works which requires development approval. The Council should consider bringing this as a standalone item by the end of financial year 2025.

C McLean: From a rationale perspective, I'll run through some of my thoughts for bringing this motion today. I'm bringing this motion in recognition of the fact that Perth is in a tree canopy crisis. Property development; a warming, drier climate with record-breaking summers; and the relentless polyphagous shot-hole borer are all acting together to reduce our tree canopy across our state. These threats must be countered with proactive planning and action at Council level to protect and increase our tree canopy.

The most recent metro-wide canopy data from DPLH (Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage) was obtained in 2020. This data showed that Perth had 16% tree canopy cover, which is the lowest of any Australian capital city. This is a staggering figure, and my concern is that without meaningful protection for the existing tree canopy, we are going to continue to see this number reduce even further.

As per the minutes of the City of Stirling Ordinary Council meeting held 4 March 2025, we see that the Council endorses a 30% average tree canopy target for City-managed land to be achieved by 2040. This target does not take into account tree canopy on private land, and this is why I see that the WALGA model planning policy for tree retention must also be considered in addition to this. With 80% of canopy loss occurring on private land, I see this as an area that needs urgent protection to be implemented, not only for the health and well-being of our City and our state but as a quick win to help support the City of Stirling target to significantly increase our overall tree canopy by 2040.

Capital cities across Australia have had blanket tree protection policies in place for decades. The sky has not fallen in, economies continue to grow, and houses continue to be built. This is not an anti-development policy. Instead, it is a policy which puts forward a sensible framework to protect existing tree canopy on private land in our suburbs to enhance the health and well-being of our community and our environment.

Tree canopy protection is one of our biggest tools in climate change mitigation, cooling our suburbs and reducing energy consumption. It also provides invaluable physical and mental health benefits to all of our people, as well as providing a safe haven for our biodiversity to be able to thrive. In response to calls from local governments, WALGA has developed this policy with some very sensible exclusions and has carefully considered the need to balance private rights with communal benefit for all residents. The WALGA policy is not intended to save every tree. Its intent is to limit the unnecessary removal of healthy trees. Removal of healthy trees for reasons of inconvenience or fear is not beneficial to the health and well-being of our community, our climate, or our environment. Sensibly applied, we believe the policy will support further density through better design and planning to ensure that significant trees are retained rather than removed.

I hereby urge you to follow other councils in adopting this solution to the ongoing loss of our tree canopy for the benefit of our community today and for the benefit of the generations who follow after us.

The Mayor:

Thank you.

C McLean:

So that's the first. The second part of the motion is that, or the second motion to be considered as a standalone, may I make that clear.

The Mayor:

Well, if they are completely standalone...

C McLean:

It's the second, part two then. I would like at least the tree planning policy retention to be brought into effect by the end of the financial year 2025.

The Mayor:

Is the second part related to it or is it on another topic?

C McLean:

It is in support of. Yes, it is in support of that.

The Mayor:

Okay. We will do that as part b.

Moved Caroline McLean, seconded Jan Barrie

2. That the City of Stirling EXPLORES initiatives for owner, builder and/or property developers for keeping trees on developed sites. This should be a separate adoption of the above mentioned WALGA template.

C McLean:

The rationale here is to encourage property developers and owner builders to maintain existing tree canopy in their developments. Incentives alone do not appear to have been effective, and so I feel that any incentive package should be designed to complement the regulation under the WALGA template rather than exist in isolation of it. So I guess that's the key part, that the second should not exist without the implementation of the WALGA policy.

MOTION 9.10/1

Moved Caroline McLean, seconded Jan Barrie

1. That the City of Stirling under Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Local Planning Schemes Regulations of 2015 immediately INITIATES the process required for adoption of the WALGA Model Local Planning Policy Tree Retention, which provides protection for mature trees on private property by defining the removal of a regulated tree or trees as works which requires development approval. The Council should consider bringing this as a standalone item by the end of financial year 2025.
2. That the City of Stirling EXPLORES initiatives for owner, builder and/or property developers for keeping trees on developed sites. This should be a separate adoption of the above mentioned WALGA template.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.11 R MITCHELL

The following comments and motions were put forward by R Mitchell, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

R Mitchell: I have a motion in relation to the boardwalk at Scarborough. But one thing I'd like to say is I don't belong to any organisation either for or against it. As a matter of fact, I don't want it, but I don't like to be included with those like Mr Pieters and the like.

The Mayor: There is no doubt, Mr Mitchell, that you are unique.

R Mitchell: I'll get on with my motion. My motion relates to the coast as it is now. We have a footpath that goes right through from Mindarie to City Beach and people walk along that and there's never been any problem with it, and I would like to see it remain in that form. The coastal dune between Scarborough and Trigg is rather unique. Along the coast, well, you might say between Karrinyup Road and Mindarie there's serious, well, they are basically cliffs and that's a unique piece of land. I'm not against something that gives the tourism and people walking down there the chance to stop and have a look at the ocean, the people surfing there. What my proposal is, is to put a gazebo at the top end of the walkway from the car park that joins the footpath that goes along West Coast Highway. Then put it in there in an area that I looked at, which is basically a remnant type growth which should be improved, and putting a Gazebo in is a statement and it's a place to go to. I was thinking today because tomorrow is my birthday, and I'm 84. I've lived a long life. I was in the City of Perth Surf Life Saving Club and I used to go up and down the coast. I didn't bother surfing, but I knew a lot of people and one bloke that struck me that has never...

The Mayor: Mr Mitchell can we please get to the motion?

R Mitchell: Well, wait a minute. This gazebo. Before I finish, I think that it should be in honour of a man that was a beach inspector on Scarborough Beach that was rather an icon, and his name was Johnny Alva, and I don't know whether you've heard of him, but I think we should put a gazebo up there and do away with this boardwalk. So I'd like to put that motion.

The Mayor: Let us keep the motion clear to build a gazebo at the top of the bike path.

R Mitchell: Yes, that's correct. I'd like to put that motion.

MOTION 9.11/1

Moved Robert Mitchell, seconded Mark Thompson

That the City BUILDS a gazebo at the top of the bike path at South Trigg Beach.

The motion was put and declared LOST.

R Mitchell:

At least it's on the record. Do we move on to other business? I have another...

The Mayor:

If I can ask if everyone comes up, we still have lots to get through. If I can just ask one question per person and then if they are all finished and people want to stay and keep asking questions to, even just myself, we will keep going. But I think in fairness for time just one succinct question per person please.

R Mitchell:

I have a second motion here, but it's in relation to parking for construction workers at the Karrinyup Shopping Centre, can I put it?

The Mayor:

You can put a motion.

R Mitchell:

This motion in putting relates to the Karrinyup area in relation to the building that's going to start, I believe in September, and it will go for about seven years. A 24 storey a 15 storey and a nine storey. Near the end of last year, there was a development application to use the Karrinyup Primary School oval, which has been used for years by the staff of the Karrinyup Shopping Centre, but the representative for the builder put in a development application Rowe Group and he wanted to use that oval on weekends throughout the year for their parking. And that would have taken away the complete use of that oval for the people of Karrinyup for seven years and it got pulled out, I'm frightened it will come back. You'll be pleased to know that I'm doing the City of Stirling a favour. I'll put the motion.

The motion relates to the construction workers to build the towers at the west side of the Karrinyup Shopping Centre over many years. The City owns the car park adjacent to the community centre, part of Lot 3 Davenport Street. I offer this motion...

MOTION 9.11/2

Moved Robert Mitchell, seconded Thomas Cameron

That the City of Stirling OFFERS to lease a fenced off portion of the car park at Lot 3, Davenport Street, Karrinyup to the builder owner for their construction workers. The lease from the beginning of the construction of the towers until practical completion.

The motion was put and declared LOST.

R Mitchell: Oh well, when they park on your verge, don't blame me.

9.12 J HAWKES

The following question was put forward by J Hawkes, of Carine WA 6020 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

J Hawkes: Good evening Mr Mayor, Councillors and everyone, this is very brief and it regards the boardwalk and it says, does the Council seriously believe that a steel and concrete boardwalk structure between Scarborough and Trigg Beach would enhance the views over the dunes to the ocean currently enjoyed by people walking or driving along West Coast Highway, and that producing, the production of cement is one of the biggest productions of CO² on the planet? That's all, thank you.

The Mayor: That matter is an item that is currently being investigated, will go out for community consultation and will be an item that will be decided at Council.

9.13 J JURACICH

The following comments and motion were put forward by J Juracich, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

J Juracich:

I will note that actually the support is from the younger people as well, not to offend the older people, but it is the younger people who will inherit what we're deciding in this Council. I wasn't going to start with a preamble, but everybody else has. So, I'd actually like to start with a phrase, "there's lies, damn lies and statistics". This was popularised by Mark Twain to highlight the persuasive power of statistics and the potential for them to be used to support weak arguments, even when presented deceptively. And I must say I've heard a lot of statistics tonight. Somebody also mentioned that people have only been here since about October 2023 opposing the boardwalk. I would refute that to say that this has actually been going on for about 20 years, that the boardwalk has been gone against for 20 years, not since October 2023. My motion, which is very quick, is just to call on the Council to request...

MOTION 9.13/1

Moved Justin Juracich, seconded Mike Masiello

That the City, as part of the boardwalk Feasibility study, PROVIDES for public examination the projected initial construction cost and anticipated annual ongoing costs of the boardwalk, including but not limited to:

- a. Maintenance;
- b. Rubbish collection;
- c. Lighting;
- d. CCTV installation and monitoring;
- e. Ongoing security;
- f. Fire prevention strategies; and
- g. Weeding vegetation and the watering of that vegetation.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.14 B MAGUIRE

The following motion was put forward by B Maguire, of Inglewood WA 6052 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

B Maguire: My motion is...

Moved Bradley Maguire, seconded Leisha Jack

That Council temporarily DEFERS proposed works at corner Clifton Crescent and Central Avenue (see Council Resolution 0523/025) and REFERS proposed works to the Community and Resources Committee (see CRC Minutes 16 May 2023, ES1) to investigate:

- a. Whether subsequent crash data for 2023, 2024, and 2025 calendar years (not available at the time of Council's resolution 0523/025) continues to support the proposed works;
- b. Whether the crash data up to 2022, which informed Council's resolution 0523/025, when viewed in light of crash data for subsequent years supports the conclusion that the spike in traffic incidents at the intersection was the result of the 9-month temporary closure of Beaufort Street by Water Corporation;
- c. Whether funding would be better reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling (irrespective of whether it 'can' be under the State Government funding programme's rules);
- d. Whether funding can be reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling consistent with the State Government funding programme's rules or whether funding must be surrendered;
- e. Whether the changed conditions at the intersection since Council's resolution 0523/025 was passed (40km/hr school crossing speed zone during morning peak hour and a portion of afternoon peak hour when previously MRWA resisted any 40km/h speed limit on Central Avenue) mean the modification proposed two-three years ago is any longer necessary; and
- f. In light of the existing intermittent 40km/h speed limit, whether a more cost-effective solution would be extending the hours of the 40km/h speed limit to include afternoon peak hour.

The proposed works to be RECONSIDERED at Council once CRC has reported.

The Mayor: So, this gentleman is not asking for us to not do specific intersection works, he is asking for us to pause it, reinvestigate and bring a report back on that.

B Maguire: It's just a question of financial oversight and management, whether a decision from two years ago is still the right decision. It may well be, I don't know.

The Mayor

I just wanted to try to clarify that because a lot of people may not know the intersection, but it is not to take out road works or anything, it is just to really reexamine a decision that was made on a particular piece of road works. Alright, we have a seconder, so I will put that motion.

MOTION 9.14/1

Moved Bradley Maguire, seconded Leisha Jack

That Council temporarily DEFERS proposed works at corner Clifton Crescent and Central Avenue (see Council Resolution 0523/025) and REFERS proposed works to the Community and Resources Committee (see CRC Minutes 16 May 2023, ES1) to investigate:

- a. **Whether subsequent crash data for 2023, 2024, and 2025 calendar years (not available at the time of Council's resolution 0523/025) continues to support the proposed works;**
- b. **Whether the crash data up to 2022, which informed Council's resolution 0523/025, when viewed in light of crash data for subsequent years supports the conclusion that the spike in traffic incidents at the intersection was the result of the 9-month temporary closure of Beaufort Street by Water Corporation;**
- c. **Whether funding would be better reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling (irrespective of whether it 'can' be under the State Government funding programme's rules);**
- d. **Whether funding can be reallocated to other road safety projects within the City of Stirling consistent with the State Government funding programme's rules or whether funding must be surrendered;**
- e. **Whether the changed conditions at the intersection since Council's resolution 0523/025 was passed (40km/hr school crossing speed zone during morning peak hour and a portion of afternoon peak hour when previously MRWA resisted any 40km/h speed limit on Central Avenue) mean the modification proposed two-three years ago is any longer necessary; and**
- f. **In light of the existing intermittent 40km/h speed limit, whether a more cost-effective solution would be extending the hours of the 40km/h speed limit to include afternoon peak hour.**

The proposed works to be RECONSIDERED at Council once CRC has reported.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.15 M GIORGI

The following comments and motion were put forward by M Giorgi, of Hamersley WA 6022, on behalf of the Friends of Erindale Road Bushland, at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

M Giorgi:

I'll speak to my motion first and then I'll state what the motion is. I'm a Hamersley ratepayer and I'm the convener of the Friends of Erindale Road Bushland. Council is aware that 13.55 hectares of remnant banksia woodland at 179 Erindale Road, Hamersley, is under threat of clearing for development. On 10 May 2022, Council voted unanimously to reject an application from the landowner to have the land rezoned to enable it to be sold as a site for housing development. When considering the owner's application, the Planning and Development Committee recommended that Council not proceed with the rezoning of the bushland. The City's report, upon which this recommendation was made, also recommended the reclassification of the bushland to a locally significant natural area and that the site be investigated for rezoning from Public Use Commonwealth to Environmental Conservation, both actions which are supported by the City's Local Planning Strategy and Local Biodiversity Strategy.

At a local level, Council will be aware, and we know support, the importance of urban forest as outlined in the City's Urban Forest Plan. If this bushland in Hamersley is cleared, it would result in a significant loss of tree canopy and wildlife habitat. It is a foraging site for the critically endangered Carnaby's Black Cockatoo. As detailed in item 12.1/CF4 at the City's recent Council meeting held 18 March 2025, I quote, *"The City has previously reported on tree canopy loss across the City, which is predominantly occurring on land zoned for residential development"* and goes on to state, *"Notwithstanding the City's best attempt to help developers retain trees on site by means of priority assessment and arborist assistance."* The policy review identified that developers rarely choose to retain trees on development sites which negatively impacts the City's tree canopy coverage."

Given there are three levels of government involved in decision making regarding the future of this bushland, Council has an opportunity right now to protect this remnant urban bushland and prevent further canopy loss across the City by reclassifying it to a locally significant natural area and rezoning the site to Environmental Conservation Zone. So, my motion that I'd like to propose is...

MOTION 9.15/1

Moved Marie Giorgi, seconded Dylan Riddell

That the City RECLASSIFIES lot 802 and part lot 803, 179 Erindale Road, Hamersley to a Locally Significant Natural Area and REZONES the bushland from Public Use Commonwealth to Environmental Conservation in the City's Local Planning Scheme to ensure its protection into the future.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.16 D KELLY

The following questions and comments were put forward by D Kelly, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

- D Kelly:** I note that there was a review of the traffic pedestrian road safety issues for roads surrounding Karrinyup shopping centre was proposed by Councillor Krsticevic at the Council meeting held 18 February 2025 and the Council voted unanimously to support this motion. I also note that Main Roads, the State Government body, is responsible for Karrinyup Road. The question is, can the Council advise if it is aware of any State Government plan to resolve the traffic chaos around Karrinyup shopping centre, including Burroughs Road and Karrinyup Road?
- Director Infrastructure:** No, we are not aware of any work that has been done by Main Roads on that intersection.
- D Kelly:** Has there been any assistance or help that has been sought by any local members of Parliament, State Parliament, in that regard?
- The Mayor:** You would have to direct that question to them.
- D Kelly:** Thank you.

9.17 A OSELLI DICKSON

The following question was put forward by A Orselli-Dickson, of Inglewood WA 6052 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

A Orselli-Dickson: Why does the City of Stirling require that new commercial developments provide one tree per six car bays as a shade amenity when many other local government areas require one tree per four bays?

Director Planning & Development: The City is not planning to change that ratio. You are correct, the City does require one tree be planted per six car bays. Each local government adopts a slightly different rate. Some are the one per four, while many others, such as the Cities of Belmont and Melville, also adopt the one per six. The City is trying to focus on ensuring those trees that are planted survive and have the best chance at growing to their full potential.

A Orselli-Dickson: Thank you.

9.18 T CAMERON

The following questions and comments were put forward by T Cameron, of Trigg WA 6029 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

T Cameron: In 2017 the State Government stopped the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority's proposed road extensions that would have run north and south of Scarborough, along the Esplanade, and through the Scarborough Trigg dune ecosystem. As quoted by the WA media statement, it said, "while the road extensions would provide additional entry and exit points into and out of Scarborough Beach, they would have detrimental impacts on the existing dune system."

Why does the City of Stirling believe this new construction, being the boardwalk, is any different, and that the State Government will change their mind, having stated the detrimental impact construction would have on the dune ecosystem that's there.

The Mayor: Thank you for that question. Look, apart from the obvious fact that a boardwalk is significantly different from a road, that will all form part of the investigations and it will certainly be under the same scrutiny from the State Government and those Environmental Protection Agencies.

T Cameron: Yeah, but it's still a construction site.

The Mayor: I acknowledge that, and that will form part of the investigation.

9.19 B STONE

The following questions and comments were put forward by B Stone, of Stirling WA 6021 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

B Stone: I've got an easy question. In mid-December I submitted a request that the swamps in Stirling, or Shearwater Stirling Reserve, were very untidy and I requested that the trees, which were dead trees in the lakes, be removed and that was in mid-December and nothing has happened since that date. Thank you.

The Mayor: Thank you for that question. Sorry to hear that, the City will be in contact and ensure someone comes to see you about this.

Additional Information

The City undertook a lake debris cleanup in March 2025, retaining some logs and branches for habitat purposes. An on-site meeting was held on 8 April with Mr Stone, the ward Councillor and Conservation and Wildlife officers to discuss amenity and habitat matters.

9.20 M O'TOOLE (ON BEHALF OF M O'TOOLE)

The following questions and motion were put forward by M O'Toole, of Joondalup WA 6027, on behalf of M O'Toole, of Carine 6020 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

- M O'Toole:** I'm an environmental scientist with over 20 years' experience specialising in environmental impact assessment and environmental approvals. My question is regarding the Scarborough Trigg boardwalk. I'd like to know why wasn't a weighted multi-criteria options analysis (MCA) undertaken instead of going straight to a boardwalk proposal? MCAs are usually the first step in any pre-feasibility work. Will the Council assure the ratepayers that a weighted MCA will be undertaken prior to spending further ratepayers' funds?
- Manager Strategy & Performance:** At this stage, as part of the pre-feasibility, the City are assessing whether the coastal boardwalk is an option at all. Once that has been completed, the City will consider conducting a MCA on the proposal.
- M O'Toole:** I'm sorry, I don't think that really is an answer to the question. So, usually a MCA is performed prior to any kind of other environmental studies being conducted, which hasn't been the case in this instance and I would like to understand why that wouldn't be the next step.
- The Mayor:** I think the answer is clear in the sense that the boardwalk itself still has not gone to any actual planning stage. It is only a preliminary environmental assessment.
- M O'Toole:** Normally the first step is a multi-criteria analysis of all of the options that are available. Prior to a pre-feasibility stage, which didn't occur here. So my question is, why hasn't a MCA been undertaken as a first step and why is it not being undertaken now as a second step?
- The Mayor:** I think the answer has been given that it will be undertaken if it becomes an option.
- M O'Toole:** That would be the next step?
- The Mayor:** Well, we have got to know if the boardwalk is going to be an option first.
- M O'Toole:** That's what the multi-criteria analysis is for.
- The Mayor:** I am sorry, that is all I can say.



M O'Toole: A multi-criteria analysis is to determine whether or not the option is viable, and that's why it's normally undertaken prior to a pre-feasibility study.

The Mayor: We appreciate your comments.

M O'Toole: I would like to put forward a motion.

MOTION 9.20/1

Moved Melissa O'Toole, seconded Arriadne Bradley

That the City UNDERTAKES a weighted, multi-criteria options analysis of the options available to the Council in terms of a boardwalk or an upgraded pathway or a do nothing approach prior to further spending of ratepayers' funds.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.21 A BRADLEY

The following questions and comments were put forward by A Bradley, of Balcatta WA 6021 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

A Bradley:

There are many factors that indicate in comparison to other WA local Councils, City of Stirling drastically underperforms in areas with respect to wildlife and environmental protection. Recently a Councillor rather concerningly confirmed they didn't know that owls were native to the area. I didn't think it was funny. Anyway, this is incredibly unsettling and leaves residents full of doubts around the understanding that our Councillors have of the environmental impacts and threats currently facing areas in the City and the wildlife that occupy these spaces. How much independent research do Councillors do, if any, into decisions that impact local wildlife and the environment?

The Mayor:

You would have to ask individual Councillors that. Councillors cannot be expected to be experts on every facet of their role, they are here for community context. The City Officers are the ones that would provide the expert opinions and would provide that through evidence in reports to Council.

A Bradley:

Okay, thank you.

9.22 P MAGARAGGIA

The following questions and comments were put forward by P Magaraggia, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

P Magaraggia: I'm from the Karrinyup area, I've lived in the area for about 30 years and I'd just like to say that I'm very anti boardwalk for a couple of reasons. All the questions and mandates and preambles have all been read out so what I'd like to do is change tact and just state a couple of things. The Shire is meant to be the steward of environmental protection and sustainability.

The Mayor: Correct.

P Magaraggia: I think that's part of the City of Stirling's kind of mandate to be astute. So what I can't understand is that why has the Shire, or City of Stirling, allowed all this preamble and just given it time and energy, to actually allow the survey to even go near this protected coastal ward area, you know, that's actually mandated to be a Class A reserve forever? Here we are, spending all this time and energy, it just goes on and on when really the Shire should just shut it down, stick to the rules of the game. That's my question and statement.

The Mayor: And it is a strong statement, but this Council will follow investigations. As a Council motions come up, Council will investigate them and then they will put them to the community.

P Magaraggia: Yeah, but my statement was, you shouldn't even be giving it time of day. It should be just in legislation, which it is, A Class reserve should be untouched. Stop tampering with it. Stop meddling with it and trying to change the rules of the game.

The Mayor: Thank you, I appreciate your comments.

P Magaraggia: Thank you, for the record.

In accordance with Clause 8.5(1) of the City of Stirling Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021, the Presiding Member ADJOURNED the meeting at 8.44pm prior to Item 9.23, for a brief recess. The meeting resumed at 8.52pm.

9.23 D HOMSANY

The following questions and comments were put forward by D Homsany, of Karrinyup WA 6018 on behalf of the Clement Drive Action Group at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

D Homsany:

Mr Mayor I'd just like to ask the question, in 2021, the Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) plans, identified Clement Drive as a possible road that may become a rat run to the Karrinyup shopping centre and its development. I can say now in 2025 that actually has happened. As a local road, we should only be carrying 6,000 cars a day. Clement Drive now carries over 9,000 cars a day. My question is, Mayor, if this was identified as something that could happen in 2021, why is it now 2025 and nothing has happened? The Council has taken no action. It's had a terribly negative impact on the residents of Clement Drive. Can I just say that the bulk of the residents of Clement Drive have been there for over 20 years, some have lived there all their lives, so they're elderly, we have a large elderly population. We cannot back out of our driveways, there's hazards. We have a school, we have two schools, we have kids going to Carine that use it as an artery and kids going to Karrinyup Primary School that have to cross it every day and in peak hour it is a nightmare. It has become a terrible situation and we'd just like to know, what is the Council going to do about it? We do know that Councillor Krsticevic has passed a motion, but why is it 2025 and it's got this bad, that something, hopefully, is going to get done?

The Mayor:

It is well known that one of the primary reasons that this Council opposed that development that was approved by JDAP was that the infrastructure around it was not mature enough to cope with the extra traffic flow. It has always been one of the City's biggest concerns, to have a regional centre and see that sort of growth without the infrastructure improvements around it. Whilst your road is certainly more than a rat run, it is probably one of the main thoroughfares, there is not many ways out of there.

D Homsany:

It's become a major artery.

- The Mayor:** Most of those streets are also experiencing similar things. It has increased over that time. The City had not planned for it. There was no planning framework that said that Karrinyup was going to be the sort of centre that needed those upgrades. There has not been a lot of support in the infrastructure or the public transport down Karrinyup Road. All I can give you in terms of comfort is there is currently a motion, and there will be a transparent report that comes to this Council identifying those issues on Clement Drive and hopefully gives you some relief in possible future mitigations.
- D Homsany:** Clement Drive has six roundabouts, two chicanes, it's on a hill so the cars are either accelerating, and I'm at the roundabout of Dwyer Street and it is a very tight roundabout and all day long, trucks clinking and clanking because they just go over the roundabout, not around it, cause it's too tight. The road is not conducive, with its current structure, to take 9,000 cars a day. So, I think something definitely needs to be done. Clement Drive is under your jurisdiction. It is a local road. I know it may not have been foreseen, but now something needs to be done, and the Council needs to do something about it.
- The Mayor:** Your comments are appreciated, and it will be before this Council.

9.24 P SCHLITTER

The following questions and comments were put forward by P Schuttler, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

- P Schuttler:** Is Council aware that the Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Planning report, adopted in 2023, identifies coastal assets at risk over the next 100 years, including buildings, roads, car parks, cafes, etcetera, and that erosion is a primary coastal hazard including at South Trigg Beach A Class Reserve, and that avoidance is the preferred management option in undeveloped coastal land?
- The Mayor:** The Mayor confirmed that Council was aware.

9.25 M BOND

The following questions and motion were put forward by M Bond, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

M Bond: The ratepayers and residents of the City of Stirling want to enjoy the beaches and restaurants, the cafes and retail in the Scarborough and Trigg Beach precinct. There is a parking crisis in all Scarborough and Trigg car parks and surrounding streets. Thursday night markets; Saturday and Sunday music and dancing events; and Sunday Surf Club at Trigg and Scarborough all add to the congestion in this area. The lack of parking affects local businesses. I realise the focus is building a boardwalk as a tourist attraction, bringing an influx of tourists and visitors to our beautiful coastline. This will only exacerbate the present parking situation. My question: What solution does the Council have to mitigate the present parking crisis now in Scarborough, Trigg, South Trigg and all the surrounding streets?

The Mayor: The parking crisis is obviously a parking crisis on those extremely busy days. There is never going to be enough parking in any major destination on those days, when you have 10,000 people. Optus Stadium is a good example of that. The Council has always been very much in favour of improving public transport and connectivity, and that is why projects such as the trackless tram have been pursued. Currently the local member has a proposal on for a cat bus service to be able to transport people in and out in a more productive way. The Council has also invested in wayfinding throughout those car parks to try to make it easier, so people know not to go into those areas, and we are investigating other areas to put public car parking in.

M Bond: \$500,000 was allocated to the boardwalk feasibility study. Surely if extra parking requirements would have been investigated for the boardwalk planning and designed to proceed? You know what is the Council solution to the parking crisis before proceeding with the boardwalk?

The Mayor: Thank you, I have just provided you with that answer.

M Bond: I would like to raise a motion. As part of the recent boardwalk feasibility study, I call upon the Council to request.

MOTION 9.25/1**Moved Margaret Bond, seconded Mike Masiello**

That the City ENGAGES an independent parking specialist to assess and report on the current parking situation at Scarborough and Trigg, during events such as the Sunset Markets. The report is to include an investigation of the number of cars overflowing into surrounding residential streets. Then forecast the impact that the proposed boardwalk will have on the baseline parking situation through the anticipated increased visitation of local, national and international tourists. This report is to be shared with the ratepayers.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.**M Bond:**

The ratepayers and residents of the City of Stirling want to enjoy the beaches and restaurants, the cafes and retail in the Scarborough and Trigg Beach precinct. There is a parking crisis in all Scarborough and Trigg car parks and surrounding streets. Thursday night markets; Saturday and Sunday music and dancing events; and Sunday Surf Club at Trigg and Scarborough all add to the congestion in this area. The lack of parking affects local businesses. I realise the focus is building a boardwalk as a tourist attraction, bringing an influx of tourists and visitors to our beautiful coastline. This will only exacerbate the present parking situation. My question: What solution does the Council have to mitigate the present parking crisis now in Scarborough, Trigg, South Trigg and all the surrounding streets?

The Mayor:

The parking crisis is obviously a parking crisis on those extremely busy days. There is never going to be enough parking in any major destination on those days, when you have 10,000 people. Optus Stadium is a good example of that. The Council has always been very much in favour of improving public transport and connectivity, and that is why projects such as the trackless tram have been pursued. Currently the local member has a proposal on for a cat bus service to be able to transport people in and out in a more productive way. The Council has also invested in wayfinding throughout those car parks to try to make it easier, so people know not to go into those areas, and we are investigating other areas to put public car parking in.

M Bond:

\$500,000 was allocated to the boardwalk feasibility study. Surely if extra parking requirements would have been investigated for the boardwalk planning and designed to proceed? You know what is the Council solution to the parking crisis before proceeding with the boardwalk?

The Mayor: Thank you, I have just provided you with that answer.

M Bond: I would like to raise a motion. As part of the recent boardwalk feasibility study, I call upon the Council to request.

MOTION 9.25/1

Moved Margaret Bond, seconded Mike Masiello

That the City ENGAGES an independent parking specialist to assess and report on the current parking situation at Scarborough and Trigg, during events such as the Sunset Markets. The report is to include an investigation of the number of cars overflowing into surrounding residential streets. Then forecast the impact that the proposed boardwalk will have on the baseline parking situation through the anticipated increased visitation of local, national and international tourists. This report is to be shared with the ratepayers.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.26 P SMITH

The following question was put forward by P Smith, of Scarborough WA 6019 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

P Smith: I have a question in relation to the Scarborough Trigg coastal boardwalk. The question is, Mr Mayor, that I've been advised by people close to Council that there are preliminary drawings or at the very least a concept drawing and some costing estimated at \$10 million for the proposed boardwalk. Mr Mayor is this the case, and if so, you could put a lot of people at ease or not, if we could have some full disclosure on this issue.

The Mayor: You know everything I know, what is on the website is all I have seen. There are no other drawings.

9.27 L THOMPSON

The following comments, questions and motions were put forward by L Thompson, of Trigg WA 6029 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

L Thompson:

This is not a populist vote and should never be one. This is about being strong enough as a Mayor and as a Council to look after that beautiful area that's a Class A reserve. Anyway, that was my thing, but jeepers I needed to say that. Erosion is now here and now, I'm very concerned that the projected erosion bill for the next 15 years managing just Mettams and Watermans is near \$15 million. How much is the considerable erosion cost of a 1km going to be once you've destabilised the mobile dune system with the destructive boardwalk, that all the experts say you shouldn't build on, considering this will only exacerbate the wind erosion around pylons causing massive shifts of sand and further destroying what you are supposed to protect? How are you going to control this? And isn't this a further waste of our money when what we are dealing with is a cost-of-living crisis, and that's going to keep going. Apart from that, my motion for the next one is, can the Council please remove the completely unrealistic artist's rendering of the proposed boardwalk from their website. Remove the completely unrealistic vegetated, completely vegetated, because it will never be like that, it's not like it now and we haven't been looking after it. It is a climatic change and we're not getting that.

The Mayor:

So you want the drawings off the website?

L Thompson:

Absolutely.

MOTION 9.27/1

Moved Lisa Thompson, seconded Thomas Cameron

That the City REMOVES the unrealistic artist rendering of the proposed boardwalk from their website.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

L Thompson: My other motions is...

MOTION 9.27/2

Moved Lisa Thompson, seconded Robyn Murphy

That the City LOBBIES the Road Safety Commission to install a fixed speed camera on the northbound traffic on West Coast Highway adjacent to the South Trigg Beach Reserve to improve pedestrian safety.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

9.28 R HADLEY

The following questions, comments and motions were put forward by R Hadley, of Woodlands WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

R Hadley: I have a couple of motions here which I'd like to start with.

MOTION 9.28/1

Moved Roland Hadley

I propose a motion of NO CONFIDENCE in Mayor Irwin's lack of community engagement and non-disclosure of information. A submission was sent to the Federal Government seeking financial support for his trackless tram project. Ratepayers were not privy to this submission. If a response has been received, what was the outcome? Part A.

The motion was ruled out of order.

R Hadley: Why would you rule it out of order?

The Mayor: You have the opportunity at any election to put your no confidence in me. There is no substance to that motion. Your next question or motion, Sir.

R Hadley: I am continuing on the same line. This Mayor has failed to contact the State Government to determine whether any construction can be built in an A Class reserve. He has failed to advise essential government agencies such as the Department of Biodiversity and Conservation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Water and Environment, etcetera. Worse still Mark Irwin, Mayor, Sheriff of Scarborough, as he now is called, has failed to contact all the ratepayers to see if a multi-million boardwalk is warranted or wanted in the first place. Appalling negligence and seemingly allowed to by disinterested, mute Councillors.

MOTION 9.28/2

Moved Roland Hadley

I propose a motion of NO CONFIDENCE in Mayor Irwin's lack of community engagement and non-disclosure of information.

The motion was ruled out of order.

R Hadley:

My second motion: a vote of no confidence in Mayor Irwin's total lack of accountability and transparency, in spending ratepayers' money is critical to this Council. He issued statements to the media without prior consultation with ratepayers. He states no public funds were spent in relation to his trackless tram project. Yet, \$27,000 was spent on trips to China, over \$10,000 was spent on producing trackless tram videos, \$20,000 was spent on flights and accommodation to Canberra to lobby for his trackless tram, \$1,260 was spent on specially printed hats promoting his tram, which I'm sure contravenes local government regulations and heaven knows what else. We learn through the media that \$700,000 was allocated for Perth Glory to acquire part of Mirrabooka Reserve. How does Mayor Irwin arrive at precisely \$700,000 for Perth Glory, \$500,000 for environmental study, \$400,000 for shire boundary markers, \$350,000 for Christmas lights, \$90,000 to illuminate a clock tower? We request that a report to Council be made detailing how all these projects moved to funding, approval and budgeting stage without prior consultation of affected ratepayers.

The Mayor:

You do not need a motion for that, it happens already. I am impressed that you think I do all that on my own. The City has an incredible CEO and Executive Team who do all that work behind the scenes and then Council makes a combined decision to approve things through a budget process. It is as simple as that. I certainly do not do all the work on all those things. The CEO and Executive Team do all of that work and provide transparent reporting to this Council who makes collective decisions. It is defined clearly under the Act.

R Hadley:

On behalf of many ratepayers, we hope that Mayor Mark Irwin apologises to Councillor Re as she was found not guilty by the State Administration Tribunal of charges against her of being a bully and a racist. These charges were quick to be highlighted and publicised by Mark Irwin. We also asked how many charges have been brought against Councillor Re since he was nominated and appointed as Mayor of this Council?

The Mayor: I have nothing to apologise for. I have never accused Councillor Re of any of those things. I would also like to say that I have not brought any charges against Councillor Re in the time I have been Mayor, so I do not know what you are talking about. It is a matter of public record.

9.29 H DYMOND

The following question was put forward by H Dymond, of Karrinyup WA 6018 at the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

H Dymond: Why does Council think another environmental study is needed for a coastal boardwalk when City officers reported in 2022 that there have not been any significant changes to the topography of the dune system since the two previous proposals were investigated in 2005 and 2013?

The Mayor: There has been a preliminary assessment that identified that the boardwalk can proceed. The Council will look at specific designs and then get them assessed. This has not been done previously.

9.30 R SAVAGE-JONES

The following comments were put forward by H Dymond, of Gwelup WA 6018 prior to the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

R Savage-Jones:

The following question relates to COVID19 Injections. The City of Stirling has a duty of care to its constituents. The Covid-19 injections are dangerous and are killing and injuring people. Local Government that simply takes orders and advice from a compromised Federal Government, TGA and CDC is negligent of their duty of care but is taking part in genocide. The SV40 cancer promoting synthetic DNA contamination in the shots is over 145 times what is considered tolerable. It is causing a massive spike in cancer and autoimmune disease in all highly vaccinated countries. Please use the Port Hedland Council to help inform and guide how to provide informed consent to your constituents.

www.porthedland.wa.gov.au/documents/external-resources

www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZikB8esX64

www.youtube.com/watch?v=ufu74W--cXs

www.youtube.com/watch?v=p-qU6jq8wv8&t=8s

Director Community Development:

The safety, quality and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines is determined by the Federal Government through the Department of Health and Aged Care, and the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA).

9.31 S COATES

The following questions and comments were put forward by S Coates, of Churchlands WA 6018 prior to the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

S Coates:

It has come to my attention that residents/ratepayers who are unable to attend the meeting in person are not permitted to vote via deputation. Could you kindly clarify why this is the case? Specifically, what is the reasoning behind the decision to not allow ratepayers who cannot attend the EGM to participate in voting through deputation? Is there any possibility for this process to be reconsidered in the future, ensuring all ratepayers have a fair opportunity to be heard and have their vote counted, regardless of their ability to attend the meeting in person?

Acting Manager Governance:

The requirement of an elector to be present at the EGM to be entitled to vote is prescribed in the *Local Government Act 1995* and the Local Government Administration Regulations 1996. Specifically, with regards to voting at a general meeting of electors:

1. Each elector **who is present** at a general meeting of electors is entitled to one vote on each matter at the meeting but does not have to vote.
2. All decisions at a general meeting of electors are to be made by a simple majority of votes.
3. Voting at a general or special meeting of electors is to be conducted so that no voter's vote is secret.

This is not a decision of the City and therefore is not within the City's control to change.

S Coates:

I am writing to inquire why there does not seem to be a proactive effort to check if properties are paving or laying plastic grass over the Council's verges, often to turn the verge into additional personal parking. There is a policy against this, but I have yet to see any action taken to stop this. As you are aware, paving over verges negatively impact local wildlife, drainage, and the overall aesthetic of the community. Can you please clarify what steps are being taken to ensure that properties comply with your regulations regarding verge paving, and whether there are any plans to address this issue in the future? When I recently asked my two ward Councillors about this it was suggested I report the properties as the Council did not have enough time, see response below.

"Unfortunately, the Team doesn't have the resources available to undertake proactive inspections so does rely on residents for feedback about cases of non-compliance. Sharon's suggestion for the City to provide more education about the requirements relating to verge areas is a great idea. Although there is nothing planned for the immediate future, the City has undertaken leaflet drops and marketing campaigns in the past to raise awareness about what is permitted."

If leaflet drops are made, then I don't see why proactive inspections can't be made at the same time? Also, why are our ward Councillors not touring their wards on a regular basis to see what is happening in their ward?

Director Planning & Development:

The Verge Control team focus on new crossover applications and reported instances of non-compliance, allowing the City to address specific community concerns as they arise. The City inspects all crossovers and verges at the end of a development to ensure compliance with relevant requirements, addressing any issues before releasing a bond held for the works. If a verge treatment does not comply with the applicable Local Law or Policy, officers work with the landowner to bring it into compliance, often considering any verge treatments in the immediate vicinity to ensure consistency. The City does not have the resources to proactively inspect all verges throughout the City.

We recognise the importance of educating the community about the regulations for hardstand verges. In the past, we have conducted marketing campaigns, newspaper articles, and included leaflets in residents' rates packages to raise awareness. These efforts aim to inform residents about the City's requirements for hardstand verges, and we plan to undertake similar initiatives when the Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2009 is reviewed this year.

Ward Councillors play a crucial role in representing their constituents and making policy decisions that benefit the community. Elected Members are active in their communities and dedicate many hours to understanding the concerns of local residents. Elected Members do not act or make decisions as individuals and are not typically involved in day-to-day operational activities like conducting inspections or enforcing compliance. While Councillors may tour their wards and engage with residents, their role is strategic oversight rather than operational enforcement.

S Coates:

Why on the 28 May 2024 did the Mayor personally move a motion for the City to seek the support and collaboration of the then local member, Christine Tonkin, and State Government for a design for a local connector road through the Churchlands Bushland? We hear nonstop talk, by the City of Stirling, about increasing our tree canopy yet this motion will potentially destroy canopy we already have and leave our native wildlife with less habitat. What consultation will the council undertake with ratepayers and resident, who hardly know much about the proposed "connector" road, before this is taken any further. The main benefactor will be a private school that pays \$0 in rates, much less than I pay, and I believe few students live within the Churchlands area.

Director Infrastructure:

For clarification, the motion regarding the proposed Local Connector Road between Empire Avenue and Pearson Street was not moved by Mayor Irwin. The decision to seek funding for a local connector road was endorsed unanimously by Council. This decision was made to allow further investigation of concerns from members of the community regarding traffic issues through the Churchlands Green Estate

Should the project receive funding for design, there will be an extensive community engagement process to ensure that all affected parties are given the opportunity to provide their feedback and comments.

9.32 R GEORGE

The following question was put forward by S Coates, of Watermans Bay WA 6020 prior to the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

S Coates:

I would like to know what and why the anti-boardwalk people are trying to protect this boring and uninteresting piece of dunes when WA has hundreds if not thousands of kilometres of sand dunes while totally disregarding safety and enjoyment of walkers along this piece of pathway when there are boardwalks in far more sensitive and beautiful parts of Australia and the world. I would like to know what and why the anti-boardwalk people are trying to protect this boring and uninteresting piece of dunes when WA has hundreds if not thousands of kilometres of sand dunes while totally disregarding safety and enjoyment of walkers along this piece of pathway when there are boardwalks in far more sensitive and beautiful parts of Australia and the world.

Manager Strategy & Performance:

The City values the contribution of all members of the community and will consider all viewpoints as part of the Coastal Boardwalk Feasibility Study.

9.33 M INMAN

The following questions and comments were put forward by M Inman, of Trigg WA 6029 prior to the Electors' General Meeting held 24 March 2025.

M Inman:

Is the Mayor and any Councillors in support of the proposed boardwalk prepared to accept the legacy of destroying flora and fauna during construction and impacting potential heritage and ethnographic sites, hydrogeology, leading to ongoing maintenance costs, visual pollution, weed, disease, rubbish, fire risk (from smoking and vapes), obsolescence (with climate change erosion line) and increased people access trampling a Class A Bush Forever Threatened Ecological Community of flora for a safety ploy that is proven unnecessary (referencing the adequacy and good condition of the existing path - Stirling Acting Director Infrastructure 18/3/25); for a Scarborough business community (supposedly) to try and attract more people from already over-crowded beach carparks (1 & 2) and for tourists (supposedly) who would rather see unobstructed views of our world-unique beautiful limestone cusp being the Trigg - Scarborough beaches?

Boardwalks and structures can be seen all around the world however tourists come to Australia to see our beautiful unique and unimpacted scenery, flora and fauna - why risk this by unnecessary destruction and ongoing impacts?

Why is the Mayor and any supportive Councillors contravening their own living green concepts and management plans for this proposed boardwalk? You only have to look down the road to see how ugly, disused and ineffectual the Floreat Boardwalk has become. Boardwalks cannot and will not benefit cyclists or runners or improve safety. Boardwalk studies from Singapore and Portugal have mixed results on effectiveness in terms of environmental conservation. Boardwalks should only be used as a last resort in order to protect an already degraded and highly human-impacted area of which this is not (yet).

Manager Strategy & Performance:

The City is currently exploring the feasibility of constructing a coastal boardwalk in the South Trigg Beach Class A Reserve. The environmental, economic and social impacts and opportunities will be considered as part of this process and will inform decision making as the project progresses.

10. CLOSURE

The Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9.16pm

These minutes were confirmed as a true and correct record of proceedings on:

Date:

SIGNED:

.....
Presiding Member Signature

.....
Presiding Member Name (*please print*)

13.2 CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND REAFFIRMATION OF PRESIDING AND DEPUTY MEMBERS

Business Unit:	Governance	Service: Council Governance
Ward:	Not Applicable	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution**0525/008****Moved Councillor Krsticevic, seconded Councillor Giudici**

1. That Councillor Andrea Creado **CEASES** to be the appointed representative for the Balga Ward of the Planning and Development Committee and is **APPOINTED** as the representative for the Balga Ward of the Community and Resources Committee from 13 May 2025.
2. That Councillor Michael Dudek **CEASES** to be the appointed representative for the Balga Ward of the Community and Resources Committee and is **APPOINTED** as the representative for the Balga Ward of the Planning and Development Committee from 13 May 2025.
3. That Council **REAFFIRMS** the appointment of Councillor Stephanie Proud JP as the Presiding Member and Councillor Suzanne Migdale as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Planning and Development Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
4. That Council **REAFFIRMS** the appointment of Councillor Karlo Perkov as the Presiding Member and Councillor Teresa Olow as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Community and Resources Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
5. That Council **REAFFIRMS** the appointment of Councillor David Lagan as the Presiding Member and Councillor Karlo Perkov as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Audit Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
6. That Council **REAFFIRMS** the appointment of Mayor Mark Irwin as the Presiding Member of the CEO Performance Review Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
7. That Council **NOTES** that in the event that the Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding Member are not able to perform the functions of Presiding Member, the committee members present are to choose one of themselves to preside at the meeting.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (13/0) by an Absolute Majority.**For:** Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.**Against:** Nil.

Recommendation

1. That Councillor Andrea Creado CEASES to be the appointed representative for the Balga Ward of the Planning and Development Committee and is APPOINTED as the representative for the Balga Ward of the Community and Resources Committee from 13 May 2025.
2. That Councillor Michael Dudek CEASES to be the appointed representative for the Balga Ward of the Community and Resources Committee and is APPOINTED as the representative for the Balga Ward of the Planning and Development Committee from 13 May 2025.
3. That Council REAFFIRMS the appointment of Councillor Stephanie Proud JP as the Presiding Member and Councillor Suzanne Migdale as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Planning and Development Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
4. That Council REAFFIRMS the appointment of Councillor Karlo Perkov as the Presiding Member and Councillor Teresa Olow as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Community and Resources Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
5. That Council REAFFIRMS the appointment of Councillor David Lagan as the Presiding Member and Councillor Karlo Perkov as the Deputy Presiding Member of the Audit Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
6. That Council REAFFIRMS the appointment of Mayor Mark Irwin as the Presiding Member of the CEO Performance Review Committee from 13 May 2025 until 18 October 2025.
7. That Council NOTES that in the event that the Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding Member are not able to perform the functions of Presiding Member, the committee members present are to choose one of themselves to preside at the meeting.

NB: ABSOLUTE MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRE

Purpose

Recommendation 1 and 2 relate to a request from the Balga Ward Councillors to switch committee membership.

The remaining recommendations are in response to the Department of Local Government's Local Government Reform requirements, which outline that Presiding Members and Deputy Presiding Members for Committees established under section 5.8 of the *Local Government Act 1995* are required to be appointed by an absolute majority Council decision. This needs to occur no later than 1 July 2025. This report ensures that Council is compliant with the new legislation.

Details

At its Special Meeting of Council held 7 November 2023, members and deputy members were appointed to the City's Planning and Development Committee (Special Council Resolution Number 1123/004); Community and Resources Committee (Special Council Resolution 1123/005); CEO Performance Review Committee (Special Council Resolution Number 1123/006); and the Audit Committee (Special Council Resolution Number 1123/007).

The Chief Executive Officer opened the first meeting of each committee following the Special Council Meeting held 7 November 2023. The election of Presiding and Deputy Presiding Members occurred as the first matter of business at these meetings. Amendments to section 5.12 and 5.13 provisions require that Council make these appointments by an absolute majority. The Council appointments are to be made by 1 July 2025.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Nil.

Stakeholder Engagement

The Department of Local Government has undertaken sector-wide and community consultation as part of the *Local Government Act 1995* reform process.

Recommended Action

In accordance with Sections 5.9(2)(a), 5.10(2) and 5.11(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, it is recommended that Council approves the request of the Balga Ward Councillors to resign from their positions on their respective major committees, and be appointed to the alternate major committee. Councillor Andrea Creado will cease her role as a committee member of Planning and Development, and be appointed to Community and Resources. Councillor Michael Dudek will cease his role as a committee member of Community and Resources, and be appointed to Planning and Development. These appointments will remain in place until 18 October 2025.

It is also recommended that Council reaffirms the committee appointments of all existing Presiding Members and Deputy Presiding Members, in line with Local Government Reform requirements.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

[Local Government Act 1995](#)

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our leadership

Objective: A well-governed City

Priority: Comply with legislation, standards and obligations

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Governance	The City will act with integrity and implement appropriate processes and controls to avoid breach of legislation.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

13.3 COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM - ROUND 3 LARGE GRANTS

Business Unit:	Strategy and Performance	Service: Strategy & Performance
Ward:	Not Applicable	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/009

Moved Councillor Paparde, seconded Councillor Hatton

That Council APPROVES the Community Grants Program Round 3 Large Grant recommendations for a total cash amount of \$85,000 as contained in Attachment 1.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (13/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Olow, Paparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

Recommendation

That Council APPROVES the Community Grants Program Round 3 Large Grant recommendations for a total cash amount of \$85,000 as contained in Attachment 1.

Purpose

To approve the Community Grants Program Round 3 Large Grant applications that have been recommended for funding by the City's internal grant assessment panels.

Details

On 1 July 2024, the City launched its 2024/2025 Community Grants Program, a centralised approach to the distribution of grants to the community. The Community Grants Program Guidelines provide detail on eligibility requirements and priorities for the program. Grant funds will be distributed to the community via five grant streams:

- Active and Healthy Communities
- Innovative and Productive Communities
- Locally-led and Creative Communities
- Sustainable Communities
- Vibrant Communities

An overview of the priorities and eligibility criteria for each grant stream can be found in the Community Grants Program Guidelines on the City's website at www.stirling.wa.gov.au/grants. Three types of grants are available - small, medium and large. Grant applications are assessed by a panel of City officers who provide recommendations for funding.

Small and medium grants, which are those recommended by the panel to receive \$20,000 or less, will be submitted to a City Director for approval. All grants awarded or declined will be reported on a quarterly basis to the City's Audit Committee to provide full transparency to Council and all successful grant projects will be listed on the City's website to ensure this information is provided to the community.

As per the Guidelines, those applications recommended by the panel to receive \$20,001 or more will be submitted to Council for approval.

Eligible applications are then assessed by a Grant Assessment Panel based on the following criteria:

% of score	Criteria (what applicants address in their application)	Measure (how we assess the application)
40%	1. What is your activity, and how will you deliver it? 2. What are the expected outcomes of your activity? 3. How will you know if your activity is a success?	a. Are the aims and objectives clearly identified and do they align to the objectives of <i>Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032</i> ? b. Does the project deliver the specific outcomes of the grant stream?
30%	4. Why is your activity important? 5. How will the local community benefit from your activity? 6. Who will be involved in your activity?	c. Is there a clearly identified local need for this activity? d. How many City of Stirling residents will benefit? e. Does the applications provide evidence of community support or involvement?
30%	7. What is your budget? 8. Will you be contributing towards your activity? 9. How will you manage your budget? 10. What is your experience in delivering similar activities?	a. Is the budget clear and realistic? b. Does the activity demonstrate value for money? c. Does the applicant have the financial capacity to deliver the project? d. Is the project well planned and achievable within the timeframes?

A score out of 10 for each measure is provided by each assessment panel member and this score is weighted to give a final score out of 100. The scores from each assessment panel member are then averaged to provide a final score. Generally, only those applications that scored above 70 points are recommended for funding.

Round 3 Large Grant Recommendations

Round 3 of the Community Grants Program opened 1 February 2025 and closed 28 February 2025 with 14 small, 14 medium and seven large applications received. To promote the Round 3 grants, the City developed quick view videos featuring information and advice from previous applicants. Of the 14 small and 14 medium grant applications, a total of six small and 11 medium applications were approved by a City Director for a total value of \$232,366.40.

Of the seven large grant applications, two applications have been recommended for funding by the City’s assessment panels with a total cash value of \$85,000. One large grant application was deferred by the panel to a medium grant category and was approved by a City Director.

A summary of the recommended Large Grants can be found in the table below:

Applicant	Activity	Grant Stream	Previous grant in 2023/2024	Panel Score	Grant Amount Recommendation
Salty Folk Inc (Auspice - Salty Events Pty Ltd)	Summer X Salt Markets	Vibrant Communities	\$31,000	74	\$35,000
ArtConnect Initiative Inc	FringeConnect Stirling 2026	Vibrant Communities	N/A	74	\$50,000

A detailed assessment is provided (Attachment 1) which outlines further information including the activity details, assessment panel score, the recommended grant amount and estimated value in kind support (VIK) from the City. The VIK contribution may include marketing of the activity, waste management and/or the waiver of venue hire or development application fees.

A table outlining the ineligible or declined large grant applications is included in confidential Attachment 2.

All approved small, medium and large grant applications will be published on the City’s website [here](#) once grant agreements have been signed by all parties.

Financial Assessment and Implications

A total funding pool of \$1,150,000 for the Community Grants Program is included in the City’s Corporate Business Plan and Budget for 2024/2025. A total of 201 applications (inclusive of Round 3 small and medium grants) amounting to \$930,543.88 has been distributed via the Community Grants Program this financial year. The large grants recommended within Round 3 of \$85,000 are within current budget parameters.

The next round of small, medium and large grant funding in July 2025 will be managed through the 2025-2026 approved budget allocation.

Stakeholder Engagement

The Community Grants Program was extensively promoted through a targeted marketing campaign in January and February. This campaign included digital screen promotions in all libraries, paid social media advertisements, and targeted e-newsletter updates. To enhance awareness and encourage applications, the City also produced nine mini-films featuring past successful applicants discussing their grant experiences. These films were shared on the City’s YouTube channel, social media platforms, and the Community Grants webpage. This webpage serves as a central hub for all grant-related information, including comprehensive FAQs and advice. Past applicants were directly informed about the new grant round opening. The City also provides pre-lodgement advice to assist all applicants in developing their grant applications.

In June 2025, the City is planning to host a Library Exhibition to provide an overview of the program guidelines, with grant support officers available to assist community members to identify the most appropriate grant stream and understand application requirements.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that Council approves the Community Grants Program Round 3 Large Grant recommendations for a total cash amount of \$85,000 as per Attachment 1.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

Community Grants Program Policy & Guidelines

[Local Government Act 1995](#)

Meeting Date	Council Resolution Number	Council Resolution
20 June 2023	0623/023	<i>“That Council ADOPTS the City of Stirling Community Grants Policy, to replace the Community Arts and Events Policy; the Grants and Funding Policy; and the Financial Assistance, Donations, Grants and Recognition Policy.”</i>

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our leadership

Objective: A well-governed City

Priority: Comply with legislation, standards and obligations

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Governance	The City will act with integrity and implement appropriate processes and controls to avoid breach of legislation.
Funding	The City will take sufficient financial risk to enable it to achieve its strategic objectives, providing it does not significantly impact on the long term financial sustainability of the City.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Attachment 1 - Community Grants Program Round 3 Large Grant Recommendations [↓](#)

Attachment 2 - Ineligible/Declined Round 3 Large Grant Applications (previously circulated to Elected Members under confidential separate cover)

Available for viewing at meeting

Nil

Linked Documents

Nil.

Community Grants Program Round 3 Grant Recommendations

Applicant:	Salty Folk Inc (Auspice - Salty Events Pty Ltd)
Activity:	Summer X Salt Markets
Date:	18/10/2025 - 21/03/2026
Location:	Clarko Reserve, 348 West Coast Dr, Trigg, WA, 6029, Australia
Grant stream:	Vibrant Communities – Large Grants

Assessment

Total Averaged Weighted Score = 74

What is the activity?	The Summer X Salt Markets by Salty Folk Inc is a beachside market at Clarko Reserve Trigg that supports local artisans and small businesses promoting ocean sustainability and coastal living. Free activities include young musicians' performances, yoga, pilates, sunrise dips with Seagals, and beach clean-ups with Sea Shepherd. Highlights are the \$5,000 Salty Start Up grant, Mini Makers for young entrepreneurs, growers corner, and a zero-waste event with reusable items.	Average Weighted Score 31
Why is it important?	The Summer X Salt Markets, a key event in WA's calendar, features 14 markets at Clarko Reserve, drawing over 60,000 visitors. It engages the community, supports 200+ local businesses, boosts the local economy, and promotes sustainability and well-being. Each year, the markets generate over \$1.7 million in revenue for the local area.	Average Weighted Score 23
How will it be delivered?	Salty Folk Inc, through Salty Events, has organised the Summer X Salt Markets in the City of Stirling for nine years. With seven years at Clarko Reserve and previous locations at Brighton and Scarborough, they have a trusted reputation for hosting community events. Collaborating with local stakeholders, they aim to commemorate the markets' 10th anniversary in 2025 with interactive activities, special guests, and a social media campaign.	Average Weighted Score 20

Recommendation

There was strong support for recommending funding for this key event in Trigg. The Summer X Salt Markets are a well-attended series of markets that bring vibrancy and activation to the local area. Given the competitiveness of this year's Community Grants program, the panel recommended funding in alignment with the previous applicant's allocation, including an increase in line with the CPI.

Total Activity Budget	Requested Funds	Funded in 2023/24	Recommended funds
\$265,327	\$50,000	Yes \$31,000	\$35,000 plus VIK (venue hire, promotion and DA Fees)

Community Grants Program Round 3 Grant Recommendations

Applicant:	Art Connect Inc
Activity:	FringeConnect Stirling 2026
Date:	12/02/2026 - 22/02/2026
Location:	Scarborough Sports and Community Club, 75 Deanmore Rd, Scarborough
Grant stream:	Vibrant Communities – Large Grants

Assessment

Total Averaged Weighted Score = 74

What is the activity?	To create a WORLD FRINGE hub in the City of Stirling over two fun-filled weekends in February 2026, FringeConnect Stirling 2026 will feature up to 56 eclectic performances over eight days, with a total capacity for 8400 patrons, showcasing a diverse range of local and international acts. This will be another vehicle for local residents to participate in community life, attract visitors to the City of Stirling, and promote economic activity in the area.	Average Weighted Score 29.5
Why is it important?	It brings the arts to the Stirling community, supports local and emerging artists, stimulates the local economy, and enhances cultural enrichment and community engagement. ARTRAGE reports show that 10% of their FRINGE WORLD audiences reside in the City of Stirling. The Fringe venue has limited restaurant capacity ticketholders, both local residents and visitors will be encouraged to take advantage of the multitude of restaurant offerings available at the Bend in the Road, Scarborough beachfront, Morris Place and surrounding areas.	Average Weighted Score 23
How will it be delivered?	The ArtConnect Initiative, formed in 2023, will partner with local town teams and community groups. The Festival Director will leverage the extensive expertise of the ArtConnect Committee. The event, curated by an experienced Arts Producer, will feature performances in two spaces (220 and 80 seats) and be part of FRINGE WORLD 2026, benefiting from ARTRAGE's support in ticketing, promotion, and access to new audiences.	Average Weighted Score 21.5

Recommendation

The panel viewed this new application as an excellent initiative to reintroduce the Fringe Festival in the City of Stirling. It was acknowledged that funding is essential for this inception year to ensure the project's success. The City intends to collaborate closely with the applicant throughout the initial year, aiming to develop the project into a sustainable event that will require less financial support from the City in the future.

Total Activity Budget	Requested Funds	Funded in 2023/24	Recommended funds
\$87,810	\$50,000	N/A	\$50,000 plus VIK (promotion)

Councillor Suzanne Migdale returned to the meeting at 8.51pm during Item 13.4.

13.4 CEUF OPPORTUNITY

Community Energy Upgrade Funds Opportunity

Business Unit:	Facilities, Projects and Assets	Service: Project Management
Ward:	Lawley	Location: 62 Alexander Drive, Inglewood Western Australia 6052
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Moved Councillor Lagan, seconded Councillor Re

That Council does NOT SUPPORT heat pumps as the preferred renewable heating option for Stirling Leisure - Inglewood at this point in time and that the heating options for the facility be reviewed in 24 months' time.

During debate, it was suggested that the word '*in*' be replaced with '*within*'. The mover and seconder agreed to this change.

Council Resolution

0525/010

Moved Councillor Lagan, seconded Councillor Re

That Council does NOT SUPPORT heat pumps as the preferred renewable heating option for Stirling Leisure - Inglewood at this point in time and that the heating options for the facility be reviewed within 24 months' time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (9/5).

For: Councillors Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Olow, Perkov and Re.

Against: Councillors Creado, Migdale, Papparde, Proud and Mayor Irwin.

Recommendation

1. That Council SUPPORTS heat pumps as the preferred renewable heating option for Stirling Leisure Inglewood.
2. That Council ENDORSES the submission of an application to the Community Energy Upgrade Funds (Round 2) for the installation of heat pumps at the Stirling Leisure Inglewood.
3. That Council NOTES the project commitments of \$2.5m in 2026/27 and \$2.5m in 2027/28 that will be listed for approval in the relevant annual budgets

Referred

This item was REFERRED to the Council meeting to be held 13 May 2025 at the Council meeting held 1 April 2025 to allow further information to be provided to Elected Members.

Additional Information - 13 May 2025

Sustainable energy at Stirling Leisure - Inglewood.

The Sustainable Energy Action Plan (SEAP) identified the '*switch from gas supplies to geothermal heating systems or heat pumps powered by renewable electricity*' as one of its key strategies. As a result, sustainable energy has always been a consideration in development plans for Stirling Leisure - Inglewood and has also been included in briefings to Council since at least 2021. This was assumed to be geothermal, however staff have been investigating heat pumps in recent years.

Heat pumps are not a new technology and are now becoming popular in Australia after being used in Europe for decades. In 2023, work undertaken on behalf of the City identified heat pumps, supported by new and more efficient solar panels, and were preferred over geothermal systems based on both financial and CO² reduction grounds. This work was well timed as it has aligned with the Federal Government's Community Energy Upgrade Fund (CEUF) which supports change from the use of fossil fuels (gas) to renewable energy sources through electrification and use of technology such as heat pumps.

City staff have investigated the use of geothermal and heat pumps and have met and discussed this with numerous installers and engineering companies both local and interstate, as well as visiting other local government sites to observe and gather feedback from site operators. This has resulted in the development of a concept that is tailored to the City's needs.

Power Purchase Agreements and Renewable Energy Certificates

The procurement of '*renewable electricity to bridge the gap that cannot be generated or stored by the City*' is another key strategy of the SEAP. The City recently entered its second WALGA Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), being accepted by Council at its meeting held 4 March 2025 (Council Resolution Number 0325/028). The first agreement was accepted by Council at its meeting held 14 November 2021 (Council Resolution Number 1121/019).

The PPA allows for the purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) to enable the City to meet its renewable electricity and greenhouse gases emissions targets. To date, the City has, and anticipates purchasing, the following RECs:

- 2023/24: \$22,607 (ex GST).
- 2024/25 (anticipated): \$130,000 (ex GST), current spend of \$78,923.
- 2025/26 (anticipated): \$170,000 (ex GST).

Gas Boilers

Gas boilers are an essential part of the required infrastructure at Stirling Leisure Inglewood, irrespective of the sustainable energy solution as they provide a 'back up' heating solution. As part of the recent upgrades to the outdoor pools at Stirling Leisure Inglewood, six new 150kW boilers were installed to complete a nine-boiler array (alongside three existing boilers) for the outdoor pool. The approximate cost for this work was \$307,000 inclusive of associated pipework and Building Management System (BMS).

Previous work on the indoor pools replaced two x 500kW standard boilers with a new 'rack' that housed five efficient Condensing Boilers at a cost of approximately \$253,000. As a result, the cost of recently installed gas boilers at Stirling Leisure Inglewood is approximately \$560,000.

Gas boilers provide a 'back up' for both heat pumps and geothermal and are currently used for this purpose at Scarborough Beach Pool.

Heat Pumps

Concept plans and visuals for a proposed heat pump system were included in a briefing to Elected Members on 10 March 2025. The design concept shows an array of 16 commercial heat pumps located just behind the existing plant room at the northwest corner of the facility. The heat pump for the spa will be situated in the spa plant room.

Heat pumps need to be placed in a well-ventilated area to ensure optimal performance and will be installed outdoors, shaded and fenced. The noise generated is contained within their casing, with an expected level of around 50 dB. This is comparable to light traffic or a normal conversation.

The total project costs for the heat pumps include the new solar panels, power upgrade and BMS (controls) but not project management by the City.

At this stage the City has no preferred manufacturer or installer. Subject to approval of the project, detailed design will be undertaken which will include performance-based specifications which can then be used to tender for a recommended manufacturer. The project will be publicly tendered, and the availability of contractors and equipment will be researched as part of procurement planning.

A cost estimate is shown in confidential Attachment 1, which was originally circulated to Elected Members in March 2025. A more detailed cost estimate is shown in confidential Attachment 3.

With respect to cost savings, approximately \$303,000 will be saved in the first year of operation, primarily resulting from reduced energy (gas) costs.

Estimates of capital costs

Further details of capital costs are shown in confidential Attachment 2.

State of Australian Aquatic Facilities 2025.

Royal Life Saving Australia has recently released its report on the 'State of Australian Aquatic Facilities 2025'. The report highlights the CEUF as a program aiming to '*help local governments make their facilities more energy efficient, cut their emissions and reduce their energy bills*' by, amongst other things, '*replacing energy-intensive heating in pools with heat pumps*'. It also lists 20 Aquatic Facilities that were recipients of Round 1 funds.

Cost Comparisons

Cost comparisons, reviewed by the Manager Finance and inclusive of payback periods, are shown in confidential Attachment 3 and compare the following options:

- Continuing with gas at the current price of \$17/GJ.
- Continuing with gas at the 'best' price of \$13/GJ.
- Continuing with gas at the 'worst' price of \$20/GJ.
- Geothermal.
- Heat Pumps (without CEUF funding).
- Heat Pumps (with CEUF funding).

The comparison will also include the following:

- Capital costs (if relevant).
- Energy costs over 20 years.
- Maintenance costs over 20 years.
- Total operating costs over 20 years.
- REC purchasing costs over 20 years.
- Total costs over 20 years.
- Savings (or loss) compared to gas.
- Simple payback period (years).
- Carbon emissions.

The original report presented to the Community and Resources Committee on 25 March 2025, and subsequently to Council on 1 April 2025, is shown below.

Purpose

To seek Council endorsement of a funding application to the CEUF.

Details

Sustainable Energy Action Plan (SEAP) 2020-2030

Council endorsed (Council Resolution Number 0521/019) the City's [Sustainable Energy Action Plan 2020-2030](#) (SEAP) with two targets for the City's corporate operations and services:

- 70% emissions reduction by 2030 (and 35% by 2025); and
- 100% renewable electricity provision by 2030 (with 50% by 2025).

The reduction of gas use in aquatic centres is a key action to achieve SEAP goals and Stirling Leisure - Inglewood is projected to be the highest carbon emitter and gas consumer when the Scarborough Beach Pool returns to normal operations. Sustainable energy for pool heating has been included in all previous concepts for a pool upgrade.

Comment

City staff have worked with engineering companies to identify the most cost-effective renewable heating option for the Stirling Leisure - Inglewood and heat pumps have been chosen as the optimal solution. If the City installs heat pumps at Stirling Leisure - Inglewood, it could be the first fully electric public aquatic centre powered by renewables in Western Australia.

There are two main options for a renewable energy source - either geothermal heating or heat pumps. The pros and cons are listed in Table 1 and a comparison is shown in Table 2.

	Pros	Cons
Geothermal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long life span: 50 years • Low carbon density throughout the entire life cycle • Quiet operations: minimal noise during operation • Environmentally friendly: fully powered by natural energy resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult maintenance: invisible and corrosive submerged pumps and pipes • Complex systems: complex 5 steps for heating with components spread across the entire site • Long out of service: few geothermal specialists available in WA • High installation cost: \$6.6 million • High maintenance cost: \$1.5 million over the past six years • Poor reputation: many local governments with geothermal have experienced similar issues
Heat pumps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to maintain: only 3 simple steps for heating, all components in one casing • Simple system: operates like home A/C • Dual functionality: provides both heating and cooling simultaneously • Tailored temperature control: each pool has its own individual heat pump • Short payback: 13 years without the grant and 6.5 years with the grant (\$7.7 million in energy savings over 20 years) • Fully renewable: combined with solar PVs, offers the same carbon savings as geothermal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorter life span compared to geothermal: 20 years • Higher carbon density for the full life cycle: due to the carbon emissions associated with producing and installing solar panels • Higher noise level compared to geothermal: more noticeable operational noise so may require some noise attenuation

Table 1: Pros and Cons

		Heat pumps + Solar PVs (pools & space heating + domestic hot water)	Geothermal (Pool heating only)
Estimated capital cost		\$ 4,800,000	\$6,600,000
Estimated annual cost saving	Total	\$360,000	\$80,000
	Maintenance cost savings	-\$30,000	-\$230,000
	Energy cost savings	\$320,000	\$240,000
	*Carbon offset purchasing cost saving	\$70,000	\$70,000
Simple Payback	(Years)	13	82
Expected lifetime	(Years)	20	50
Carbon reductions	(tCO2-e)	762	763

Table 2: Renewable heating options comparison table

**Carbon offset purchasing cost: Gas boilers need to buy renewable energy certificates (RECs) to compensate for their whole emissions to achieve the City’s SEAP targets. In contrast, heat pumps and geothermal systems, which are powered by renewable energy, need fewer RECs than gas boilers.*

A breakdown of the budget estimate is shown within confidential Attachment 1.

At this stage, the project does not include a battery as it is anticipated that all power generated by the solar panels will be used in real time, that is, there will be no excess generation to be stored. A battery of sufficient capacity for this site would cost in the vicinity of \$1 million.

Community Energy Upgrades Funds opportunity

CEUF strongly supports the use of heat pumps, and the City could leverage this opportunity to make the Stirling Leisure - Inglewood more sustainable.

The Department of Climate, Energy, the Environment, and Water (DCCEEW) launched the CEUF in December 2023. The fund is a specialised, competitive grant initiative that offers a 50% co-contribution, up to \$2.5 million, for energy improvements at local government facilities. The aim is to enhance energy efficiency, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and decrease energy costs. The deadline for the second-round submission is the end of June 2025.

Key milestones for CEUF round two submission

- Application open: March 2025
- Budget allocation commitment letter (CEO): May 2025
- Application submission: June 2025

CEUF project timeline (Maximum project length is 24 months)

- Outcome notification: September 2025
- Project starts: December 2025
- Projects complete due date: June 2028

The CEUF fund requires a detailed project plan to be submitted, and the City is currently collaborating with an external engineering company to prepare this. This work involves outlining the capital budget commitment, setting milestones, conducting risk assessments, assessing the availability of electrical supply upgrades, and providing cost estimates.

Financial Assessment and Implications

The estimated cost for the heat pump project at Inglewood Pool is approximately \$4.8 million. This includes \$2.8 million for mechanical work, \$0.6 million for adding new and replacing old solar PV panels, and \$1.4 million for electrical and miscellaneous expenses. If the City is successful, it needs to secure a budget of at least \$2.4 million over the next three years.

The City expects that the heat pumps at Inglewood Pool can save \$7.7 million in reduced energy costs over the next 20 years and reduce carbon emissions by 65% (762 t CO₂-e/yr). The expected simple payback period is 13 years, which is shorter than the heat pumps' 20-year lifespan. The 13-year period could be reduced to five years if the City successfully secures the CEUF funding.

Stakeholder Engagement

On 17 September 2017, the Stirling Leisure Inglewood Project Steering Group discussed renewable heating options for the Inglewood Pool. The group, which includes representatives from Infrastructure, Community Development and Corporate Services, endorsed heat pumps as the preferred option over geothermal heating. They also endorsed the submission of an application for CEUF funding (round 2) to support the installation of heat pumps at Stirling Leisure - Inglewood.

These decisions were also endorsed by the Executive team.

Recommended Action

That Council supports the funding application to the Community Energy Upgrade Funds, and subsequent co-funding costs in future budget allocations.

Relevant Policies, Legislation and Council Resolutions

[Local Government Act 1995](#)

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our natural environment

Objective: An energy-smart City

Priority: Improve the City's energy management and maximise energy efficiency

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Environment	The City will prioritise protection, enhancement and sustainability of the natural environment unless this cannot be achieved without significantly compromising the City's economic or social sustainability.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Attachment 1 - Budget Estimate (previously circulated to Elected Members under confidential separate cover)

Attachment 2 - CEUF Capital Costs (previously circulated to Elected Members under confidential separate cover)

Attachment 3 - Cost comparison (previously circulated to Elected Members under confidential separate cover)

Available for viewing at meeting

Nil

Linked Documents

Nil.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION

'Notices of Motion for Consideration' include a brief report to assist Council in deciding to approve or not approve the Motion.

A further and more detailed report will be submitted at a future Ordinary Council meeting for Motions that are approved, in accordance with Clause 4.5(2)(c) of the City of Stirling Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021.

Director Community Development, Michael Quirk disclosed an Impartial Interest in Item 14.1 as he is a Basketball WA (BWA) Board Member with the BWA strategic plan identifying 'places to play' as a key priority, including people being able to walk to a local basketball facility in their local park.

14.1 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TERESA OLOW - BASKETBALL COURTS ON PUBLIC OPEN SPACES

Business Unit:	Recreation and Leisure Services	Service: Leisure Services
Ward:	Not Applicable	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/011

Moved Councillor Olow, seconded Councillor Re

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council meeting to be held 25 November 2025 identifying the challenges of designing and locating outdoor basketball courts on Public Open Spaces as well as possible strategies to mitigate noise impacts.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council meeting to be held 25 November 2025 identifying the challenges of designing and locating outdoor basketball courts on Public Open Spaces as well as possible strategies to mitigate noise impacts.

Background provided by Elected Member

“There have been complaints made by residents regarding the impact of noise from outdoor basketball courts located in Public Open Spaces. These courts provide an opportunity for people of all ages, particularly young people, to participate in physical activity and socialise with others. Based on community demand and population growth, there appears to be an undersupply of outdoor basketball courts across the City of Stirling. Higher density residential areas with smaller backyards will also increase reliance on provision of sport/recreation infrastructure within our Public Open Spaces. On that basis, it is important that the City identifies how the challenges associated with the planning/design/management of outdoor basketball courts can be addressed.”

Details

Providing recreational amenities in Public Open Spaces (POS), such as basketball facilities, is becoming increasingly vital as the City's population and urban density grow. These amenities offer essential recreational opportunities for social interaction and physical activity that cannot be accommodated at home in smaller backyards. The City currently provides 38 outdoor basketball facilities:

- 23 - informal pads (hoop and concrete pad only)
- 6 - 3*3 or ½ court
- 7 - full court
- 2 - multi court

In addition to these 38 facilities the City has received at least 10 requests for new basketball facilities in 2024/25 alone. According to the City's Community Infrastructure Plan, which guides the provision and planning of community infrastructure, it is anticipated that up to 15 additional basketball facilities will be needed within public open spaces across the City over the next 20 years to accommodate growing community demand and support population growth.

Several factors must be considered during planning for basketball facilities in POS. The design needs to incorporate a range of elements to create inviting places for people to utilise. Elements such as seating, drink fountain facilities, Wi-Fi, court art or graphics and good quality basketball systems including nets are essential to encourage high utilisation. Ideally a range of infrastructure that is unique to each location will maximise use and ensure high levels of activation as well as achieving good passive surveillance.

Different sizes of basketball courts are also considered in the design development process. The size of the court is usually determined by the POS classification, proximity to residential properties, and any surrounding infrastructure or amenity such as bushland, major roads or existing infrastructure. Smaller courts, such as a basketball pad, allow for shooting hoops and less gameplay, which can reduce noise due to less bouncing of the ball. Larger 3-on-3, half, and full courts are generally only considered in POS where greater distances from residential properties can be achieved.

Given the nature of basketball, facilities located within POS must consider noise impacts on surrounding land-uses particularly residential properties. The design needs to incorporate a sufficient buffer to minimise the impacts of noise on surrounding residents while providing a suitable level of passive surveillance to ensure an attractive and safe basketball facility for the community. Providing a sufficient buffer often limits the number of public open spaces where Basketball can be provided. Noise assessments are also considered during the design development process.

In 2022 the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation prepared draft guidelines intended to assist local government with appropriate placement of outdoor basketball facilities including proposed minimum distances from adjacent residential properties. The guidelines were not intended to be mandatory or apply retrospectively. The City lobbied against the proposed guidelines given how many of the existing assets within the City would not meet the proposed clearance distances and the negative impact on people choosing to play basketball in public places. The draft guidelines were ultimately scrapped by the State Government in February 2023 citing community feedback and a desire to adopt a commonsense approach to encourage use of public open spaces. Residents with concerns about amenity should report excessive noise and it would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The City has been installing noise-attenuating backboards to also mitigate noise. These backboards are specially designed for basketball to help minimize the noise generated when a basketball hits the board. They are often made from materials like heavy-duty fiberglass mesh, which significantly reduces the sound compared to traditional backboards. The impulsive noise of a bouncing ball is also an important consideration with identifying suitable locations for facilities. Whilst backboard noise can be mitigated the sound of a ball bouncing is more difficult to control. The City generally does not light local and community level courts for usage after dark. The facilities are intended to be used during daylight hours. Signage is provided to identify the times of use and expected behaviours, further limiting potential noise impacts. If lighting is proposed, particularly at our larger and regional POS, the community will be consulted on the proposed lighting design and opening hours as part of the project design and consultation stage.

While the City has already implemented some noise mitigation strategies for recently completed basketball facilities, further detail can be investigated and presented to Council in November 2025.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Nil.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our community

Objective: An active and healthy City

Priority: Facilitate a range of recreation and leisure opportunities for everyone in the City

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Community	The City will ensure that it engages with the community in accordance with its Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

14.2 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TONY KRSTICEVIC - SCARBOROUGH PRECINCT CROWDED PLACES ASSESSMENT UPDATE

Business Unit:	Community Safety	Service: Safer Stirling
Ward:	Coastal	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Advocacy - *Advocating to government or other organisations.*

Council Resolution

0525/012

Moved Councillor Krsticevic, seconded Councillor Papatde

1. That Council **RECEIVES** the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment status update and **NOTES** that the 'Scarborough Beach Precinct Community Safety Improvement' project has been listed for consideration within the draft 2025/26 budget.
2. That the City **ENGAGES** with relevant State and Federal Government departments to communicate key recommendations from the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment and identify appropriate grant funding opportunities to enable implementation.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papatde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council meeting to be held 27 May 2025 advising the current status of the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment, particularly those actions related to the separation of pedestrians and vehicles, and identifying proposed actions to obtain support from relevant law enforcement and funding agencies for its implementation.

(Suggested Alternative Recommendation – refer to conclusion of report.)

Background provided by Elected Member

“On 21 March 2025, a Toyota Prado being pursued by the WA Police Force was able to gain unauthorised entry to key pedestrian areas at Scarborough Beach Precinct. This incident reaffirms the need to implement community safety improvements, in collaboration with relevant law enforcement agencies, and through funding support from both the Federal and State Government.”

These infrastructure, management and technology improvements will address recently identified vulnerabilities to ensure the safety of people attending activities and events within the precinct.”

Details

In 2023/24, following discussions with WA Police, the City assessed *Australia’s Strategy for Protecting Crowded Places from Terrorism* (2017) to establish a clear understanding of what constitutes a crowded place, the roles and responsibilities of all those involved in protecting these places, and the threat environment in which they operate. As per the Strategy, crowded places are:

“Locations which are easily accessible by large numbers of people on a predictable basis. Crowded places include, but are not limited to, sports stadia, transport infrastructure, shopping centres, pubs, clubs, hotels, places of worship, tourist attractions, movie theatres, and civic spaces. Crowded places do not have to be buildings and can include open spaces such as parks and pedestrian malls. A crowded place will not necessarily be crowded at all times. Crowd densities may vary between day and night, by season, and may be temporary, as in the case of sporting events, festivals, or one-off events.”

Crowded places are a preferred target for not only terrorists but other individuals / organisations seeking to carry out hostile activities. In most cases, the location itself is not the target – it is the high volume and concentration of people that makes a crowded place attractive to attack. Landowners and operators of a crowded place have the primary responsibility for protecting their sites, including a duty of care to take steps to protect people that work, use or visit their site from a range of foreseeable threats.

As the Local Government Authority responsible for the Scarborough Beach Precinct, the City of Stirling has the primary role to implement infrastructure and management measures that address risk, emergency and crisis management and response. This starts with a risk assessment and vulnerability analysis for the Precinct through preparation of a Crowded Places Assessment.

Through a suitably qualified consultant, the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment was completed in May 2024 with the final report including 11 recommendations. Preparation of the Assessment involved consultation with a range of key stakeholders including Council’s Crime Prevention Advisory Group, WA Police Force (Protective Security Unit and Scarborough Police Station) and Scarborough Beach Association. The key Assessment recommendations and status update are summarised below:

No.	Crowded Places Assessment Recommendation	Current Status
1	Leverage Passive Mobile Phone Crowd Analysis platform to better understand site headcount, throughput, dwell times and usage. This will assist in data informed decision making relating to security, emergency, commercial, resource and marketing management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Software trialled over 2024/25 summer period with mixed success. • Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.
2	At CCTV camera end of life intervals, review the purpose of each camera against the DORI (Detection, Observation, Recognition and Identification) principle, and install the appropriate fixed camera arrangement to enhance overall coverage of the precinct and increase predictability and consistency of imagery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review has commenced in accordance with the City’s CCTV Action Plan, which was presented to Council’s Crime Prevention Advisory Group in November and endorsed by the Executive Team in December 2024.
3	Ensure server storage for CCTV allows for recordings of a minimum 31 days for post-incident investigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed.
4	Implement Video Surveillance System (VSS) smart analytics to exponentially increase the monitoring and proactive capability of the surveillance network and increase efficiency of retrieval and investigation processes. CCTV to be enabled with real time analytics for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weapons detection - Unattended packages - Automatic number plate recognition, vehicle movement detection (geofencing on footpaths and restricted areas) - Detecting crowd surging, unusual crowd formations, fire, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.

No.	Crowded Places Assessment Recommendation	Current Status
5	Ensure regular pruning of trees that may inhibit CCTV views – this requires Community Safety and other law enforcement agencies to report the trees to the appropriate City of Stirling department for action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commenced in accordance with the City's CCTV Action Plan, which was presented to Council's Crime Prevention Advisory Group in November and endorsed by the Executive Team in December 2024.
6	<p>6.1: Implement temporary Vehicle Security Barriers (VSBs) during events to reduce the vulnerabilities at identified locations. Each VSB should be deployed with a minimum of 1.2 metre spacings between each with intended use of the entry point to dictate most appropriate VSB solution.</p> <p>6.2: Install removeable Vehicle Security Barriers (VSBs) at identified locations that can be removed during bump in for events, or when contractors require vehicle access to the site. During business as usual, the VSBs should be in position to ensure no unauthorised vehicle access to the foreshore.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.
7	Replace the concrete balls along The Esplanade with permanent Vehicle Security Barriers (VSBs) through the use of rated or engineered solutions, based on a vehicle dynamics assessment. This may include planter boxes, engineered landscaping solutions or large statement features to ensure separation of persons and vehicles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.
8	Consider moving the pedestrian crossings away from the Scarborough Beach Road / The Esplanade roundabout to improve traffic flow and reduce pedestrian danger.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be considered as part of State Government works including additional stand space, seating and shade at Scarborough Beach bus terminus, including improvements to the West Coast Highway and Scarborough Beach Road intersection.
9	Install a public announcement system including strategically placed digital displays and a public announcement system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.

No.	Crowded Places Assessment Recommendation	Current Status
10	Small foot patrol deployment (i.e. WA Police Force Officers) on site will act as a detection, deterrent and response capability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Stirling partnership with WA Police Force for the Scarborough Beach Precinct includes joint operations on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. • City of Stirling CCTV Operator assists the WA Police Force with <i>Operation NightSafe</i>, by using the City's advanced network of 80 CCTV cameras to enhance rapid response and evidence-gathering.
11	Develop specific Incident and Emergency Response Procedures as an appendix to the broader City of Stirling Emergency Management Plan. These should detail the expected security response to incidents, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active Armed Offender - Hostile Vehicle Attack - Intoxicated / Drug Affected Persons - Assaults - Bomb Threats - Suspicious Items - Fires - Weapons - Protests - Loose Animals - Unmanned Aircraft Systems response - Suspicious Behaviour - Unauthorised Access - Site safety issues - Medical Issues - Emergency site access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocated for external funding through the recent 2025 State and Federal Government Elections.

Upon review, an additional three projects within the Precinct were identified that support the objectives and recommendations of the Crowded Places Assessment. Funding was allocated in 2024/25 to deliver these projects, as per below:

No.	Project	Current Status
1	Implement parking technology and signage at Scarborough Beach and surrounding coastal carpark areas that displays the number of available bays and direct drivers to these locations. Aim is to reduce traffic and congestion within the precinct and improve access to parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$550,000 allocated in the 2024/25 budget, funded through the City's Public Parking Reserve • Project delayed due to Main Roads approvals associated with dynamic signs located on West Coast Highway. • Expected completion May 2025.
2	Installation of remotely operated bollards to the lower promenade area adjacent to the Scarborough Beach Pool. Associated with the Crowded Places Assessment this ensured controlled access to this pedestrian area, where uncontrolled vehicle access by vehicles was identified as an issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$80,000 allocated in the 2024/25 budget. • Expected completion May 2025.
3	Installation of additional CCTV cameras on the corner of Manning Street and The Esplanade. This has been raised as a high-risk area for WA Police and members of the public given its proximity to licenced venues and vehicles entering from West Coast Highway.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$30,000 allocated in the 2024/25 budget • Expected completion June 2025.

On 3 April 2025, the City's Manager Community Safety met with WA Police Force representatives to review the incident that occurred 21 March 2025 where an offender in a stolen vehicle was able to gain unauthorised entry to pedestrianised areas at Scarborough Beach. Through these discussions it was reaffirmed by WA Police that they support implementation of the Crowded Places Assessment recommendations.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Implementation of the Crowded Places Assessment recommendations is estimated at \$1.5 million. This has been included in Council's draft 2025/26 budget with \$500,000 reserve funding and \$1 million from external sources. The City sought funding support from all parties during the recent State and Federal Government Elections, although no commitment was forthcoming from a successful candidate or party. As such, it remains necessary for the City to continue to identify external State and Federal Government grant funding opportunities.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our community

Objective: A safer City

Priority: Create strong partnerships to improve community safety

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Business Disruption	The City recognises the possibility of major disruptions to community, workforce, assets and systems and will have business continuity plans for each service for activation as required.
Purpose	The City will pursue community and sector leadership through forward thinking decision making, and alignment of its services and operations with its strategic objectives.
Reputation	The City will ensure that any decisions that may affect the City's reputation are made at the appropriate level with stakeholders remaining informed and engaged.
Partnerships	The City will be proactive in improving existing relationships and working with new partners to grow its reputation as an organisation that the community, business, government and other organisations choose to engage with.
Funding	The City will take sufficient financial risk to enable it to achieve its strategic objectives, providing it does not significantly impact on the long term financial sustainability of the City.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil

Suggested Alternative Recommendation

1. That Council **RECEIVES** the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment status update and **NOTES** that the 'Scarborough Beach Precinct Community Safety Improvement' project has been listed for consideration within the draft 2025/26 budget.
2. That the City **ENGAGES** with relevant State and Federal Government departments to communicate key recommendations from the Scarborough Beach Precinct Crowded Places Assessment and identify appropriate grant funding opportunities to enable implementation.

14.3 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR ANDREA CREADO - MIRRABOOKA TOWN ACTIVITY CENTRE STATUS UPDATE

Business Unit:	Community Development	Service: Community Development Administration
Ward:	Balga	Location: Mirrabooka Town Centre
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/013

Moved Councillor Creado, seconded Councillor Dudek

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council Meeting to be held 12 August 2025 providing a status update on implementation of the Mirrabooka Town Activity Centre Plan and identifying the potential for the various City assets located in the Town Centre to achieve positive land-use, economic and social outcomes for the region.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council Meeting to be held 12 August 2025 providing a status update on implementation of the Mirrabooka Town Activity Centre Plan and identifying the potential for the various City assets located in the Town Centre to achieve positive land-use, economic and social outcomes for the region.

Background provided by Elected Member

“Over the years various planning frameworks for the Mirrabooka Town Centre, including the current Activity Centre Plan, have attempted to create a place with a diverse range of uses, which is attractive and safe, and is a focus for the region’s shopping and service needs.

Given that Council has recently supported a number of initiatives to activate the Town Centre, including redevelopment of the Town Square and attraction of Perth Glory, it is timely to investigate the feasibility of better utilising various City assets in the Town Centre to maximise economic and social impacts. This could involve the potential use of vacant land parcels, incentivisation for commercial and residential development, improved parking management strategies, and upgrades to the Mirrabooka Community Hub.”

Details

Mirrabooka Town Centre is located within the Balga Ward approximately 10km north of the Perth CBD. It comprises an area of approximately 83 hectares bounded by Reid Highway to the north, Mirrabooka Avenue to the west, Yirrigan Drive to the south, and Northwood Drive to the east. Key features include Mirrabooka Square Shopping Centre, Mirrabooka Bus Station, Mirrabooka Community Hub (including library), Mirrabooka Regional Open Space, Mirrabooka Town Square and Stirling Leisure - Mirrabooka (Herb Graham Recreation Centre). The Town Centre also accommodates a large number of education, health, medical and social services agencies as well as low to medium density residential dwellings. Notably, there are large tracts of vacant land in the Town Centre including several undeveloped landholdings owned by the State Government.

Mirrabooka Town Centre is designated as a Secondary Centre within *State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity centres*. Planning for the Town Centre has an extensive history since its development in the 1960s and 70s. This has included Mirrabooka Enquiry By Design (2001), Mirrabooka Regional Improvement Strategy (2002), Local Area Plan (2010), Mirrabooka Town Centre Local Development Plan (2015) and Mirrabooka Town Activity Centre Plan (2021). The current Activity Centre Plan was approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission in 2021. This Plan provides the planning framework for the Town Centre including the movement network, public spaces, land use and development intensity, subdivision pattern, built form and infrastructure provision.

A number of recent City driven recent initiatives have placed an increased focus on the Town Centre. This includes (but is not limited to) the \$1 million town square revitalisation, the administration / training ‘Home of Perth Glory’ being established at Stirling Leisure - Mirrabooka, improved management and enforcement of car parking on vacant lots, and disposal of two lots on Milldale Way for development purposes. Despite these recent initiatives, it is evident that many of the Activity Centre Plan objectives are yet to be realised with limited new commercial or residential developments and numerous undeveloped landholdings. Long-term planning and decision making is also required for City owned assets and landholdings, including the Mirrabooka Community Hub and Softball WA sites.

It is considered timely for the City to assess the current status of Activity Centre Plan implementation and identify opportunities to deliver upon key community infrastructure, economic development, land-use development and social outcomes for this important Secondary Centre. Officers can prepare a report to be presented to the Council Meeting to be held 12 August 2025. Noting that this report will include input from across multiple Directorates and Business Units.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Nil.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our community

Objective: An inclusive and harmonious City

Priority: Facilitate social connections and access to services locally

Key Result Area: Our economy

Objective: A vibrant City

Priority: Activate local centres to increase visitor and economic activity

Objective: A smart and prosperous City

Priority: Attract and promote investment and partnership opportunities

Priority: Advocate, lobby and partner with stakeholders to benefit the community

Key Result Area: Our built environment

Objective: A liveable City

Priority: Prioritise growth in activity corridors and centres

Priority: Improve the quality, liveability and identity of local areas

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Purpose	The City will pursue community and sector leadership through forward thinking decision making, and alignment of its services and operations with its strategic objectives.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

[Mirrabooka Town Activity Centre Plan](#)

14.4 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - MAYOR MARK IRWIN - LAND ACQUISITION OPPORTUNITIES IN LOCAL CENTRES

Business Unit:	Property and Commercial Services	Service: Property Services
Ward:	City Wide	Location: Not Applicable.
Applicant:	Not Applicable.	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/014

Moved Councillor Krsticevic, seconded Councillor Re

That a confidential report be PRESENTED to Council on options to provide public parking to support the local shops at Scarborough Beach Road West Area.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to Council investigating land acquisition opportunities in Local Centres with the specific requirement of protecting and improving car parking outcomes.

Background provided by Elected Member

“Recently, many Local Centres have seen change of use applications with small bars, cafes and supermarkets. The increase in patronage is putting constant pressure on surrounding roads and residents. There are potential opportunities to secure the long-term success of Local Centres through acquiring adjacent blocks and using parking reserves to purchase and supply parking.”

Details

The City has 48 Local Centres and 19 Neighbourhood Centres, with the City last undertaking a parking occupancy study for these Centres in 2019. This work was part of the ongoing monitoring and review of car parking the City was doing after amending the local planning policy to approach car parking in different ways.

2019 Parking Occupancy Study

The 2019 parking occupancy study allowed for six hours of surveying per centre in three two-hour slots. The data gathered at the time indicated that the vast majority of the surveyed centres showed serious underutilisation of parking areas, some of which was attributed to a stunted economy. The findings of the report were presented to Council on 2 August 2022 (Council Resolution #0822/007).

The report noted that alleged parking problems often stem from an inadequate parking layout – patrons do not wish to park far away from the centre entrance or in areas of the parking lot where they feel unsafe, or where the parking lot is unformed and will often park illegally for convenience. In such cases, amendments of parking provision requirements may not be as effective as guidelines for designing parking layouts that would ensure safe and accessible parking spaces.

The City has seen change since the last study, with the City growing in size and our community telling us, through the Local Convos, that they want to stay in their neighbourhood, with a strong feeling that their local businesses provide all their daily needs, both of which has resulted in parking demand increasing in local and neighbourhood centres. The City understands that it needs to enable a locally responsive approach to the supply and management of car parking.

Parking Principles

Council considered the City’s [City Wide Parking Principles August 2024](#) at the Ordinary Council meeting held 27 August 2024 (Council Resolution Number 0824/032). It was noted in the report to Council that the effective supply and management of parking in a consistent and sustainable manner is a complex challenge with no single solution. Effective parking supply and management needs to balance competing demand for limited space to enable access to businesses, residences, activities and destinations as well as ensuring parking provision supports high quality public places/spaces, well-designed buildings and safe and efficient operation of the road network. The Parking Principles were adopted to maintain line of sight between the City’s Strategic Planning long-term objective of reducing reliance on private car usage, whilst enabling a locally responsive approach to the supply and management of car parking, based on collected data on parking demand and road network performance. In addition, a focus needs to be placed on those Local and Neighbourhood Centres which are near Urban Corridors.

The Parking Principles include two key principles relevant to this report: to promote the monitoring of parking occupancy to determine the success of changes or need for further improvement (Parking Principle #4), and to utilise funds from the public parking reserve to improve access to parking (Parking Principle #7).

Next Steps

To be able to provide information to Council with regards to opportunities to protect and improve car parking outcomes at the 48 Local Centres and 19 Neighbourhood Centres, the City would re-survey to gather up-to-date parking occupancy data. This would be overlaid with the City's data on documented problem Centres along with data from the City's License and Number Plate Recognition system with regards to parking utilisation and duration of stay. From there, the City could identify Centres with parking pressures where land acquisition could assist to protect and improve car parking outcomes.

The City has approached the consultant who completed the work in 2019 for an indicative quote for re-surveying. They have indicated that the cost of six hours of survey for each centre (three instances of two-hour surveying slots) would cost \$151,430 (excluding GST). There would be opportunity to reduce this cost using a hybrid model of some hours of surveying simply recording occupancy with other hours of surveying including occupancy, dwell time and other urban observations. The use of City gathered data could reduce this cost further. The City would implement the most value for money option should this notice of motion be supported.

Depending on contractor availability to undertake the surveying, Officers can prepare a report to be presented to the Planning and Development Committee meeting to be held 7 October 2025 detailing the outcomes of the data analysis and identifying Centres where the acquisition of adjacent blocks would assist in securing the long term success of those Centres.

The City of Stirling contains a number of areas that will experience significant change over the next 15 years. The City has commenced the preparation a new Local Planning Strategy, as recommended by the City's [endorsed Report of Review \(2024\)](#). As part of this work, the City is reviewing its 80 Activity Centres and approximately 85.5km of Urban Corridors. Activity Centres in proximity to Urban Corridors will be prioritised with directions and actions to manage growth and change.

Financial Assessment and Implications

The maximum cost of completing re-surveying of parking occupancy data for the City's 67 Centres would be \$151,430. The other data which would complement this surveying, and assist in determining land acquisition opportunities, is held by the City.

The Public Parking Reserve is forecast to have a balance of \$5.2 million at 30 June 2024.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our economy

Objective: A vibrant City

Priority: Activate local centres to increase visitor and economic activity

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Purpose	The City will pursue community and sector leadership through forward thinking decision making, and alignment of its services and operations with its strategic objectives.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

14.5 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR KARLO PERKOV - TRAILS PROGRAM FOR TRIGG BUSHLAND

Business Unit:	Parks and Environment	Service: Conservation & Wildlife
Ward:	Coastal	Location: Not Applicable
Applicant:	Not Applicable	

Role

Executive - *Governing the City and the community through executive powers.*

Council Resolution

0525/015

Moved Councillor Perkov, seconded Councillor Krsticevic

- 1. That Council CONSIDERS inclusion of Trigg Bushland Trail Signage upgrade in the draft 2025/26 budget.**
- 2. That the City PRESENTS a Citywide trails program to the Community and Resources Committee meeting to be held 19 August 2025.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papatde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to Council on the development of a Trails Program for Trigg Bushland, and other City managed conservation reserves, that promotes the City's important conservation assets.

(Suggested Alternative Recommendation – refer to conclusion of report.)

Background provided by Elected Member

“Trigg Bushland has existing interpretative signs that were installed 25 years ago and are now faded and corroded. On the back of the successful Lake Gwelup Trail Program launched late 2024, the interpretative technique of story-telling has the potential to enrich other significant conservation areas for both locals and visitors alike.”

Details

Walking trail signage allows the community to engage with and learn about their local spaces, connect with nature and the local community, and are linked with positive outcomes for health and wellbeing. Existing trail signage across the City is limited to a handful of sites – Lake Gwelup, Trigg Bushland, Star Swamp, Scarborough Beach Reserve and Inglewood Triangle. Apart from the newly installed interpretative trail signage at Lake Gwelup, all the trails have old information and are in poor condition.

The Trigg Heritage Trail signage is in very poor condition and needs replacement. Its content is no longer relevant to our community and could be updated to appeal to locals and visitors alike.

The City commenced preliminary consultation for the updated Trigg Heritage Trail in 2021. As part of the planning, City Officers organised guided walks with Friends of Trigg Bushland, Aboriginal Elders and RAP group members to discuss the themes for the trail. There was strong interest in the project from all stakeholders. In 2022, the Rotary Club of Karrinyup approached the City regarding Lake Gwelup and commission a trail to commemorate their 50th anniversary in 2024. With the agreement and support of the Friends of Trigg Bushland, the Trigg Heritage Trail was postponed allowing the Lake Gwelup Heritage Trail to be constructed in 2024. In 2024-25, the City commenced developing content for the Trigg Trail signage with a view to install it in the 2025/26 financial year – subject to Council budget approval.

Financial Assessment and Implications

Funds have been included in the draft City-wide Parks Conservation Signage budget 2025/26 for the development and refurbishment of Trigg Bushland trails signage.

Sustainable Stirling 2022-2032

Key Result Area: Our community

Objective: An active and healthy City

Priority: Facilitate a range of recreation and leisure opportunities for everyone in the City

Key Result Area: Our natural environment

Objective: A biodiverse City

Priority: Support, engage and guide our community to connect with nature and improve biodiversity across the City

Strategic Risk

Strategic Risk	Risk Appetite
Community	The City will ensure that it engages with the community in accordance with its Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
Environment	The City will prioritise protection, enhancement and sustainability of the natural environment unless this cannot be achieved without significantly compromising the City's economic or social sustainability.

Relevant Documents and Information

Attachments

Nil.

Available for viewing at the meeting

Nil.

Linked Documents

Nil.

Suggested Alternative Recommendation

1. That Council **CONSIDERS** inclusion of Trigg Bushland Trail Signage upgrade in the draft 2025/26 budget.
2. That the City **PRESENTS** a Citywide trails program to the Community and Resources Committee meeting to be held 19 August 2025.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING

15.1 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR ANDREA CREADO - STIRLING LEISURE - BALGA PLANNED UPGRADES TIMEFRAME

Councillor Andrea Creado submitted the following Notice of Motion at the Council meeting held 13 May 2025.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council meeting to be held 1 July 2025 identifying the proposed timeframe for planned upgrades to Stirling Leisure – Balga to enable consideration within the City’s forward capital works program and long-term financial plan.

Reason for Motion

“Stirling Leisure – Balga is a valued facility which attracts high utilisation and plays an important role in local community health and wellbeing. The facility was last refurbished in 2007 although some parts of the building date back to 1975. There has been significant investment in the Stirling Leisure Scarborough Beach Pool and Inglewood since that time, so it is now timely for Council to consider a timeframe for upgrades to Stirling Leisure Balga.

It is likely that significant renewal and redevelopment will be required to deliver a facility that meets customer expectations as well as current compliance standards. Given the expected high capital cost, it is necessary for Council to consider the allocation of funds as part of its longer term financial planning.”

15.2 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR TONY KRSTICEVIC - PUBLIC OPEN SPACE FRAMEWORK AND PRIORITY AREAS

Councillor Tony Krsticevic submitted the following Notice of Motion at the Council meeting held 13 May 2025.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to Council in November 2025 outlining:

- a. a framework – aligning with the Public Open Space Strategy (2021), the Urban Forest Plan (2024), and other relevant strategies – for improving and developing a diverse range of Public Open Space across the City.
- b. priority areas (reserves) across the City for improvement within the next five years with budget consideration as part of the annual budgetary process.

Reason for Motion

“The City would benefit from having a structured approach to the improvement of Public Open Space to ensure a diversity of options that take local considerations and wishes into account

It is important that these opportunities are realised in alignment with various strategies and actions that the City already has in place, and are taken into consideration, when planning for future use of Public Open Space.

For example, water reductions mean that additional irrigation of new spaces is not possible without an equivalent offset in other areas. Pressure for additional Public Open Space (acquisition) is a higher priority in some areas of the City than others.”

15.3 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR STEPHANIE PROUD JP - FUTURE PLANNING OF STIRLING COMMUNITY CENTRE - INNALOO

Councillor Stephanie Proud JP submitted the following Notice of Motion at the Council meeting held 13 May 2025.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the Council meeting to be held 12 August 2025 identifying the proposed future planning for Stirling Community Centre - Innaloo.

Reason for Motion

“The City’s Community Infrastructure Plan 2023 - 2033 identifies the opportunity to co-locate community activities at bowling clubs and also identifies that there is a gap in the provision of performing arts type facilities. Given the expected redevelopment of Innaloo Sports Club, through the recent \$4 million State Government funding commitment, it is important to also consider for Council and the local community to understand the future planning for nearby Stirling Community Centre – Innaloo.”

15.4 PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR ELIZABETH RE - WELFARE CHECKS

Councillor Elizabeth Re submitted the following Notice of Motion at the Council meeting held 13 May 2025.

Notice of Motion Recommendation

That a report be PRESENTED to the August 2025 Community and Resources Committee meeting that informs Council how many welfare checks are being conducted each year, how are welfare checks referred and managed directly by City officers and those which are referred to partner organisations with formal or informal arrangements who have the expertise to respond.

Reason for Motion

“There is a reported increase in social isolation in the community and Council want to understand how to connect community with welfare checks and support services.”

In accordance with Clause 4.8 of the Meeting Procedures Local Law 2021, Mayor Mark Irwin ruled to EXTEND the meeting for one hour at 9.36pm.

16. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

17. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

18. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Council Resolution

0525/016

Moved Councillor Lagan, seconded Councillor Paparde

That item 18.1 - Confidential Matter be **CONSIDERED** Behind Closed Doors in accordance with Section 5.23(2)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, which permits the meeting to be closed to the public for business relating to the following:-

- (a) *a matter affecting an employee or employees.*

The motion was put and declared **CARRIED (14/0)**.

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Paparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

At 9.37pm the meeting was closed to the public and all employees who were not required left the meeting for consideration of Item 18.1.

Acting Manager Governance, Jackson Mawby disclosed a Financial Interest in Item 18.1. Accordingly, he left the meeting at 9.37pm prior to consideration of the item.

18.1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTER

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:

- (a) *a matter affecting an employee or employees.*

Council Resolution

0525/017

Moved Councillor Proud, seconded Councillor Krsticevic

That Council PROCEEDS with the confidential recommendation as outlined in the Recommended Action section of this report.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.
Against: Nil.

Council Resolution

0525/018

Moved Councillor Migdale, seconded Councillor Re

That the Meeting be REOPENED to the public.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED (14/0).

For: Councillors Creado, Dudek, Ferrante, Giudici, Hatton, Krsticevic, Lagan, Migdale, Olow, Papparde, Perkov, Proud, Re and Mayor Irwin.

Against: Nil.

At 9.55pm the meeting was reopened to the public.

19. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 9.55pm.

These minutes were confirmed as a true and correct record of proceedings on:

Date:

SIGNED:

.....
Presiding Member Signature

.....
Presiding Member Name (*please print*)