

XIV. MOTIONS WITH NOTICE

Nil.

XV. MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE WAS GIVEN AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING

15.1: NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY

**ITEM 15.1: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

In light of the recommendations and observations of the Best Practice Review 2010, Council adopts a mandatory training policy with regard to both all incoming Councillors and all existing Councillors after the October 2011 elections.

That the Mayor and Councillors training to include the following WALGA Elected Member training units:

- Councillor Roles and Responsibilities;
- Ethics and Conduct of an Elected Member;
- Financial Report and Budgets;
- Strategic Planning;
- Change Management;
- Policy Development;
- Land Use Planning;
- Sustainable Asset Management;
- CEO Performance Appraisals and Manage Conflict;

And;

That the City allocates appropriate financial resources in the 2011/12 Budget to enable this to take place.

Reason:

The Best Practice Review clearly identified the lack of Councillor training as a contributor to the challenges the city of Albany faces. By adopting this policy now all prospective Councillors will understand this training is required. Other Councils have conducted this training as a group in their Council Offices, greatly reducing the cost. We could also invite neighbouring councils to take part in training here in Albany and all benefit from the economies of scale.

Officer's Comment:

The Notice of Motion has budgetary implications therefore it is prudent for Council to be provided with that information prior to consideration of the motion. As the Council will not decide the budget until its June OCM, there is no urgency at this time to act on the motion. At the June OCM Council will be asked to make decisions on various competing budgetary priorities, and this is one of those priorities that should be considered in the context of the FULL budget. I recommend the motion be considered as part of the June OCM budget debate. In the meantime, the Councillor could make submissions to the Council Workshop and the Audit Committee meeting that will be organised to consider the budget recommendations by the City's Executive.

15.2: NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK – RECYCLING STRATEGY

**ITEM 15.2: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

THAT the waste recycling strategy which will be presented at a future Councillor Workshop be prepared in collaboration with any Elected Member who wishes to become involved.

Reason:

Recycling of waste involves the City in annual costs of several hundred thousand dollars. Councillors may have experience in managing such costs and should be encouraged to participate in staff deliberations at an early stage.

Officer's Comment:

Councillor Bostock gave notice at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 19 April 2011, which read as follows:

“That Council institute a Committee, consisting of any member who wishes to be involved, to review the waste recycling operations in the city of Albany”

Notice of Motion submitted in accordance with:

- a. Clause 5.4 of the *Standing Orders Local Law 2009*, being:
“5.4 Motions
 - (1) *A member proposing a primary motion or amendment must state its substance before addressing the meeting.*
 - (2) *The presiding person or the meeting by resolution may require a complicated motion to be divided into two or more motions.”*

- b. The *Local Government (Rules of Conduct) Regulations 2007*, regulation 9 which states:
“9. Prohibition against involvement in administration
 - (1) *A person who is a council member must not undertake a task that contributes to the administration of the local government unless authorised by the council or by the CEO to undertake that task.*
 - (2) *Sub regulation (1) does not apply to anything that a council member does as part of the deliberations at a council or committee meeting.”*

15.3: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY – AGENDA BRIEFING

NOTICE OF MOTION TO REVOKE A PREVIOUS DECISION OF COUNCIL

In accordance with Regulation 10(1a) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*, we the undersigned hereby move to have Report Item 4.1(i) – Local Public Notice – Council Meeting Calendar, which was moved at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 15 February 2011, be reconsidered.

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

ITEM 15.3: REVOCATION MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY

VOTING REQUIREMENT: ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

THAT the Motion resolved at Report Item 4.1(i) – Local Public Notice – Council Meeting Calendar dated 15 May 2011 as follows:

“THAT Agenda Briefing session be held two weeks (14 days) prior to Ordinary meetings of Council. “

Be revoked.

[Section 5.25 (1)(e) of the Local Government Act 1995 refers]

Reason:

It is my understanding that council has never operated before on a draft agenda basis. The ‘final agenda’ not being available until after the Agenda Briefing could lead to staff recommendations being amended to meet political pressures rather than the recommendations being the best professional advice. Compliance with our standing orders as I have understood them (and have been operated since their inception) is not possible under this draft agenda process. The whole purpose of the Agenda Briefing is to show open and accountable governance and allow the ratepayers/councillors the opportunity to have timely accurate information with the decision making process being equitable and transparent.

ITEM 15.3: MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY – BRIEFING AGENDA

VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY

Council resolve that the Agenda Briefing for the Ordinary Council Meeting be the 2nd Tuesday (7 days prior to the OCM) in the Month. That this Agenda is the final Agenda and the information provided by staff continues to be their unbiased professional opinion. This Agenda should be provided to Councillors and the public no later than 12 noon on the Thursday prior to the Agenda Briefing.

Reason: Refer to revocation motion.

Officer's Comment:

The need for improvement within Council meeting processes and timelines was identified by the CEO shortly after her commencement in February 2011 and over the past three months, as she has observed increased numbers of Council meeting and Agenda Briefing sessions.

The intent behind the changes previously presented to Council was to allow Elected Members greater time to scrutinise Officer Reports and conduct appropriate additional research into the cause and effect of an Officer recommendation or Elected Member's motion.

There were recent queries raised by a Councillor at a Council meeting, regarding providing Officer Reports and Councillor Motions within required "notice" periods. As a consequence, the CEO identified a further deficiency within the Council Meeting process specifically relating to agenda development and release.

Those changes allow:

- In the subsequent week to the Briefing Session, the City's Officers will refine their reports to incorporate, where appropriate, more information to address feedback from the public and Council Members provided at the Agenda Briefing Session. Report refinement will allow Members to have the fullest available information they require to consider the recommendations to Council. This is what has occurred process wise for some time.
- The papers (including the Agenda) for the Council meeting will then be finalised on the Tuesday ONE week before the Council meeting, and distributed to Councillors and the public. This further allows both groups increased time to read, consider and discuss the papers, and prepare themselves for debate on any item.

At the Council meeting, the public will (like now) be able to question any Council paper.

The CEO's recommendation to Council has been that Council trial this process for six months.

The *Local Government Act 1995* and Regulations, and the Council's Standing Orders are not definitive on "notice" timeline requirements, as part of the Agenda development process, and this lack of clarity causes legal uncertainty. Accordingly, the CEO determined that to make that process clearer, the agenda should be marked "draft" and all Officer Reports will also be draft documents, until the finalised agenda and Reports (and Council Member Motions) are distributed to Council Members and the public under the cover of the finalised agenda.

Under Clause 3.3(2) of the Standing Orders “the purpose of the agenda briefing session is to provide an opportunity for elected members and persons in the public gallery to ask questions on the content of the **proposed** agenda” – the use of the word “proposed” clearly indicates that any agenda that may be provided at an agenda briefing session is not the finalised document. The use of the word “proposed” supports the position that an agenda can be draft until the final distribution of the Council papers.

The CEO agrees with Council that significant work needs to be undertaken to make the Standing Orders much clearer, less ambiguous and provide definitive “rules” for meeting process. Until that occurs and new Standing Orders are made local law, the CEO proposes meeting processes improvements that are possible within the current Standing Orders should be embraced.

Ultimately, in support of the Council’s wish for increased transparency and quality of information provision for Albany’s citizens, clause 1.3 of the Standing Orders should be considered.

Clause 1.3 of the standing Orders state:

” (1) The purpose of (the Standing Orders) is to provide a set of procedures to assist in the good conduct of meetings of the Council....

(2) ...intended to result in:

- (a) better decision-making by the Council;
- (b) orderly and efficient conduct of meetings dealing with business of the Council;
- (c) greater community participation and understanding of the business of the Council; and
- (d) more open and accountable local government.”

Clause 1.3 forms the basis of Council’s recent decision for meeting process changes, including ensuring processes are in place to provide increased time for sharing and consideration of information that will go before Council at its meetings. The processes resolved by Council at their meeting of 15 February 2011 is intended to reflect and implement the spirit and intent of clause 1.3.

15.4: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK – GOVERNANCE MATTERS

**ITEM 15.4: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

That the agenda for Councillor Workshops be set by councillors, to informally discuss governance matters.

Reason:

There is at present no forum for Councillors to meet, where they can consider the future long term development of our City, without being distracted by short term issues.

Officer's Comment:

The CEO has sought advice from Council Members regarding future Council Workshop briefing topics. Strong response was received to that request, and a list of proposed topics was provided recently to Council Members in that regard. All of those topics are strategic or of a high level operational nature. As no further feedback was received from Members in respect of that list of topics, the CEO is now preparing a forward timetable of items for consideration at future Council Workshops, based on that list. That timetable will be provided to Council Members in the near future.

Should Council wish to hold another meeting/forum (in addition to the Council Committee meeting, the Council Workshop, the Agenda Briefing session and Council meetings) to allow Councillors more time to meet to consider future long term development of the City and or governance matters, the CEO will facilitate organisation of that additional meeting.

15.5: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY – CODE OF CONDUCT

**ITEM 15.5: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LEAVESLEY
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

In light of the recommendations and observations of the Best Practice Review July 2010, Council instructs the CEO to undertake research and prepare recommendations for a Councillor Workshop with regard to the City's Code of Conduct. In particular in relation to provisions when dealing with lobbyists, elected member dealings with developers/proponents, and employee liaisons with proponents. This work to be completed and the new code of conduct adopted prior to the October 2011 Local Government Elections.

That the City allocates appropriate financial resources in the 2011/12 budget to enable this to take place.

Reason:

Extract from Best Practice Review: *"Including these provisions in the Code of Conduct will enhance transparency and bolster public confidence in the Council."*

Officer's Comment:

The Council has requested the CEO to:

1. Undertake a review of the Standing Orders, given the identified inadequacies and ambiguities within those local laws. Those reviewed Standing Orders will be considered by Council in the near future.
2. Support Council in undertaking a review of its Governance processes (including reviewing its Code of Conduct and governance policies). Further to the *Better Practice Review*, (Council has made a commitment to the Minister for Local Government that such Governance Review will be completed in the near future. (OCM 20 April 2010, Item 16.4.1.)

The CEO has commenced work on both those activities.

Completion of the review of the Code of Conduct should be possible for completion within the anticipated 2011/2012 budget.

15.6: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR J BOSTOCK – SCHEME AMENDMENT REQUESTS (SARs)

**ITEM 15.6: NOTICE OF MOTION 1 BY COUNCILLOR J BOSTOCK
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

In line with the Better Practice Review and with immediate effect, Council discontinue the use of Scheme Amendment Requests (SARs) and only consider formal Scheme Amendments in accordance with legislation. Relevant City Policy and guidelines are to be amended accordingly.

Reason:

Whilst the intent of an exploratory request might sound practical and save proponents time and money in preparing an application, Council are disadvantaged in attempting to make judgement without all the necessary facts. Since the process is not provided for in law, provisional “acceptance of permission” can increase expectation causing considerable potential for ambiguity and confusion with additional risk to litigation.

Officer’s Comment:

The Notice of Motion has minor budgetary implications. It would be prudent for Council to be advised of cost information prior to consideration of the motion, given the “tight” budget position - a potential revenue loss may be unacceptable.

At the June OCM Council will be asked to make decisions on various competing budgetary priorities, and this is one of matters that could be considered in the context of the FULL budget. I recommend the motion be considered as part of the June OCM debate. In the meantime, the Councillor could make submissions to the Council Workshop and the Audit Committee meeting that will be organised to consider the budget recommendations by the City’s Executive.

**ITEM 15.6: AMENDED RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

THAT Council:

- 1)SEEKS comment from planning consultancies, the Department of Planning, other comparable local governments, relevant government agencies and any interested persons on the move to cease the receiving of Scheme Amendment Request applications consistent with the recommendations of the Better Practice Review, and whether there are any alternative approaches which have been employed to deal with requests outside of strategy recommendations within other areas that could be considered by Council.**
- 2)REQUESTS staff provide feedback on the above consultative process and examples of any alternative approaches at a Councillor Workshop prior to 30 November 2011.**
- 3)CONTINUES to accept Scheme Amendment Requests during this interim period, however ADVISES planning consultancies that a moratorium on such requests and formal scheme amendment applications will be imposed once consent has been granted to advertise the Draft Local Planning Scheme No. 1 (expected to be granted by the Western Australian Planning Commission in September / October 2011).**

Officer's Comment (G Bride)

Background

1. The Scheme Amendment Request (SAR) process was developed as part of the Great Southern Planning Protocol coordinated by the Great Southern Development Commission in 2005, in consultation with the Department of Planning (Albany) and local governments of the Great Southern.
2. The intent of the SAR process was primarily to identify on a strategic level whether a rezoning proposal had planning merit and whether there were any significant issues that needed to be identified/resolved in a formal rezoning application prior to the preparation of that document. The proposal would also be referred to relevant government agencies to identify any initial concerns.
3. The SAR process has been in place within the City of Albany for at least eight (8) years and has generally been well received by the development industry, the Department of Planning and other government agencies.

Discussion

4. The Albany Local Planning Strategy was adopted by Council in June 2010 and formally endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission in August 2010.
5. As the City now has an adopted Planning Strategy, which identifies a broad vision for the future growth of the City, the relevance of the SAR process is diminished somewhat.

6. The Better Practice Review raised concerns that support for a SAR application gave a form a tacit approval to an amendment application. It is important to note however that all Council resolutions relating to SAR proposals only state that Council would be '*willing to entertain the submission of a formal rezoning application*' and does not specifically give consent to such proposals. The resolution also identifies the key studies or reports that should be included in any such rezoning application to assist Council in understanding all the issues. It is known by the proponent that a formal scheme amendment will need to be reviewed by the Environmental Protection Authority, advertised to the community and scrutinised by government agencies. Ultimately the Minister for Planning decides whether to accept or reject the rezoning proposal. There is no commitment that Council would initiate or adopt the amendment after advertising.
7. It should be noted that Draft Local Planning Scheme No. 1 will be presented to Councillors at its July Elected Members Workshop and ultimately to the August 2011 Council Meeting requesting the acceptance of modifications made to the initiated version and formally seeking the consent of the Western Australian Planning Commission to advertise the document. At the same meeting staff will recommend that a moratorium on the acceptance of scheme amendments (not already lodged) be evoked once consent to advertise has been granted by the Commission.
8. There is also only a small number of SAR proposals remaining in the system as planning consultants have been made aware of the impending advertising of the Scheme.
9. A number of other local governments are utilising the SAR process (with similar processes) outside of the Great Southern Region. Some local governments also have a process in place to receive applications to amend their Local Planning Strategy and should Council and the WAPC ultimately decide to amend the strategy, the proponent would lodge a formal rezoning application. It is important to note that in some circumstances there may be valid reasons to consider a proposal which is not completely consistent with an adopted Strategy.
10. Should the motion be adopted, no consultation with the development industry would have occurred; a consultancy may currently be preparing a SAR proposal and may not be able to lodge the proposal due to the effect of the resolution.
11. Given the impending review of the Local Planning Scheme and the subsequent moratorium on new scheme amendments (and by association SAR's), it is recommended that this issue be referred to an Elected Members Workshop by no later than the end of November 2011, after consultation on the merits of retaining the SAR process has been undertaken with the development industry, Department of Planning, relevant government agencies and comparable local government authorities outside of the Great Southern. This will also allow sufficient time for staff to review a number of different mechanisms that may be used by other local governments.

15.7: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR J BOSTOCK – COUNCIL CHAMBER CONFIGURATION

**ITEM 15.7: NOTICE OF MOTION BY COUNCILLOR J BOSTOCK
VOTING REQUIREMENT: SIMPLE MAJORITY**

In line with the Better Practice Review, the configuration of the Council Chamber is altered to better reflect the purpose and roles of those in attendance. No Councillors should have their backs to the public gallery and officers should be formally separated and sit apart from the decision making Council. The detailed plan to be formulated at the next Councillor Workshop and the changed implemented as soon as practicable.

Reason:

The Ordinary Council Meeting is the instrument through which Council makes decisions and governs, thus the Chamber and its layout are significant in signalling the formality and importance of the occasion. The current seating arrangements do not allow the public to observe the decision making process and Councillors back to the public is disrespectful. Whilst the City Executive Directors are seated at the “head” of the Chamber there is the possibility of confusion as to their role in the proceedings. A simple seating rearrangement could open up the Chamber making the proceedings more accessible to the public and better reflect the governance role of the Mayor and Councillors.

Officer’s Comment:

While the CEO agrees with the Councillor that no Councillor should have their back to the public gallery, to configure the room with separate seating arrangements for Executives may cost more than \$10,000 (informal cost estimate previously sourced when Better Practice Review was released).

The CEO has considered rearranging the seating at the current table configuration, such that the four Executives sit with their back to the public gallery (with the CEO and minute secretary remaining seated near the Mayor). This change may only incur minimal expense. However, the CEO had decided to defer such rearrangement until after the October Council election.

At the June OCM Council will be asked to make decisions on various competing budgetary priorities, and this is one of matters that could be considered in the context of the FULL budget. I recommend the motion be considered as part of the June OCM debate. In the meantime, the Councillor could make submissions to the Council Workshop and the Audit Committee meeting that will be organised to consider the budget recommendations by the City’s Executive.

XVI. URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY DECISION OF THE MEETING

ITEM 16.1: REVOCATION MOTION BY COUNCILLOR WELLINGTON

In accordance with Regulation 10(1a) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*, we the undersigned hereby move to have Report Item 12.8.2 Community and Economic Development Strategy and Policy Committee Meeting Minutes-27 January 2009, Committee Recommendation 3 which was moved at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 17/02/2009, and Report Item 14.6.1 Lease of Albany Leisure and Aquatic Centre Cafe which was moved at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 20/07/2010, be reconsidered.

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

ITEM 16.1: MOTION 1

VOTING REQUIREMENT: ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

THAT Item 16.1: Revocation Motion by Councillor Wellington be accepted by Council as an Urgent Item.

Reason:

Continuing the supervision of the Albany Leisure and Aquatic Centre has financial implications for Council. Given the decisions made by Council at its meeting on 19/05/2011, the resolutions that Council made at the meetings held on 20/07/2010 and 17/02/2009 can no longer stand.

ITEM 16.1: REVOCATION MOTION BY COUNCILLOR WELLINGTON

1. **THAT the following condition imposed by the resolution of Council on 17 February 2009, detailed in Item 12.8.2, being:**

“THAT active supervision be INTRODUCED into the gymnasium within current staffing levels.”

and

2. **THAT the following condition imposed by the resolution of Council on 20 July 2010, detailed in Item 14.6.1, being:**

“THAT Council continue to operate the Albany Leisure and Aquatic Centre (ALAC) Cafe with City of Albany staff as a community service, and continue to utilise the cafe services in the provision of catering services across the organisation, and in the interim the administration investigate further option which would make the cafe more sustainable in line with commercial operations. A report is to be prepared for council review over a twelve month period from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011.”

Be REVOKED.

Reason:

Council decisions made at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 19 May 2011 are inconsistent with previous decisions of Council.

Officer's Comment (CEO):

As a result of Council's resolutions at its meeting of 19 May 2011, it is necessary to revoke previous Council resolutions.

Gymnasium Supervision

The Albany Leisure and Aquatic Centre Gymnasium has been supervised by ALAC staff during operational hours since February 2009, pursuant to Council's prior resolution of 2009.

This staffing model is unnecessary from a risk management perspective but is very costly in respect of staff expenses. During off peak times the gymnasium need not be supervised but rather effective risk management such as signage could be displayed for user's self responsibility and appropriate clauses also included in membership contracts.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 16 December 2008, Council resolved to seek legal and insurance advice on the possible ramifications of operating an unsupervised gym (Item 12.8.2).

In December 2008 the City of Albany sought legal advice on the City's potential exposure to civil liability in relation to the gym facilities at ALAC for the purposes of consideration of supervision in peak times.

That advice was that the City can better risk manage its duty of care in relation to gym users at ALAC, by providing appropriate warning of the risk.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 17 February 2009, Council resolved that active supervision be introduced into the gym within current staffing levels, and some appropriate signage be installed (Item 12.8.2).

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 17 May 2011, Council resolved that steps be taken to increase the efficiency of ALAC. During discussion of that motion, the City of Albany CEO informed Council that an item would be presented at the June 2011 OCM recommending rescinding Council's resolution of February 2009 regarding the active supervision of the gymnasium.

To increase cost efficiency in the gym, the necessity to supervise at off-peak times where there are very small numbers of people using the gym equipment is unnecessary from a risk management perspective.

In April 2011 the City of Albany sought legal advice regarding the type, location and precise wording of signage within ALAC, including the gym.

Consistent with prior advice this most recent advice identifies that ALAC can significantly limit its liability using effective signage and exclusion clauses in membership contracts. The City is now proceeding to implement the legal advice recommendations.

Council should note that the CEO has arranged for ALAC staff to continue to supervise the gymnasium during peak times.

Monitoring the gym at off-peak time incurs \$21,939 in staff resources. While there will be costs to erect signs and amend membership forms, this will be minimal compared to staffing costs currently incurred.

Cafe Services

In 2009-10 the Cafe experienced a deficit of \$57,232, is currently budgeted for a \$30,000 deficit in 2010-11 and will continue to be in deficit (of approximately \$37,000) in 2011-12 on current projections.

In October 2010, the City of Albany contracted Chartered Accountants RSM Bird Cameron to develop a financial business plan for the Time-out Cafe. This plan investigated three possible scenarios:

1. Operate the Cafe “business as usual” - forecasts assume that the Cafe continues to trade under management of the City with no significant changes to operations;
2. Operate the Cafe with a commercial focus - assesses the potential performance of the Cafe under more aggressive trading assumptions,
3. Sub-Leased – to a private operator.

While the plan recommended option 2, with an apparent Net Present Value (NPV) advantage under that scenario, it was based on several assumptions:

- ALAC enforcing a “no external food” policy – this will require considerably more staffing effort and could lead to consumer disputes which would also need to be managed by staff.
- More aggressive visitor numbers patronising both ALAC generally and the Cafe in particular – there is no guarantee of this being realised.
- Further increased gross margins – again, given the recent financial history of the Cafe, there is no guarantee that this will be realised.

In comparison, the NPV calculations for option 3 included amounts which perhaps should not have been costed into the calculations, such as any redundancy payment to the cafe staff – alternate employment could potentially be found for those staff members. The calculations do not appear to have fully accounted for the potential rent and other return that may be possible to the City in leasing.

The plan states that the Cafe’s “gross margins are significantly lower than the industry average and staff costs are significantly higher. A significant reason for the under-performance is high staff costs due to the cafe primarily employing casual staff”.

Discussions with many experienced cafe operators in the City of Albany show that it is common practice in the industry to employ staff on a casual basis for staffing flexibility.

At its Council Meeting in May 2011 the Council resolved to:

“Invite expressions of interest for commercial operation of the Timeout Cafe (acknowledging acceptance of the cafe’s role in an emergency situation as ALAC is a designated evacuation centre).”

Accordingly the decision of Council on 19 May 2011 requires revocation.

XVII. REQUEST FOR REPORTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION.

Nil.

XVIII. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NOTICES OF MOTION TO BE DEALT WITH AT THE NEXT MEETING.

IX. ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH WHILE THE MEETING IS CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

XX. NEXT ORDINARY MEETING DATE

Tuesday 19 July 2011 at 7pm.

XXI. CLOSURE OF MEETING

**STATUS REPORT ON DEFERRED ITEMS
 FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Meeting Date	Item Number	Details/Status
15/06/2010	15.2.3	Lot 5 Rufus Street - Compensation for Subdivision Design Changes. WAITING ON ADVICE FROM LGIS.
16/11/2010	2.6	Surrender Lease over Hangar Site 2 at Albany Airport. REQUIRES FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY COUNCIL.
16/11/2010	1.2	Development Application Wind Turbine at Lot 158 Randell Crescent. THIS ITEM WAS LAID ON THE TABLE UNTIL COUNCIL DEVELOPS A POLICY DEALING WITH WIND TURBINES.
16/11/2010	1.3	Development Application Wind Turbine at Lot 154 Randell Crescent. THIS ITEM WAS LAID ON THE TABLE UNTIL COUNCIL DEVELOPS A POLICY DEALING WITH WIND TURBINES.
15/02/2011	4.11	Padre White Lookout Project. CEO to undertake further investigation of this project, including detailed budget analysis for project scope and provide further advice to council. OUTSTANDING.
15/02/2011	2.4	Cull Road Subdivision-Sale and Marketing. (ii) Council DEFER the Sale of the balance of Lot 9001, Cull Road subdivision in order to further examine opportunities to: a. Improve recovery of lead infrastructure and pre-servicing costs; b. Improve alignment and lot viability for the balance land; c. Complement the City of Albany development; d. Complement neighbouring developments; and e. Work with and respect the rights of existing and future residents of the area. OUTSTANDING.
19/04/2011	1.1	Adoption of Draft Local Planning Policy Manual. RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION 2 WAS LAID ON THE TABLE FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY COUNCIL.
19/04/2011	4.7	Audit Committee Recommendations. That Council request the Chief Executive Officer to further review the investment of Surplus Funds Policy through the Finance Strategy Committee, prior to recommendation to Council. PENDING.
17/05/2011	1.1.2	Seniors Advisory Committee Recommendation- That Council Support the establishments of a working party to develop guidelines to assist the City of Albany Planning and Development Services Department to support Housing for Lifestyle Principles for future lifestyle villages. LAID ON THE TABLE FOR A PERIOD OF ONE MONTH TO ALLOW FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY COUNCIL TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE JUNE 2011 COUNCIL

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING & BRIEFING
AGENDA – 21/06/2011
REFER DISCLAIMER

		MEETING.
17/05/2011	3.1	Albany Leisure and Aquatic Centre. That the Business Plan be Brought back to Council for the Approval of the Recommendation. PENDING COMPLETION OF BUSINESS PLAN