



MINUTES

ANNUAL MEETING OF ELECTORS

**Tuesday 13 March 2018
6.00pm
City of Albany Council Chambers**

ANNUAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
MINUTES – 13/03/2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Details	Pg#
1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING	3
2.	PRAYER AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL LAND OWNERS	3
3.	RECORD OF APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE	3
4.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS AGM HELD 10 MARCH 2016	4
5.	RECEIPT OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE 2016-17 FINANCIAL YEAR	4
6.	GENERAL BUSINESS	4
7.	PUBLIC QUESTION AND STATEMENT TIME	4
8.	CLOSURE	16

ELECTORS MEETING PROCEDURE

In accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995*, being:

5.31. Procedure for electors meetings

The procedure to be followed at, and in respect of, electors meetings and the methods of voting at electors meetings are to be in accordance with the regulations.

Subject to regulations 15 and 17 the procedure to be followed at a general or special meeting of electors is to be determined by the person presiding at the meeting.

5.32. Minutes of electors meetings

The CEO is to:

- (a) cause minutes of the proceedings at an electors meeting to be kept and preserved; and
- (b) ensure that copies of the minutes are made available for inspection by members of the public before the council meeting at which decisions made at the electors meeting are first considered.

5.33. Decisions made at electors meetings

- (1) All decisions made at an electors meeting are to be considered at the next ordinary council meeting or, if that is not practicable-
 - (a) at the first ordinary council meeting after that meeting; or
 - (b) at a special meeting called for that purpose,

whichever happens first.

- (2) If at a meeting of the council a local government makes a decision in response to a decision made at an electors meeting, the reasons for the decision are to be recorded in the minutes of the council meeting.

The procedures for the conduct of an electors meeting are prescribed in the *Local Government Act (Administration) Regulations 1996*, being:

reg 15. Matters for discussion at general electors meetings-s. 5.27(3).

For the purposes of the section 5.27(3), the matters to be discussed at a general electors meeting are, firstly, the contents of the annual report for the previous financial year and then any other general business.

reg 17. Voting at electors meetings-s 5.31

- (1) *Each elector who is present at a general or special meeting of electors is entitled to one vote on each matter to be decided at the meeting but does not have to vote.*
- (2) *All decisions at a general or special 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.*

reg 18. Procedures at electors meetings-s 5.31

Subject to regulations 15 and 17, the procedure to be followed at a general or special meeting of electors is to be determined by the person presiding at the meeting.

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Mayor declared the meeting open at **6.00pm**

2. OPENING PRAYER

“Heavenly Father, we thank you for the peace and beauty of this area. Direct and prosper the deliberations of this Council for the advancement of the City and the welfare of its people. Amen.”

“We would like to acknowledge the Noongar people who are the Traditional Custodians of the Land.

We would also like to pay respect to Elders both past and present”.

**3. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE
PREVIOUSLY APPROVED**

Mayor

Dennis W Wellington

Councillors:

Frederickstown Ward

G Stocks

Frederickstown Ward

R Stephens

Kalgan Ward

E Doughty

Kalgan Ward

B Hollingworth

Breaksea Ward

R Hammond

Breaksea Ward

P Terry

Vancouver Ward

T Sleeman

Vancouver Ward

J Shanhun

West Ward

A Goode JP

West Ward

S Smith

Yakamia

A Moir

Yakamia

R Sutton

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer

A Sharpe

Executive Director Corporate Services

M Cole

Executive Director Development Services

P Camins

Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment

M Thomson

Executive Director Community Services

S Kay

Manager Finance

D Olde

Meeting Secretary

J Williamson

Public Gallery and Media: Approximately 25 members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies/Leave of Absence

Mr Mervyn Leavesley

Apology

Mr John Guidera

Apology

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

ITEM 5.0: RESOLUTION

**MOVED: COUNCILLOR SMITH
SECONDED: COUNCILLOR MOIR**

THAT the minutes of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 7 February 2017, as previously distributed, be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

CARRIED

5. RECEIPT OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE 2016-17 FINANCIAL YEAR

ITEM 6.0: RESOLUTION

**MOVED: COUNCILLOR STEPHENS
SECONDED: COUNCILLOR TERRY**

THAT the City of Albany Annual Report for the 2016-17 Financial Year be received.

CARRIED

6. GENERAL BUSINESS

The matters to be discussed at a general electors meeting are, firstly, the contents of the annual report for the previous financial year and then any other general business.

7. PUBLIC QUESTION AND STATEMENT TIME

Questions tabled by Mr Andrew Duncan, 57 Barrass Road, Little Grove

CITY OF ALBANY

Questions re Electors AGM Tues 13th March 2018

1. What future provisions will be made for parking at Middleton Beach given that the current parking between the Surf Club and Three Anchors is to be removed and the proposed Hotel / Commercial development will significantly increase parking needs? (Concerned that locals utilising the premium swimming beach will not be able to access parking in the future , and parking is already near capacity during peak summer periods).

***Response:** Each of the individual developers in the Middleton Beach Activity Centre will be required to provide parking within their lot in accordance with the approved structure plan. It is anticipated that this would be in a subterranean configuration.*

Additionally, future stages of the works will include more public parking on Adelaide Crescent, as well as a new parking station in the centre of the balance lot to the west of the realigned Flinders Parade.

2. What is planned for parking (tour ship bus access, visitor access - long vehicles etc.) in relation to the new Visitor Centre, without compromising local shopping / library etc. access for Albany residents?

ANNUAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
MINUTES – 13/03/2018

Response: The western side of York Street will be marked for long vehicles only and the City will monitor usage and the impacts on other parking in York Street and make any changes considered necessary in due course.

Our experience has shown the number of RVs and caravans parking near the current Visitors Centre on a daily basis is minimal. The long bays in front of the new Visitor Centre can be used by these vehicles.

In addition, the City is updating the information bay at Amity Quays and directing caravans and RVs there initially. Visitors will also be provided with walking directions to the new Visitor Centre. The City will be providing an information sheet for other regional Visitor Centres and will work with them to assist us to direct people with large vehicles to Amity Quays.

3. When will the new hanger sites at Albany Airport be available and what will be the mechanism for release? (Tender, fixed price etc.)

Response: Additional hangar sites will be made available post 30 June 2018. The Property Management (Leases and Licences) Policy provides vacant property will be offered through an EOI/RFP (Request for Proposal) process. Rental for all Airport hangar sites are based on market valuation and reviewed every 3 years in line with the Policy.

A report will be prepared for Council approval to ensure that compliance with existing and future leases is being maintained.

Future additional hangar sites have been identified, pending review and endorsement through the Airport Master Planning process.

4. When will the Strategic / Master Plan for Albany Airport be Review/ updated given the current plan is dated 2012 and is considerably outdated?

Response: The Airport Master Plan for the Albany Airport is scheduled for a full review. The review will formally commence in August 2018.

5. When developing the new Airport plan will it include an assessment of General Aviation needs, especially in relation to quantifying the demand hanger sites?

Response: Yes. General aviation users are key stakeholders that will be involved in the consultation process. Communication with stakeholders throughout the process is critical to ensure all interested parties work together to achieve common goals.

Regards
Andrew Duncan
57 Barrass Rd
Little Grove

Tabled Address by Mr Warren Marshall, 36 Cliff Street, Albany.

11/03/2018

**City of Albany
ANNUAL ELECTORS MEETING - 2018
March 13, 2018
6pm**

PREAMBLE

Thank you for the opportunity to speak before my elected council and the officers discharged with acting in the best interest of the residents and ratepayers. It is salutary to remember that one of the definitions of leadership is the authority to serve others. It is in this context I make the following statements and ask the associated questions.

I have lived at 36 Cliff Street since 1953. It is unfortunate that I am unable to attend in person, but I am grateful that I can place my representations before you in this manner.

That Albany as a city is only as good as its people maybe a truism but it masks an assumption that the responsible people with the authority to serve others are indeed altruistic, visionary, and purposeful.

I would argue that the City of Albany as an entity is indeed lucky to have an informed and passionate community, that in holding to account what the CoA does, ensures that the CoA is truly committed to making things better for the people in an open, accountable, and transparent way.

My statements and questions below address each of the goals which underpin the Annual Statement, the CoA's desire for new opportunities, solutions, and outcomes for the whole of the City of Albany. (Page 68) and specific items within the report.

**SECTION 1 - VIEWS
Pages 3, 4, 45, 46, 47, 52, 57 - Annual Report
Page 51**

STATEMENT:

The COA is quick to endorse and accept the concept of the need to preserve wherever possible the unique views that Albany possesses in projects which it deems to have cultural, social, and economic significance.

This is what the Annual report trumpets.

“Connected Built Environment

3. Develop vibrant neighbourhoods which retain our local character and heritage.” (page 51).

But where is the commitment to the retention of local character and heritage with respect to views.

There is no commitment for the ordinary resident ratepayer, only for the large multimillion dollar projects which the CoA see as defining the future of Albany.

How short-sighted and disrespectful to the residents.

Let me give you three examples

EXAMPLE 1: MIDDLETON BEACH

Pages 3, 4, 45, 46, 47, 52, 57 - Annual Report

underpinned by the

Feb 18/ 2018 attachment - Report Item Dis 077 Refers

This latter report contains

- 30 references to the word “view”,
- 3 references to the concept “view corridor” and
- one reference to the concept “view cone”.

The following statement also occurs;

“Preserve clear sight lines and key views to landmarks, the foreshore, other public places and optimise views and outlook from within buildings.”

EXAMPLE 2: REPORT ALBANY ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Here are excerpts from the consultant’s Report for the Entertainment Centre before it was built. The Report makes much of the concept of ‘view’ using words such as preserving, reinforcing, and maintaining what presently exists.

Here is a summary:

- Pg 4 “...thus the View corridor has however been maintained and an overpass”
- Pg 5 “This harbour View is at the very essence of the Albany experience ...”
- Pg 7 “Views and vistas - Views and vistas of Princess Royal Harbour are maintained through View corridors
- Pg 8 “To enable local Views to be maintained ...”
- Pg 9 “Preserving existing View lines has been a major determinant in the planning of the Albany Waterfront.”
- Pg 10 “.. because each defines a View which must not be blocked.”
- Pg 10 “... a View shed to Princess Royal Harbour occurs which begins to define ...”
- Pg 10 “This View shed determines the maximum building heights to the western edge of the development.”
- Pg 11 “The Spencer Street View corridor should be reinforced ...”
- Pg 40 “... preserving Views to Princess Royal Harbour.”
- Pg 43 “In order to maximise viewing potential from Stirling Terrace ...”
- Pg 43 “The View corridor aligning with Spencer Street 11.2 ...”
- Pg 43 “... minimise interruption of Views from Stirling Terrace.”
- Pg 45 “... breaks in buildings fronting the Promenade to provide View corridors to the marina.”
- Pg 45 “Permanent View corridor between Accommodation and Commercial Precincts”
- Pg 72 “The Spencer Street View Corridor” page 72.

**EXAMPLE 3 - ALBANY WATERFRONT STRUCTURE PLAN
HERITAGE REPORT - HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT**

Approximately

100 references to “view”

17 references to “view corridor”

MY QUESTION OF THE COUNCIL and THE CoA OFFICERS

Q1

“When will the City afford the residents and ratepayers the same respect, the same amenity and the same liveability respect as has been afforded to the above three large developments by developing local planning laws that require developers (and development applications) to address the concept and impact of ‘views’, ‘view sheds’ ‘view corridors’ and ‘view cones’ on the surrounding area especially in those parts of Albany with strong historical significance?”

Q2

“Why has the City not addressed this matter like other LGA’s have done; is there a lack of will, a lack of skill or a lack of resources?”

Q3

“What other evidence or information or justification is required for the CoA to embark on this process as a matter of urgency in order that funds be provided in the forthcoming budget so that the words contained in the Annual Statement are sincere and not a sop?”

Responses provided by the Executive Director Development Services:

While the comments in respect to other local governments are noted, as previously conveyed, the City of Albany does have a number of Local Planning Policy and Planning Scheme requirements which address the matter of views.

Further to this, and as you have mentioned, a number of the larger projects within the City of Albany have the matter of view protection factored into the initial statutory documentation.

It is of note that the City of Albany Local Planning Scheme No. 1 requires a visual impact assessment to accompany Development Applications within the Middleton Beach redevelopment. In addition to this, there are numerous instances within the City of Albany Planning Scheme whereby heights, building locations and materials are controlled in order to mitigate any potential impacts on view scapes.

The City of Albany is currently reviewing its Local Planning Policy Manual. The review has the opportunity to cover the matter of views within the policy context. While the scope of this review can involve the matter of views, please consider that the development and application of Local Planning Policies are restricted by various legislation and statutory planning regulations, which can influence the nature and level of control over certain planning matters.

Further to this, local planning policies can generally not contradict or overreach the boundaries of matters already within State Planning Policies.

SECTION 2 - TREE PRESERVATION AND VALUE

Annual report - Page 49

STATEMENT:

The CoA is proud (and rightly so) to endorse and trumpet its new Urban Tree Strategy. However a careful reading of the document reveals that it is

- a. long on rhetoric and short on details
- b. a strategy? position statement which confuses the public and private domains in its language and intent in that taken at its best it suggests all trees public and private are covered in the policy but taken at its worst it only refers to only those managed by the City.

Look at what the Annual report says,

“The urban tree strategy is another strategic plan with a strong environmental focus that was adopted in 2016-2017 and supports the outcomes the city is aiming to achieve through its carbon footprint reduction strategy.”(page 49)

And what has been achieved? An audit of only CoA controlled land which refers to street trees and details only 170 new street tree plantings. How many trees have been destroyed on private land during the audit which could have been preserved had the CoA adopted the strategy to cover both public and private land through the adoption of informed local laws planning controls? Urban trees don't just grow along the streets.

QUESTIONS

Responses provided by the Executive Director Infrastructure and Environment:

1. What is the strategy truth? Does it cover both public and private domains?

The Strategy looks at both public and private land. Predominantly, the Strategy is seeking to increase trees (canopy cover) within streetscapes (including street tree and retainment of trees within subdivisions) and in public open space. There have been a number of projects that are currently being implemented including a street tree planting program in those suburbs deemed low in canopy cover, and also various revegetation projects including Lake Seppings biodiversity corridor in accordance with the successful 20 Million Trees funding program.

2. If as I read it is does not, what will the City do to ensure the integrity of the concept of urban tree preservation remains by adopting local planning laws which require all development applications to address urban **tree preservation**?

Tree protection is a key objective of the Strategy, and a tree protection and preservation policy is currently being developed by the City. The City is working with the WA Planning Commission and WA Local Government Association to ensure that this Strategy is linked to the Albany Local Planning Scheme. All trees listed on the Municipal Heritage Register as either Commemorative, Significant or Heritage on private and public land are monitored closely by the City's Planning team to ensure effective long term management.

3. When will the City adopt as have other LGA's across Australia a methodology such as the THYER Tree Valuation Method to quantify the value of urban trees so as emphasise the worth and value of vegetation? The Thyer tree valuation method has been accepted Australia wide as the best practice tool for assisting Councils with their deliberation over trees and their perseveration/ retention etc. The method was designed to calculate tree value in two situations:

- a. value to the community of trees growing on public land
- b. value that the community may claim, of trees growing on private land.

The City is currently trialling the “Thyer Method” for tree valuations, and the completion and adoption of the City’s Urban Tree Management Plan will provide a more detailed explanation. The Thyer Method has been used where there has been illegal clearing in natural reserves and road reserves.

Only then will the CoA be able to claim that the Strategies 5 objectives meet the vision of a resilient, healthy, diverse & sustainable urban tree network and are truly meaningful.

SECTION 3 - WEBCAMS
Annual Report -pages 57, 64.

STATEMENT:

For nearly 8 years I have been asking the CoA to embrace the use of webcams to promote Albany.

I have received a deaf ear year after year with every reason in the book given - no money, no planning, no interest and no drive. No-one wants to show initiative and intelligence; to be a little bit open minded and energetic and visionary.

This was the City’s response in 2017.

REPLY TO MY QUESTIONS
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
MINUTES - 07/02/2017

*“In lieu of the HMAS Perth cameras, the City is investigating relocating the equipment to other locations offering **very scenic view sheds** and integrating these into the current Amazing Albany websites. “*

- a. The statement reinforces the concept of the value and importance of the retention of viewsheds and my contention that it is time the City played fair with each resident and applied the same concept to each development application, not just the favoured few multimillion dollar big projects.

Response provided by the Executive Director Corporate Services:

The ongoing interest shown by Mr Marshall in webcams is noted.

- b. What report has been written for the Councillors which canvasses the relocation of this equipment?

Response provided by the Executive Director Corporate Services:

The use of webcams and other imagery to showcase views of the City of Albany is still under consideration. Whether webcams or CCTV, video images or the like has not been determined. The new Visitor Centre will be showcasing virtual reality technology, and we are currently investigating how this content can be more widely distributed in order to promote the region.

- c. Where is this equipment now?

Response provided by the Manager IT:

The webcam is in storage at the City of Albany. The solar power equipment that powered the webcam has been repurposed at the Transfer Sheds at Hanrahan Tip to power two CCTV cameras. The camera footage has been used to provide evidence of thefts and break-ins.

But wait ...

How many councillors know there is an active real time webcam now?

At Middleton Beach - showcasing Ellen Cove

Run I assume by the Surf Club.

<https://www.ipcamlive.com/middletonbeach>

Look at the history.

- a. there was a webcam at the Windfarm. Gone.
- b. and one at Middleton beach run by Coastwatch. Gone
- c. and two at the Frenchman Bay dive wreck; one above and one below the water.

Gone.

Acknowledge the losses above.

How many Councillors have seen the webcams at Rovaniemi Finland?

<http://international.rovaniemi.fi/en/webcam>

This Finnish City derives much tourist income because it is the WORLD home of Santa Claus Village. Each year tens of thousands of people from around the world mainly Europe but including 4 from Albany visit Rovaniemi and spend money. Big money. **And one of the reasons is because of their commitment to technology as a tool to promote what they can offer. An experience of a lifetime.**

How much thought and imagination does it take to realise that the things that Albany has to offer are equal to anything in the world but only if it promotes them.

And webcams are so cheap. Look at the one the Surf club runs. Not the best quality. But I guess it costs them practically nothing. Ask them!

Imagine integrated webcams on Mt Melville and Mt Adelaide/ Clarence, in York Street with the harbour as a backdrop. One of the world's finest natural harbours, sounds and hinterlands on display ... for the WORLD to see. Imagine a webcam that incorporates the new ANZAC centre – the WORLD home of the Anzac spirit?

I just despair at the lack of vision shown, metaphorically and in reality.

If WA is being used as the London Australia hub with the new nonstop Dreamliner Albany needs to find a way to get a share of the action. Use the webcams to promote the City.

Just do it. No more excuses. Do it.

Look at the Annual report. Where is the vision? There is none.

1. Page 57

“Additionally, the City has funded CCTV system upgrades worth about \$80,000 during 2016-2017.”

Each camera is crime focussed.

2. Page 64

“State government pledging \$1 million to the amazing south coast brand and strategy over the next four years, with market launch expected in early 2018.”

Surely some of this massive budget can do more than pay lip service to the proven technology already in place at Middleton Beach and be used to promote the City and not just monitor crime.

Please afford respect to and the display of a 'Fair Go' to the ratepayers.

SECTION 4 – INVESTMENTS

Page 5 Financial Report Annual Report

- a. Assuming this cost has been quantified, what was the final cost to the ratepayers of Albany with the City's failed foray into the subprime investment market with Lehman/ Grange?
- b. What checks, and balances are now in place to ensure there is never a repeat of this folly?

Response (Executive Director Corporate Services):

- a. *The City has been successful in recouping almost all of the investments in Lehman/Grange. This is still subject to ongoing legal action and the formal liquidation of Lehman Bros over 10 years after the event – both in Australia and overseas. While this is frustrating, this is outside of the control of the City. The City is highly likely to recoup more funds once these actions conclude. However, the timeframe and final amount is still somewhat unclear.*
- b. *The City has an Investment of Surplus Funds Policy which sets clear parameters. The investment portfolio and compliance to this policy is reported to Council on a monthly basis. The Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations was also amended in April 2012 to effectively ban investing in exotic. The policy reflects those changes.*

6.05pm Ms Catherine Macdonald, 53 La Perouse Road, Goode Beach

Ms Macdonald's tabled address is detailed below:

City of Albany, AGM of Electors, 13 March 2018
Comment on Annual Report

Thank you, Mr Mayor.

Mr Mayor, Councillors, City of Albany officers, ladies and gentlemen

I am the newly-elected president of the Frenchman Bay Association, the association that represents the community of Goode Beach, sometimes still known by its historical name of Frenchman Bay.

The FBA was founded in 2002 'to represent and promote community interest in the local physical and social environment' and it continues to do so. The community at Goode Beach is diverse, including teachers, nurses, businesspeople and tradespeople as well as geologists, engineers and the odd Professor. This variety is reflected in the membership and committee of the FBA. I have run my own small business from home in Goode Beach for more than 10 years.

My field of expertise is social impact assessment and community relations, and I have more than 30 years' experience in various aspects of this area, mostly in the resources sector and in many different countries as well as Australia. For that reason, I pay particular attention to community engagement and consultation processes used by local government and organisations.

I would like to congratulate the City of Albany for its Annual Report, particularly its statement on p. 64 that they are:

committed to striving for continuous improvements in communication and engagement with the community.

That is an excellent declaration of approach. I sincerely hope that this intent to engage fully with the people likely to be affected by projects, whether direct neighbours or stakeholders situated further afield, will not be diminished by unnecessary focus on legal requirements and regulations. By this, I do not suggest that the City should ignore the law, far from it. Rather, from my long experience, I have learned that going above and beyond the legal requirements and engaging with communities as early and as often as possible leads to much more open, transparent and co-operative relationships.

Giving people more time to absorb plans, study them and respond to them; engaging in discussions about possible options and alternative outcomes and encouraging proponents to try to accommodate community concerns wherever possible will lead to a greater rate of project acceptance and support. I hope the City of Albany will continue to move further in this direction.

Our small community at Goode Beach is currently facing two proposals to develop 5-star resorts in our neighbourhood, one at each end of our suburb. The thought of TWO resorts in such a small area is rather astonishing to me! There are different views about each proposal within Goode Beach, which is natural. It would be rather strange if everyone thought the same thing, and rather boring!

All the same, a substantial proportion of Goode Beach residents have expressed their concern about the scale and situation of these proposals, and they have banded together in various activities to draw the attention of the City and wider Albany, national and international communities to these concerns. My fellow committee member, Robin Budden, who also has international community relations experience, will talk to you about some of these initiatives later this evening.

I will not steal his thunder, but will conclude by expressing the hope that the debate and discussion of these proposals, whether in Council or the media or anywhere else will be conducted at a level above sniping about 'nimbys' or the 'rich bastards out at Goode Beach'. Albany can do better than that. In any case, one of these projects would be in my front yard, not back!

Thank you
Dr Catherine Macdonald
FBA President

6.08pm Mr Robin Budden, La Perouse Road, Goode Beach

Mr Budden's tabled address is detailed below:

**PRESENTATION TO THE ALBANY CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING
13th March 2018**

Robin Budden

94 La Perouse Road, Goode Beach, WA 6330

0417 986 574

robinbudden@y7mail.com

My name is Robin Budden, I am speaking here tonight as a Committee Member of the Frenchman Bay Association, a Save the Lake at Goode Beach Campaigner and a Resident of Goode Beach.

Mr/Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Council thank you for the opportunity to present to you this evening.

My comments tonight relate to the Council's community engagement performance and in particular the findings of the Council's 2017 Community Perception Survey. The wording in the Annual Report makes it clear that the Council sees the results of this survey, based on 613 responses from the community, as important, stating that: "the information provides a foundation for continual improvement within the City" and pats itself on the back for achieving results that were positive overall, "with the average rating for the 2017 survey slightly higher than in 2015 and being above the local government average".

This is all well and good and commendable, however in response to the questions: "How open and transparent Council processes are" and "How the community is consulted about local issues", performance on both has gone backwards since 2015 and they are both below the local government average.

How open and transparent Council processes are	42	45	43	47
How the community is consulted about local issues	45	48	45	47

Our recent experiences with the Lot 660 Resort Proposal reflect this less than satisfactory result and leave us wondering whether the members of Council really are serious about listening to the community and valuing community input to decision making processes, or whether they are simply paying lip service.

A few examples:

- 1. The residents of Goode Beach were not considered Stakeholders by the Proponents – we didn't make it onto the list – and only became aware of the advanced stage of the proposal in September 2017. City of Albany and Department of Planning in contrast have been consulted with since 2015 and neither thought to suggest to the Proponent that they really should talk to the locals.*
- 2. We were given the absolute statutory minimum -28 days - to submit our comments and concerns with what is a significant development in coastal sand-dunes and very close to a unique wetland. Despite the very limited time, we pulled together and responded, as both a Community Association and as individual residents.*

3. *That was back in October. Since then we've had no feedback on either our submissions or the status of the application. We can only speculate on what is going on between the Proponent and the Council. Nothing at all transparent in the process. Nothing at all to take any comfort that the Council is acting in the best interests of all parties.*

We have also done our own Community Perception Survey, with volunteers from Goode Beach and other parts of Albany running a series of information sessions at local markets and community events. We asked those who share our concerns to express them to council by signing a petition. The end result - 1,344 people - 911 Albany residents and 433 from out of town, many of them visitors from WA, Interstate and Overseas who come to Albany for its natural beauty and environment – the very thing the resort will destroy if it goes ahead.

We have presented the petition to the City and the Department of Planning. So far we have heard nothing. We remain hopeful that we will, eventually – and that the City considers the very clearly expressed views of the 1,344 respondents when making its decision. In closing, I would ask that the Council up its game, to get serious about valuing community interests, concerns and inputs and to show by its actions that the City is in touch with its community and is committed to transparent decision-making.

Thank you.

*One final point – I have a copy of my presentation for your records and can make an electronic copy available if you wish.
Thank you again*

6.13pm Mr Roland Paver, 12 La Perouse Road, Goode Beach

Summary of key points:

- Community consultation must be conducted to the fullest extent.
- Third party right of appeal with the State Administrative Tribunal is no longer valid.

MOTION

**MOVED: MR ROLAND PAVER
SECONDED: MR RICHARD VOGWILL**

THAT the decision of Council at the February 2017 meeting regarding WALGA proposals for review of the Local Government Act 1995 be RESCINDED.

CARRIED BY SHOW OF HANDS

Reason for Motion:

There are three specific proposals included in the submission to WALGA.

1. That Annual Electors Meetings are to be done away with.
2. That a minimum of 500 signatures will be required to call a Special Meeting of Electors.
3. That local governments should be given the power to declare someone a frivolous and vexatious complainant.

These three proposals seek to reduce the capacity of electors to express their opinions and to declare them frivolous and vexatious complainants when they do.

Mr Don Dufty, 6 Lunar Rise, McKail

Summary of key points:

- Congratulated the City on the new Visitor Hub.
- Suggested that the City introduce a by law to prohibit removal of trolleys from shopping centres, in response to the large amount of shopping trolleys he has seen left around the City.
- With regards to the Goode Beach development, Mr Dufty stated that while there had been little support for the development from residents of Goode Beach, he supported the development.

6.21pm Ms Pat Kerruish, 35 Garden Street, Middleton Beach

Summary of key points:

- Congratulated the City on the restoration and revitalisation of the Queens Garden on Stirling Terrace.
- Expressed concern at the amount of vandalism occurring in the gardens, and requested that the City of Albany consider the installation of CCTV to monitor and deter further damage.

6.22pm Mr Bill Evans, 248 Middleton Road, Albany

Summary of key points:

- Mr Evans requested information relating to the City's procurement procedures. A copy of the City's Procurement Procedure will be provided to Mr Evans.

Tabled questions from Mr Wayne Monks, 113 Riverside Drive, Kalgan received by email.

My name is Wayne Monks, I am a ratepayer of the City of Albany and live at 113 Riverside Drive Kalgan

Q1 Mr Mayor the Emu Point boat harbour has been an important part of the local recreation and commercial fishing industry and has important social and economic values to the City of Albany so will the City make provisioning in its future budgets to upgrade these facilities.

Response: The City will be awarding the Tender for the upgrade of the Emu Point Boat Pens at the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held on 27 March 2018.

Q2 Mr Mayor eco-tourism plays a critical role in protecting the ecological values of the marine and estuarine environment and is a key component that helps to promote and enhance the magnificent values of Oyster Harbour, its pelican colony and other fauna and marine species so will this City upgrade and protect the Emu Point facilities so that these values can be maintained and preserved for future generations.

Response: As per the first response, the City is committed to upgrading the Emu Point Boat Pens to provide a floating pontoon marina which will enable eco-tourism operations currently utilising the Emu Point Boat Pens to continue into the future.

Wayne Monks

8. CLOSURE OF MEETING

There being no further business the Mayor declared the meeting closed at **6.23pm**.



Dennis W Wellington
MAYOR