



City of **Perth**

Minutes

Ordinary Council Meeting

9 December 2025

Wendy Attenborough
A/Chief Executive Officer
15 December 2025

Minutes to be confirmed at the next Ordinary Council Meeting

These minutes are hereby certified as confirmed.

Presiding member's signature _____

Date _____

Information

This information is provided on matters which may affect members of the public. If you have any queries on procedural matters, please contact a member of the City's Governance team via governance@cityofperth.wa.gov.au.

Question Time for the Public

An opportunity is available at Council meetings for members of the public to ask a question about any issue relating to the City. This time is available only for asking questions and not for making statements. Complex questions requiring research should be submitted as early as possible to allow the City time to prepare a response.

The Presiding Person may nominate a member of staff to answer the question and may also determine that any complex question requiring research be answered in writing. No debate or discussion can take place on any question or answer.

To ask a question, please complete the Public Question Time form available on the City's website www.perth.wa.gov.au/council/council-meetings.

Disclaimer

Members of the public should note that in any discussion during a meeting regarding any item, a statement or indication of approval by any council member, committee member or officer of the City is not intended to be, and should not be taken as, notice of approval from the City. No action should be taken on any item discussed at a meeting of a Committee prior to written advice on the Committee or Council's resolution being received.

Any plans or documents contained in these minutes may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1968*, as amended) and the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction.

Table of Contents

1.	Declaration of Opening.....	5
2.	Acknowledgement of Country/Prayer.....	5
3.	Attendance	5
3.1	Apologies.....	6
3.2	Leave of Absence	6
3.3	Applications for Leave of Absence	6
4.	Announcements by the Lord Mayor.....	6
4.1	Revocation Motion.....	6
4.2	Christmas and the One City Together for Summer Safety Program	7
5.	Disclosures of Interests.....	7
6.	Public Participation	11
6.1	Responses to Public Questions Previously Taken on Notice	11
6.2	Public Questions.....	11
7.	Confirmation of Minutes	35
8.	Questions by Members which due Notice has been Given.....	35
8.1	Councillor Raj Doshi.....	35
8.2	Councillor Catherine Lezer	37
8.3	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds.....	46
9.	Correspondence	46
10.	Petitions.....	46
19.	Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given	48
19.1	Notice of Motion - Revocation of Council Decision – 18 November 2025 – Item 21.1.....	48
11.	Planning and Sustainability Alliance Reports.....	63
11.1	Outcomes of Consultation – Planning Scheme Amendments and Policies for Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Short-Term Rental Accommodation.....	63
11.2	53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth - Proposed Helipad Addition ('Unlisted Use') to the Existing Office Development (DA-2025/5209)	179
11.3	Hay Street - Two Way - Elder to Thomas - Final Concept Plan.....	292
11.4	Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth.....	302
12.	Community Development Alliance Reports	336

12.1	Review of Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement	336
13.	Infrastructure and Operations Alliance Reports	343
	Nil.	
14.	Commercial Services Alliance Reports.....	343
	Nil.	
15.	Corporate Services Reports	344
15.1	Monthly Financial Statements - October 2025	344
15.2	Schedule of Accounts Paid - October 2025	404
15.3	Special Budget Review - Project Re-Prioritisation	452
15.4	WACA - Request for Rates Concession.....	461
15.5	Audit Exit Interview and presentation of audited 2024/25 Financial Statements	468
16.	Engagement and Activations Alliance Reports	586
16.1	Economic Development Sponsorship 2025/26	586
16.2	Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant - 30 iParks Pty Ltd	595
16.3	Policy Review CP 4.10 - Incoming Sponsorship	605
16.4	2026/27 Sponsorship and Grants Program	630
17.	Chief Executive Officer Reports	635
17.1	Adopting the Annual Report and Setting the Date for the 2024/25 Electors General Meeting.....	635
17.2	Adoption of the City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025.....	703
17.3	Adoption of the City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026.....	724
17.4	Review of Local Laws.....	785
17.5	2026 Council and Committee Meeting Dates	790
17.6	Information regarding decisions of Council on a proposed workplace culture review...	799
17.7	Termination of Membership - Catalina Regional Council.....	815
18.	Committee Reports	826
	Nil	
19.	Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given	826
	<i>Item 19 was brought forward to be considered prior to Officer Reports. See+ page 47</i>	
20.	Matters for which the meeting may be closed.....	827
20.1	Strategic Risk Profile Review November 2025	828
21.	Urgent Business	830
22.	Closure.....	830

1. Declaration of Opening

The Presiding Member declared the Ordinary Council Meeting for the City of Perth open at 5:00pm.

2. Acknowledgement of Country/Prayer

The Presiding Member gave an Acknowledgement of Country:

I respectfully acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet, the Whadjuk Nyoongar people of Western Australia, and pay my respects to Elders past and present. It is a privilege to be standing on Whadjuk Nyoongar country.

Thea Chief Executive Officer recited a prayer:

Almighty God, under whose providence we hold responsibility for this City grant us wisdom to understand its present needs, foresight to anticipate its future growth, and grace to serve our fellow citizens with integrity and selfless devotion. And to Thee, be all blessing and glory forever. Amen.

3. Attendance

Members in Attendance

Lord Mayor

Councillors

Bruce Reynolds

Raj Doshi (*retired 7:56pm*)

Liam Gobbert

David Goncalves

Viktor Ko

Catherine Lezer

Adam Pacan (*retired 6:59pm*)

Chris Patton (*retired 7:26pm*)

Lisa Ma

Officers in Attendance

A/Chief Executive Officer

General Manager Infrastructure and Operations

A/General Manager Commercial Services

A/General Manager Community Development

Chief Financial Officer

A/General Manager Engagement and Activation

General Manager Planning and Sustainability

A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy

A/Alliance Manager Council Governance and Policy

Council Governance and Policy Officer

Wendy Attenborough

Allan Mason

John Fish

Tracey Hirst

Michael Kent

Tom Griffiths

Maria Cooke

Charlie Clarke

Ebony Mackey

Ali Muzammal

Public Gallery

There were approximately 36 members of the public in the gallery.

3.1 Apologies

Nil.

3.2 Leave of Absence

Nil.

3.3 Applications for Leave of Absence

Nil

5:02pm *The Lord Mayor asked elected members to acknowledge that Elected Members have had sufficient time to read and consider the Agenda Items presented. Councillor Catherine Lezer raised that she hadn't had a chance to review the responses to her questions for which due notice had been given.*

4. Announcements by the Lord Mayor

4.1 Revocation Motion

The Lord Mayor stressed that the evening's discussion was not about politics or point-scoring, but about the long-term health of the organisation, the wellbeing of staff, and the stability of the City of Perth. The Lord Mayor affirmed that all actions taken regarding the workplace culture review motion were done lawfully, in good faith, and out of a duty of care. The original intention of the motion, the Lord Mayor said, was simply to provide staff with a safe and independent avenue to speak up, enabling the council to fulfil its oversight responsibilities responsibly.

The Lord Mayor acknowledged that administration had significantly pushed back against implementing the decision, seeking multiple legal opinions and suggesting it was unlawful. Supporting the revocation of the motion, the Lord Mayor explained, was not a retreat but a redirection aimed at achieving the same outcomes while fostering cooperation.

The Lord Mayor noted that several communications from staff and former staff, along with concerns raised during the election campaign, created a clear responsibility to provide a safe and confidential reporting pathway. The Lord Mayor reiterated a commitment to transparency and improvement should the process reveal any issues needing correction.

According to the Lord Mayor, the environment had changed dramatically since 18 November, fuelled in part by media scrutiny that could not be addressed without undermining the integrity of the process. Despite the challenges, the Lord Mayor said the truth would emerge and that actions had been guided by concern for those affected.

The Lord Mayor urged councillors to consider the most stable and credible way to support staff and restore confidence in the City of Perth, arguing that independence was essential and what both staff and the community deserved. The Lord Mayor supported revocation not because the original principle

was wrong, but because prioritising the organisation’s long-term health and staff safety was paramount. The Lord Mayor called on all councillors and the administration to reset, lower tensions, and recommit to unity, transparency, and accountability.

The Lord Mayor concluded the formal remarks by reaffirming that staff must feel safe, the public must have confidence, and the council must have a fresh start with a genuinely independent review process, regardless of which mechanism ultimately delivers it. Supporting the revocation, the Lord Mayor said, represented choosing stability over noise and unity over division.

4.2 Christmas and the One City Together for Summer Safety Program

the Lord Mayor highlighted the city’s Christmas season and the launch of the One City Together for Summer Safety program, involving WA Police, government partners, businesses, and the community. The initiative includes extended night patrols, mobile CCTV towers, community activations, police-community engagement, noise monitoring trials, and a citywide safety campaign. Its goal is to make Perth the safest state capital in Australia.

The Lord Mayor described recent festive activities in the city, including the Christmas Trail, giant tree, light installations, concerts, markets, Santa visits, and the nativity concert, noting that the city felt vibrant and alive. The Lord Mayor thanked staff, partners, volunteers, businesses, and the community for bringing the festive season to life and wished all councillors, staff, residents, businesses, and visitors a Merry Christmas. The remarks ended with an encouragement to enjoy the city’s full program of free Christmas activities.

5. Disclosures of Interests

Name	Councillor Liam Gobbert
Item number and title	Item 11.1 Outcomes of Consultation – Planning Scheme Amendments and Policies for Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Short-Term Rental Accommodation
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>“Interest in real property”</i>

Name	Councillor Catherine Lezer
Item number and title	Item 11.1 Outcomes of Consultation – Planning Scheme Amendments and Policies for Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Short-Term Rental Accommodation
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>“A person closely associated owns property in Royal Street adjacent to 20 Royal Street mentioned in this item.”</i>

Name	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds
Item number and title	Item 11.1 Outcomes of Consultation – Planning Scheme Amendments and Policies for Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Short-Term Rental Accommodation
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>“Interest in real property”</i>

Name	Councillor Chris Patton
Item number and title	Item 11.2 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth - Proposed Helipad Addition ('Unlisted Use') to the Existing Office Development (DA-2025/5209)
Nature of interest	Indirect Financial Interest
Interest description	<i>“One of my companies, K2 Audiovisual has a long trading history with Royhill/Atlas/Hancock.”</i>

Name	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds
Item number and title	Item 11.2 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth - Proposed Helipad Addition ('Unlisted Use') to the Existing Office Development (DA-2025/5209)
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>“Have met Sanjiv on a couple of occasions in passing at events.”</i>

Name	Councillor Viktor Ko
Item number and title	Item 11.2 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth - Proposed Helipad Addition ('Unlisted Use') to the Existing Office Development (DA-2025/5209)
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>“I have met with and spoken to Mr Sanjiv Manchanda from Hancock Prospecting regarding this agenda item.”</i>

Name	Councillor Liam Gobbert
Item number and title	Item 11.4 Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>“Interest in real property”</i>

Name	Councillor Raj Doshi
Item number and title	Item 11.4 Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"I have attended charity events at the venue"</i>

Name	Councillor Viktor Ko
Item number and title	Item 11.4 Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>"I own a residence at 108 Terrace Road. Though the property does not adjoin, the report and scheme has wider implications for all of Terrace Road hence this declaration".</i>

Name	Councillor Adam Pacan
Item number and title	Item 11.4 Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth
Nature of interest	Proximity Interest
Interest description	<i>"I have a property 63 Adelaide Terrace".</i>

Name	Councillor Catherine Lezer
Item number and title	Item 15.4 WACA - Request for Rates Concession
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"I am aquatinted with Micheal Veletta a current WACA board member."</i>

Name	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds
Item number and title	Item 15.4 WACA - Request for Rates Concession
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"As Ex president of City rotary He has had involvement with John via their agreement of the club to meet at the WACA. They are also Charity partner. He has had further involvement as City Leader and Stakeholder relationship since."</i>

Name	Councillor Lisa Ma
Item number and title	Item 16.1 Economic Development Sponsorship 2025/26
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"Study Perth/ Cultural Organisations – Kinship/Friendship"</i>

Name	Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves
Item number and title	Item 16.1 Economic Development Sponsorship 2025/26
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"In relation to Study Perth, I previously met the CEO of Study Perth."</i>

Name	Councillor Catherine Lezer
Item number and title	Item 16.2 Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant - 30 iParks Pty Ltd
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"For consistency and completeness I disclose I am a Councillor on Heritage Council WA."</i>

Name	Councillor Lisa Ma
Item number and title	Item 16.4 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grants Program
Nature of interest	Impartiality Interest
Interest description	<i>"Study Perth/ Cultural Organisations – Kinship/Friendship"</i>

6. Public Participation

6.1 Responses to Public Questions Previously Taken on Notice

Questions from Vicki Raniszewski and Steve Wellard that were taken on notice at the Special Council Meeting on 25 November 2025 have been responded to in the Agenda for this meeting.

6.2 Public Questions

Prior to Public Question Time, Councillor Catherine Lezer moved the following motion:

Motion

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Raj Doshi

That Council APPROVE no time limit being applied to public question time.

LOST(4/5)

For: Councillors Raj Doshi, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan and Lisa Ma

Against: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Chris Patton

Robin Harvey – WA 6004

Q1. Follow up question (related to previous council motions) - Given the unanimous motion by City of Perth to follow up with the State Government about the Burswood Motor Racing Track and to oppose its construction. Questions During the election the proposed Burswood Motor Racing Track was identified as a primary election issue and of significant importance to the electors of East Perth in particular. In the weeks before the election a motion to oppose the racetrack and ask for further clarification from the state government was passed unanimously. Now the new council has been established please provide electors with information on how this motion has been actioned by councillors and administrators and what the council is doing to make it clear to the government that they oppose the racetrack proposal.

Provided by A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy

A1. The Administration wrote to Premier Roger Cook on 30 September 2025 regarding the decision at the Ordinary Council Meeting about the Burswood Motor Racing Track.
The letter advised the Premier of Council’s resolution in relation to the Proposed Perth Entertainment and Sporting Precinct (Burswood Park).

Dr Kevin McIlsac – Perth 6000

Q1. Cr Goncalves in the 2 December 2025 OCM you introduce a motion to add yourself as the primary member for the Catalina Committee, replacing existing member Cr Doshi
What is the purpose of the Catalina Committee?
What work does it do, what matters does it oversee?

Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

A1. The Catalina Regional Council (CRC), a regional local government established for the specific purpose of undertaking the rezoning, subdivision, development, marketing, and sale of the Tamala Park land (marketed as Catalina Estate).

Q2. What is the annual fee associated with this meeting?

Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

A2. Information on all elected member representation can be found in the Committees, Sessions, and External Bodies Register [on the City’s website](#). This register also details the remuneration associated with each body.

Q3. Cr Doshi has a 100% attendance record and is the incumbent member. Prior to your motion to replace her, was there any identification of a skills gap, performance deficiency, or attendance failure on her part that necessitated her replacement?

Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

A3. My motion was not based on any finding of a performance or attendance issue.
I am not making any adverse commentary about her capability or commitment.

Q4. The Catalina Committee deals with complex, long-term issues. Can you explain how removing an experienced, performing member supports the principle of continuity, and how the City or Committee benefits from the loss of that institutional knowledge?

Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

- A4.** I agree continuity and institutional knowledge matter that is why external and strategic committee representation can best be done with those with effective leadership and open communication channels to the Lord Mayor and council members.
- Just as importantly, the City does not “lose” Councillor Doshi’s knowledge - she remains a valued elected member, and her insights can continue to inform the City’s position and priorities as appropriate via briefings and engagement opportunities.
- Q5.** Given that there is no performance issue with the incumbent, and arguably a loss of continuity by changing delegates, can you provide the specific advantages the City of Perth gains by swapping Cr Doshi for yourself, or is this motion purely a matter of rotating the financial allowance to yourself?

Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

- A5.** The advantage was entirely grounded in governance and the City’s responsibility to secure the best possible outcomes for its community. The Catalina Regional Council is not a routine committee - it oversees a major, long-term strategic asset with significant financial and community implications for all member councils.
- Ensuring senior representation strengthens the City’s ability to advocate at the appropriate leadership level, to maintain direct and transparent lines of communication, and to influence decisions that shape both financial returns and long-term urban outcomes for our residents.
- Appointing a senior delegate is consistent with the practice of our neighbouring councils and reflects the seriousness with which they - and now we - approach this regional partnership.
- This was not about personalities or performance; it was about ensuring that the City of Perth is represented with the leadership weight and communication profile necessary to safeguard community value and uphold strong, modern governance.

David Lee – West Perth 6005

- Q1.** As a ratepayer in City of Perth, I have concerns about the last-minute motion raised at the City of Perth council meeting on 18 November 2025 when Councillors approved a \$125,000 plus GST workplace culture review, with potential additional costs due to a new paid council committee. I am asking Bruce Reynolds, David Goncalves, Liam Gobbert, Lisa Ma, and Chris Patton, who voted in favour of this motion, to answer these questions individually, not as a group.
- Is this motion for a workplace culture committee your idea, when did you first learn about this urgent motion and how much time did you have to read, understand and review it prior to voting?

Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

- A1.** Thank you for the question.
- The intent behind the motion was straightforward: to provide staff with a safe, independent avenue to raise concerns and to meet our Work Health and Safety obligations.
- Due to confidentiality restrictions, I cannot discuss individuals or specifics. What I can say is that when concerns are raised including potential psychosocial safety risks

	Council has a duty to act. Standing Orders allow urgent business where there is a credible basis, and Councillors voted accordingly on the night.
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A2.	The motion was not my idea. I first saw it when it was circulated electronically with what I believed to be due consideration of the standing orders. I had sufficient time to read the motion, consider the intent, assess the risks raised, and exercise my responsibilities under section 2.10 of the Local Government Act, which requires councillors to make decisions independently and in the best interests of the community.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A3.	No. The motion was circulated and read aloud by the Lord Mayor and considered at the OCM. I understood and agreed with the intent of the motion prior to voting.
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A4.	The motion was originally not my idea. I became aware of it when it was circulated to all councillors before the meeting. As a new councillor, I reviewed the information in front of me on the night and voted based on what I believed was appropriate at the time. The intent, as understood in the chamber, was to provide an independent avenue for staff concerns.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A5.	The first time I saw the motion or new about the associated cost was when it was presented by the lord mayor just before the council meeting
Q2.	Why is the councils new Workplace Culture Committee necessary if the City of Perth already has governance structures to address culture issues & why doesn't this review also include council members?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	<p>The system of work health and safety at the City, including culture and employee experience, is structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement. This includes a range of opportunities for staff to provide confidential feedback on their experience or to seek assistance with issues of concern. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and wellbeing focus, can be found on the City's website at Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor recently advised the A/CEO that any matters of workplace safety are appropriately managed by the Administration, and he has full confidence that the City's WHS system will continue to operate in accordance with those obligations.</p> <p>Elected members have been invited, on a number of occasions (including in the Agenda paper) to discuss with Administration issues of concern that prompted the Lord Mayor's original notice of motion. No matters have been brought forward.</p> <p>Legal advice provided to Elected Members confirms that the Motion of 18 November 2025 to establish a Workplace Culture Committee did not meet the requirements of the Local Government Act 1995. Additionally, legal advice also sets out the invalidity of the revocation motion moved at the Special Council Meeting of 25 November 2025 by Cr Gobbert. This is an important matter of process and the appropriate separation of responsibilities.</p> <p>In this context, the Administration supports external engagement through the Inspector of Local Government, when he takes up office from the 1 January 2026, and wrote to the Minister for Local Government on 26 November 2025 seeking such engagement.</p>
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	The Committee was designed to strengthen independence, transparency, and oversight in a sensitive area that directly affects staff wellbeing.

	<p>It was not intended to replace existing structures, but to complement them by adding an additional independent pathway.</p> <p>The underlying principle has always been the same: supporting a safe, respectful, high-performing workplace for staff.</p>
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A3.	<p>The purpose of the review is to examine organisational culture, governance systems, and staff-related matters - areas that fall within the scope of assessing the performance and function of the City.</p> <p>Councillors are not employees and therefore are outside the jurisdiction of an organisational culture review. Elected members are governed instead by specific legislation (Local Government Act, Regulations, Code of Conduct), which contain their own accountability mechanisms.</p> <p>The committee provides a clear structure for overseeing the review, ensuring independence, transparency, and appropriate governance - particularly because workplace culture concerns may involve matters where Administration should not be assessing itself.</p>
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A4.	<p>The Council may create and abolish committees for purposes which it deems necessary to undertake its role of oversight. I am not able to answer the second part as I did not propose the motion.</p>
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A5.	<p>My understanding was that it was intended to give staff an independent space to raise concerns. It sits alongside existing structures and doesn't replace them. Supporting a respectful and safe workplace is important to all of us.</p>
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A6.	<p>The thought behind this was to have an independent and transparent review by a third party. As I didn't raise the motion, I am unable to comment why it wasn't extended to elected members.</p>
Q3.	<p>(a)As the law firm Mills Oakley was appointed directly, did you authorised or have a say in this selection, (b)what is your personal connection with this company. And (c) have Mills Oakley ever been used by the City of Perth prior to this engagement?</p>
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A1.	<p>(c) Response by the Administration: Since October 2020, when the new Council was appointed, the City has engaged Mills Oakley on 6 occasions, to review commercial documentation, at a total cost of \$25,864.30.</p>
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	<p>I have no personal connection with Mills Oakley.</p> <p>They are a WALGA-approved panel supplier with extensive experience in this specialist area. Any formal engagement would have required a Council resolution and CEO implementation.</p>
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A3.	<p>I did not authorise or participate in the selection of Mills Oakley.</p> <p>I have no past or present personal, financial, or professional connection with the firm whatsoever.</p> <p>As to whether Mills Oakley has been used previously by the City, that is a matter of administrative record and within the CEO's remit to answer, not elected members.</p>
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A4.	<p>The Council appointed Mills Oakley. I do not have any connection with this firm. Prior engagement by the City will need to be confirmed via City officers.</p>

Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A5.	I didn't have any role in selecting the firm, and I don't have any personal connection with them. They are a WALGA-approved supplier with experience in this type of work.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A6.	I have no connection with this company
Q4.	When were you first informed about this new council committee and how much you'll be paid for this role at ratepayers expense?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A1.	The Administration first became aware of the proposed new committee when the Lord Mayor circulated his Notice of Motion six minutes prior to the start of the 18 November 2025 meeting. The A/CEO became aware of the proposal when a hard copy of the Notion of Motion was circulated by the Lord Mayor towards the end of the meeting. In relation to any fees payable, Council Members receive an annual attendance fee that covers both Council and Committee meetings.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	There is no additional payment for this committee.
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A3.	I became aware of the committee structure when the motion was circulated. Councillors do not receive any additional personal remuneration for being members of Council committees. All councillor payments are set by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, not by Council, and committee attendance does not increase those entitlements. There is no extra payment to me because of this committee.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A4.	The Council formed the committee at the OCM. Committees of Council do not carry additional payment for elected members.
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A5.	I was informed when the motion was shared with all councillors. There is no additional payment for serving as a deputy member of this committee.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A6.	I was informed when the motion was presented. There was never any remuneration to be paid for this role
Q5.	Is there a combined estimate of costs for Mills Oakley and Workplace Culture Committee for ratepayers to know the overall cost of this workplace culture review?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	Council authorised a maximum of \$125,000 plus GST, noting that actual expenditure would depend on the final scope. Based on indicative estimates, it was anticipated the total cost would be in the vicinity of approximately \$70,000.
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A2.	Any further budget implications are operational matters managed by the CEO and would be reported through standard financial processes.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A3.	The Council approved a budget of \$125k for the work.
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A4.	Council approved a maximum amount of \$125,000 plus GST.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	

A5.	There was a budget to spend up to 125K.
Q6.	Why is this report confidential and not a public document for ratepayers to see, if public funds are used to pay for this?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	Workplace culture reviews involve staff experiences, sensitive internal information, and matters covered by employment, privacy, and WHS legislation.
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A2.	Confidentiality provisions exist to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect staff welfare and privacy; • safeguard sensitive workplace information; • allow witnesses to speak freely without fear of reprisal; and • ensure legal and procedural integrity.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A3.	Employee matters are pre-determined to be confidential
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A4.	Confidentiality is there to protect people. Reviews about workplace culture often involve staff sharing experiences or concerns, and that information can be sensitive. Employment and privacy laws require councils to handle it carefully. Keeping these reports confidential is common practice across local governments, and it's done to make sure employees feel safe and respected throughout the process.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A5.	The Lord Mayor will need to answer this.
Q7.	Is this a good use of ratepayer money & why? During the special council meeting on 25th Nov 2025, at relatively short notice, where a revocation motion was raised by CLR Liam Gobbert and then voted down by councillors for voted for the earlier motion in favour of this cultural review & as a result of that defeat, under the council s standing orders, the revocation cannot be removed for at least three months?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	<p>The City is always focused on continuous improvement.</p> <p>The system of work health and safety at the City, including culture and employee experience, is structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement. This includes a range of opportunities for staff to provide confidential feedback on their experience or to seek assistance with issues of concern. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and wellbeing focus, can be found on the City's website at Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth</p> <p>The Lord Mayor recently advised the A/CEO that any matters of workplace safety are appropriately managed by the Administration, and he has full confidence that the City's WHS system will continue to operate in accordance with those obligations</p> <p>The Lord Mayor and elected members have been invited, on a number of occasions (including in the Agenda paper) to discuss with Administration issues of concern that prompted the Lord Mayor's original notice of motion.</p> <p>Under the <i>Work Health and Safety Act</i> all Elected Members have a responsibility to bring matters affecting the health and safety, including psychosocial hazards promptly to the attention of the Administration. No matters have been brought forward.</p>

	Legal advice provided to Elected Members confirms that the revocation motion moved at the Special Council Meeting of 25 November 2025 by Cr Gobbert was invalid. This is an important matter of process and the appropriate separation of responsibilities.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	Ensuring staff safety, wellbeing, and a healthy culture is a core responsibility of any organisation. Investing in a safe and high-performing workplace is a responsible measure that supports stability, retention, and long-term performance all of which benefit the community.
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A3.	Yes. A safe, accountable, transparent, and well-functioning organisation is essential to delivering services efficiently and preventing costly failures and further risks in the future. The revocation motion was originally defeated because I made an individual assessment that withdrawing the review would not serve the organisation's or the community's long-term interests.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A4.	Each item involving expenditure is subject to Council support for approval which the workplace culture review received; Ensuring a safe workplace is important for the delivery of services to ratepayers. The Standing Orders and the Act allow for many different scenarios.
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A5.	Investing in staff wellbeing and culture could help the organisation work better for the whole community. A healthy workplace allows staff to deliver better outcomes for residents, students, businesses and everyone who relies on the City.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A6.	I believe an independent review is a good thing for any large organisation. It should be carried out every few years. It ensures staff feel valued, motivated and the city is running as optimally as it can.
Q8.	Was this revocation motion just a procedural manoeuvre to block the future Catherine Lezer revocation motion that she had signalled that she intended to lodge at the next regular council meeting on December 9th, 2025, and why? I do not need a response from the CEO, Acting CEO, or General Managers. I hope that ratepayer s money is used wisely to avoid future rate increases due to wasteful spending and hope that you can offer some clarification on this, thank you for reading and for your time.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	No. I was advised on the Friday that a revocation was to be tabled. We already had a Council meeting scheduled for 4pm on the Tuesday. I notified Administration on the Saturday of my intention so that the matter could be dealt with at the earliest lawful opportunity. Councillors who could not attend were given the option to dial in electronically. Given that the original motion was moved under urgent business, it was appropriate and efficient to test the revocation as soon as possible. Correction by the administration: <i>It is understood that the Lord Mayor is referring to an Elected Member Engagement Session, not a Council Meeting.</i>
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	

A2.	No. I voted based on the merits of the revocation before me at the time, not in response to other councillors' intentions or hypotheticals - as I was legally required under section 2.10 of the Act to make decisions in the best interests of the community.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A3.	No. Council may convene Special Meetings at its discretion to consider motions.
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A4.	The special council meeting schedule and procedural steps followed the standard processes. simply consider each motion based on the information available when it comes before Council. From my understanding, the revocation was scheduled at the earliest lawful opportunity due to being moved as an urgent matter. Although short-noticed, the scheduling and procedural steps followed the meeting processes and all councillors were also given the option to join electronically.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A5.	I believe an independent review is a good thing for any large organisation. It should be carried out every few years. It ensures staff feel valued, motivated and the city is running as optimally as it can
John Morrison – East Perth 6004	
Q1.	To the Lord Mayor, on what basis did you decide to use Mills Oakly?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	As per my earlier statement, Mills Oakley is a WALGA-approved panel supplier. They are widely known for their experience in workplace culture reviews and organisational assessments for large organisations, including prominent councils and universities.
Q2.	What is the cost to the rate payers of this new special committee?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A2.	The Administration would be required to provide full administrative support to any Council Committee. This includes convening meetings, preparing agendas and minutes, and developing reports and advice to support the Committee. Establishing a new Committee will likely result in additional resourcing and financial impacts. These may arise through the need for staff time required to support the Committee's work, the need for specialist expertise, increased governance and reporting workloads, redirection of existing resources from current projects, and potential impacts on service delivery and business as usual. The full budget and resource impact has not been assessed at this time.
Q3.	Further to the resignation of the acting CEO Peta Mabbs on 25/11/2025 due to constant bullying, is this true or not?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
	The City does not provide information about its employees in the public domain.
Q4.	Why weren't all Councillors given time to obtain relevant information and advice from Administration staff plus have time to debate this new urgent motion?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A4.	Councillors received and read the motion during the meeting. Under our Standing Orders, urgent business may be brought forward where appropriate, and the motion was provided in chamber and read aloud to all.

	This notice met the requirements of the Standing Orders. Councillors were able to consider the matter and voted in it by absolute majority.
Jason Bo – East Perth 6004	
Q1.	The Administration claims to have benchmarked this policy against other capital cities. Yet, the City Renewal Authority in Canberra has a delegation limit of \$100,000 , and our largest local peer, the City of Stirling, requires Council approval for anything over \$20,000 . Can the CEO provide details on the 5 Local Governments mentioned under point 21, and why it appears we're trying to set a record high delegation of authority limit?
Provided by Acting General Manager Engagement and Activation	
A1.	<p>The purpose of this policy is to provide a transparent, consistent and efficient framework for managing <u>incoming</u> sponsorship to the City. The City of Stirling's \$20,000 threshold relates to 'providing sponsorship' (outgoing).</p> <p>It is important to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Incoming</u> sponsorship (revenue): the subject of this policy, where higher CEO delegations are common and appropriate because the financial risk to ratepayers is significantly lower, and - <u>Outgoing</u> sponsorship (expenditure): where some local governments apply low delegation limits. <p>The policy does not change the CEO's delegation of authority. All incoming sponsorships, regardless of value, will continue to require CEO approval.</p> <p>The \$150,000 threshold is operational only – it simply identifies when a formal assessment panel is required. It does not expand the CEO's financial authority, and it aligns with existing Council-approved delegations within the City's broader purchasing and budgeting framework.</p> <p>As part of the scheduled review, the Administration benchmarked governance approaches used by the City of Hobart, City of Sydney, City of Cockburn, City of Wanneroo and City of Melville. The findings informed the updated policy now before Council and show the proposed amendments are consistent with current industry practice for <u>incoming</u> sponsorship. It also considers the City's financial capacity.</p>
Q2.	The report confirms the previous 'Formal Assessment Panel' consisted of three internal staff, ensuring at least a consensus-based review. By removing this panel for deals under \$150,000, are we replacing a collaborative check-and-balance with a single chain of command, allowing a single officer from the Partnerships Team and the CEO to approve six-figure deals without any peer scrutiny?
Provided by Acting General Manager Engagement and Activation	
A2.	<p>The purpose of the operational change provides a contemporary agile, efficient approach to assessing higher volume, lower-value, lower-risk incoming sponsorship agreements whilst safe-guarding the City and meeting the expectations of corporate and community partners.</p> <p>This change does not remove assessment and evaluation or create a single chain of command. All sponsorships, regardless of value, must still:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be assessed against the same policy criteria, - use the same documented assessment template, and - receive final approval from the CEO (not from an individual officer).
Q3.	If the requirement for a formal panel assessment is removed for sponsorships under \$150,000, will the details of these agreements - including the sponsor name, cash value,

	and benefits provided - be reported publicly? If not, how will council, let alone ratepayers, know which corporations are funding City activities and what access they are receiving in return?
Provided by Acting General Manager Engagement and Activation	
A3.	<p>No changes are proposed to existing record keeping and reporting practices. The policy requires all incoming sponsorship arrangements to be reported in the City's Annual Report, and for full records – Statements of Interest, assessment and decision documents, and sponsorship agreements – to be maintained in the City's record management system.</p> <p>In practical terms, that means Council will continue to see, through the Annual Report and other reporting, who the City's major sponsors are, the kinds of events and projects they are supporting, and the overall value of the sponsorship program.</p> <p>The City's Partnership Agreements include a clause that the City may (acting reasonably and in good faith) publish information and statistics relating to an Agreement, which allows to City to meet its reporting obligations.</p>
Alan Dolphin – WA 6107	
Q1.	<p>I am the Vice President of Free the Hounds we are a registered charity advocating for the welfare of Greyhounds. As we are 100% volunteer based, we rely on public donations to raise much needed funds. One of our more successful methods of raising these funds is to hold a tin shake in the City, typically twice a year. I also volunteer with Greyhound Adoption WA, once again a 100% volunteer group, the largest Greyhound rehoming group in WA who also hold an annual tin shake. Unfortunately, on nearly every occasion we are subjected to abuse and threats from people, typically homeless, drug or alcohol affected or varying mental health issues. The latest incident occurred last Friday, 5 December, where for at least 20 minutes we were abused by a woman obviously affected by substance abuse. As an ex-City employee of 45 years, I knew to contact City Watch, who I thank for their prompt action in getting police attendance and the resultant arrest of the abuser. My questions are:</p> <p>Taking note of the One City Together for Summer initiative, Does the City have any long term strategies to deal with the anti-social element of the City?</p> <p>One City Together Every day?</p>
Provided by Acting General Manager Community Development	
A1.	<p>The City has a number of strategies in place to address antisocial behaviour. These are supported by strong partnerships and evidence-based initiatives. We work closely with key stakeholders, including WA Police, the lead agency for managing antisocial behaviour in Western Australia, and the Department of Communities, which provides outreach and support services to people experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>We regularly review data for emerging trends and implement targeted campaigns to address issues. OneCity: Together for Summer initiative is an example of this. This strategy includes additional ranger and security patrols, the deployment of decibel monitoring devices (which measure noise levels) to work alongside our 24/7 CCTV coverage and a refreshed campaign to promote positive behaviours across the city and encourage timely community reporting, such as the example you have provided.</p>
Q2.	Can the City provide a more permanent, visible, physical presence particularly in the malls?
Provided by Acting General Manager Community Development	

A2.	<p>The City’s Safe City Patrols — made up of both Ranger and Security teams — operate 24 hours a day, responding to calls and rotating through the malls as part of their regular routes.</p> <p>We also have dedicated teams patrolling the CBD during busy periods for an enhanced presence and early morning joint patrols with WA Police through the malls.</p>
Q3.	<p>When was the last survey of the general public conducted in regard to their thoughts on the City, including safety? When would the City consider conducting such a survey?</p>
<p>Provided by Acting General Manager Community Development</p>	
A3.	<p>The City regularly conducts surveys that include broad questions about safety as well as targeted surveys on specific issues.</p> <p>In September 2025, the Capital City Plan engagement invited wide community input on a range of themes, including safety, through online surveys, interactive workshops, and pop-up sessions. Over 2,000 people and organisations provided feedback to the City.</p> <p>In November 2025, a Safety Perception Survey focused on the Mounts Bay Road motorcycle bays following recent security upgrades at that site.</p> <p>In April 2023, safety questions were included as part of the engagement for the City’s Social, Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</p> <p>In 2022, local businesses were surveyed to gather feedback on the early morning SafeCity Patrols.</p>
<p>Sandip – West Perth 6005</p>	
Q1.	<p>When working with the City's Governance team on the motion to replace Cr Doshi, what exact advice, views or opinions did the Governance team provide Cr Goncalves as feedback?</p>
<p>Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy</p>	
A1.	<p>In a meeting with the Deputy Lord Mayor on Tuesday 11 November 2025 the Administration became aware of his intention to introduce a Notice of Motion regarding committee membership.</p> <p>The administration was not made aware of who the DLM was intending to propose to nominate for the Catalina Regional Council.</p> <p>The DLM was advised that it would be appropriate to bring his proposal to an Elected Member Engagement session to enable an opportunity for all Councillors to review and discuss the proposed motion.</p> <p>The Deputy Lord Mayor advised the Administration that he would prefer to proceed directly to the Ordinary Council Meeting.</p> <p>The administration then prepared an administration response which is outlined in the agenda for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 18 November 2025.</p> <p>At 4:18pm on 18 November 2025, the administration received Deputy Lord Mayor Goncalves’ alternate motion which contained the names of those they proposed for representation on the Catalina Regional Council. This alternate motion was distributed to elected members at 4:29pm on the same day.</p>
Q2.	<p>If the motion remains passed, how many City ratepayer-remunerated roles does Cr Goncalves now hold, what is the remuneration of each and what is the annual total?</p>
<p>Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy</p>	
A2.	<p>Information on all elected member representation can be found in the Committees, Sessions, and External Bodies Register on the City’s website. This register also details the remuneration associated with each body.</p>

Q3. What is Cr Goncalves's meeting attendance record since election to date, for the meetings for which he receives remuneration, and other committee positions he holds?

Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy

A3. Records of the Deputy Lord Mayor’s meeting attendance, from his election date until 30 June 2025, can be found in the [2023/24 Annual Report](#) and the draft 2024/25 Annual Report. The draft report is currently being considered by Council and is available in draft form in the [agenda for this meeting](#).

This is summarised as follows:

Ordinary Council Meetings

2023/24: 6/10

2024/25: 8/10

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 5/5

Special Council Meetings

2023/24: 1/2

2024/25: 1/2

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 2/2

Agenda Briefing Sessions

2023/24: 5/10

2024/25: 6/11

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 5/5

Audit, Risk and Improvement Committees (previously Audit and Risk Committee)

2023/24: Non-member

2024/25: Non-member

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 0/1

Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee

2023/24: 1/4

2024/25: 1/4

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 0/1

Electors General Meeting

2023/24: 1/1

2024/25: 1/1

From 30 June 2025 to Present: N/A

Elected Member Engagement Sessions

2023/24: 12/17

2024/25: 8/14

From 30 June 2025 to Present: 3/5

	<p>The administration does not track attendance of elected members at meetings of external bodies.</p> <p>Attendance data may be available from the individual bodies.</p>
Q4.	<p>According to City of Perth Governance and all applicable acts, please who is responsible for the following: The health and safety of all Council staff?</p>
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A4.	<p>The CEO is responsible, under section 5.41(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, for ‘the employment, management, supervision, direction and dismissal of other employees’. Responsibility for workplace health and safety under the Work Health and Safety Act 2020 (WHS Act) is vested in the ‘person conducting a business or undertaking’ (PCBU). For a local government, this is the CEO (either alone or with other senior employees). The duty of care of a PCBU is set out in sections 19 and 20 of the WHS Act.</p>
Q5.	<p>According to City of Perth Governance and all applicable acts, please who is responsible for the following: The health and safety of the Chief Executive Officer?</p>
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A5.	<p>Councillors are not a PCBU and are ‘Other Persons’ for the purposes of the WHS Act. Under section 29 of the WHS Act, Other Persons must: (a) Take reasonable care for the person’s own health and safety (b) Take reasonable care that the person’s acts or omissions do not adversely affect the health and safety of other persons (c) Comply, so far as the person is reasonably able, with any reasonable instruction that is given by the person conducting the PCBU to allow the PCBU to comply with the Act. Under the Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates, Council Members should maintain and contribute to a harmonious, safe and productive work environment.</p>
Q6.	<p>According to City of Perth Governance and all applicable acts, please who is responsible for the following: The health and safety of the elected Councillors?</p>
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A6.	Refer 5 above.
Steve Wellard – West Perth 6005	
Q1.	<p>At the Ordinary Council Meeting held 18NOV25 I asked the Lord Mayor to be honest with our Ratepayers, the Council & the Premier and confirm that he was still a member of the Liberal Party despite his campaigning and media interviews stating he had resigned and is an independent Lord Mayor. I refer the Lord Mayor to section 18 of the Liberal Party of Australia (Western Australia Division Incorporated) Constitution & Rules, a document that he as a Branch President would need to have been familiar with. Section 18 clearly states that A member shall cease to be a Member of the Party if the Member: (a) is expelled from the party (b) fails to pay their annual Membership Subscription within six (6) months of the date on which it falls due in accordance with clause 17(b) (c) resigns from the Party by written notice to the State Director (d) being a Parliamentary Member resigns from a Parliamentary Section or (e) without the consent of the State Council stands for election to any Parliament in opposition to any candidate endorsed by the Party.</p>

	Lord Mayor, there is no doubt that you verbally told many people, including the Premier & Ratepayers that you intended to resign from the Liberal Party. Did you actually understand & follow proper process to formally resign in writing to the State Director as per 18 (c)?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	1–3. Liberal Party resignation / written notice / membership status Thank you for the question. As I outlined in my chamber statement on 2 December 2025, transparency and independence have guided every step I have taken as Lord Mayor. Before nominating for Lord Mayor and after being elected as DLM, I notified the Perth Division President that I was resigning from the Liberal Party. I also made this clear at the Branch AGM handover, where I explained to incoming office-bearers why I was stepping away from party politics. You know this as you as well as Senator Dean Smith were present and part of that very discussion I took reasonable and direct steps to make that resignation known. From that point forward, I ceased all involvement in the Party and I have served Perth as an independent Lord Mayor. Internal party administration including membership records and office bearer processes is entirely a matter for the Party. It is not a matter for the City of Perth, and it does not affect my duties or the independence with which I serve this community. My role is to represent the people of Perth without party influence, and that has been my position from day one. I resigned and that is the end of it. Any other part of your questions will be taken on notice
Q2.	Can you provide documented evidence of your resignation letter sent to the State Director, in which case I can then request the party membership records to be updated?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	See above response
Q3.	If you did not provide written notice as per 18(c), do you now concede that you are still to this day a current & financial member of the Liberal Party while Lord Mayor of the City of Perth?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A3.	See above response
Q4.	I refer to the Guardian News Article of Tuesday 02 DEC 25 called Bid by Gina Rineharts company to build the helipad set to be blocked by City of Perth where by Cr Chris Patton is quoted advising he is unable to vote on the motion tonight due to a declared interest (assumed to be a financial interest). The article continues to quote Cr Patton stating his support for the helipad approval motion. Can the Lord Mayor confirm he gave Cr Patton permission to speak to the media on this motion ahead of it being heard & debated at tonight’s council meeting & from a Councillor that has advised a financial interest in the motion being approved by Council? Can Governance advise if this behaviour by Cr Patton is in accordance with, or acceptable to the Code of Conduct & Local Government Act?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A1.	All media engagement must occur in consultation with the Lord Mayor and in accordance with the City of Perth Code of Conduct. While the legislation limits disclosure and recusal requirements to formal Council meetings, the Department of Local Government Industry Regulation and Safety (DLGIRS) makes clear that ethical obligations extend beyond legal compliance. Although elected members may

	legally engage despite a conflict of interest, doing so, particularly through the media, is ethically unacceptable and risks undermining probity, accountability and public trust.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	I cannot comment on any individual councillor’s conflict-of-interest declaration beyond what they themselves have placed on the record. Councillors do not require my permission to speak to the media when they speak in their own capacity and must comply with the Local Government Act, the Code of Conduct, and their obligations around conflicts of interest. Council decisions are made formally in this chamber, following debate and with all relevant declarations at the time. If concerns arise around compliance established processes are under the act are available.
Q5.	As Deputy Lord Mayor, Cr David Goncalves is a required attendee to the City of Perth Act 2016 Committee meetings held at least twice annually between the City of Perth & the State Government. Due to the significance of these meetings and flow on effects to ratepayers it is important for ratepayers to understand the conflicts of interest from all committee members. The Deputy Lord Mayors employment & financial interests are referred by those on Council as being opaque. Can the Deputy Lord Mayor confirm to ratepayers His relationship with WA Labor including his membership, leadership roles held & financial interest status?
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A5.	I firmly reject the premise that my employment or financial interests are “opaque,” or that any elected member has suggested such a thing. My disclosures are fully compliant with the Local Government Act 1995, the City of Perth Code of Conduct, and all statutory requirements for the Register of Interests. Regarding my connection to WA Labor: I am an ordinary, general member. I hold no leadership roles. I have served as a member of the Policy Forum. I have no current financial interests, paid roles, or financial arrangements of any kind with the Party. As Deputy Lord Mayor, my role on the City of Perth Act 2016 Committee is solely to represent the interests of the City and its ratepayers. I take conflict-of-interest obligations extremely seriously and comply fully with all legal, ethical, and governance requirements at every meeting and in every decision.
Q6.	As the current Full-Time Executive Director of International STEM Council can you advise your direct & indirect financial interests given the International STEM Council webpage under Membership requests amongst many things, for Sponsorship from Commercial organisations involved in science research, and Companies who promote science education products and services. Can the Deputy Lord Mayor advise ratepayers how the multiple business class work trips he takes to Europe & USA each year are funded and if any of this funding should be considered conflicts of interest while representing the City of Perth?
Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	
A6.	The premise of the question is incorrect - and the assertion that these flights are business class is factually wrong. Whilst I have undertaken private conference trips these flights have only ever been booked as economy tickets. All international travel since getting elected - and prior - has been privately funded, not by commercial sponsors, nor by companies involved in science research, nor by way of corporate sponsorship. Because these trips have been personal and privately funded without links to local organisations, they have not and do not give rise to any direct or indirect financial interest. Nor do they create any conflict of interest in relation to my responsibilities as Deputy Lord Mayor or as a representative of the City of Perth.

	I comply fully with all legislative and governance requirements, including the Local Government Act 1995, the Code of Conduct, and the disclosures required in the Register of Interests. None of the private considerations assumed in this question could reasonably be considered to create a conflict for the City of Perth.
Vicki Raniszewski– East Perth 6004	
Q1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25th November at the Special Council meeting, Councillor Gobbert moved a revocation motion, the Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, second it. Behind closed doors, Councillor Gobbert and Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds voted it down immediately along with Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves, Councillor Chris Patton and Councillor Lisa Ma. Councillor Gobbert and Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, could you please explain your reasoning for suddenly changing your mind on this within a matter of minutes seeing though this evidently was the basis of the 25th November urgent special council meeting?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A1.	<p>Thank you for the question.</p> <p>As I set out clearly in my chamber statement on 2 December, the 25 November Special Council Meeting occurred in a rapidly changing context.</p> <p>Bringing the revocation forward gave Council the ability to respond quickly if revocation proved to be the most stabilising option.</p> <p>I didn't lodge a revocation motion.</p> <p>The principle behind the workplace culture review remains sound.</p>
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A1.	It is within the normal debate process for elected members to move/second motions and to vote either in favour or against.
Q2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, why is it when Councillor Gobbert often uses Standing Orders in council meetings, you accept them without hesitation and without advice from governance, however in the AGM meeting 2nd December, Councillor Lezer raised a standing order, and you needed to refer to governance to understand what it entailed and then overrode Councillor Lezer standing order?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	<p>Standing Orders apply equally to all councillors.</p> <p>When a point of order is clear and routine, I rule on it immediately.</p> <p>When a Standing Order is less common or requires clarification, I refer to Governance and I do that for any councillor, including Cr Gobbert, whenever it is required.</p> <p>My approach is always the same: ensure the ruling is accurate, consistent, and in line with the Standing Orders.</p>
Q3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To All elected members who voted for the Workplace Culture Motion, you all completed regular procedural training since the election mid October. Can each please explain why you chose to ignore those procedures to consult the CEO and governance to assist you in your decision making and, please give ratepayers your assurance the proper procedures will be followed in future decisions?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A1.	<p>The City is always focussed on continuous improvement.</p> <p>The system of work health and safety at the City, including culture and employee experience, is structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement. This includes a range of opportunities for staff to provide confidential feedback on their experience or to seek assistance with issues of concern. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and</p>

	<p>wellbeing focus, can be found on the City’s website at Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth</p> <p>The Lord Mayor recently advised the A/CEO that any matters of workplace safety are appropriately managed by the Administration, and he has full confidence that the City’s WHS system will continue to operate in accordance with those obligations.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor and all elected members have been invited, on a number of occasions (including in the Agenda paper) to discuss with Administration issues of concern that prompted the Lord Mayor’s original notice of motion. Under the Work Health and Safety Act all Elected Members have a responsibility to bring matters affecting the health and safety, including psychosocial hazards promptly to the attention of the Administration. No matters have been brought forward.</p> <p>Legal advice provided to Elected Members confirms that the revocation motion moved at the Special Council Meeting of 25 November 2025 by Cr Gobbert was invalid. This is an important matter of process and the appropriate separation of responsibilities.</p>
<p>Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds</p>	
<p>A2.</p>	<p>Under the Local Government Act and our Standing Orders, councillors including the Lord Mayor are entitled to bring forward motions, including as urgent business, without requiring CEO pre-approval.</p> <p>The motion related directly to Council’s strategic oversight responsibilities particularly in relation to workplace culture, WHS concerns and governance. It was not an operational directive, and therefore did not require CEO authorisation beforehand.</p> <p>The rationale was straightforward: serious psychosocial and WHS concerns had been raised including by the CEO and when credible risks to staff safety are identified, Council has a responsibility to act promptly.</p> <p>The motion was brought in accordance with Standing Order 4.14. The meeting followed proper procedure, and the motion passed by an absolute majority.</p>
<p>Provided by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves</p>	
<p>A3.</p>	<p>I did not ignore any procedures in considering or voting on the Workplace Culture Motion. My decision-making fully complied with the Local Government Act 1995, the City of Perth Standing Orders, and all governance requirements for elected members.</p> <p>Procedural training makes clear that while elected members may choose to seek advice from the CEO or Governance, we must abide by the overarching requirements of the Local Government Act that requires councillors to exercise independent judgment and make decisions in the best interests of ratepayers. The Workplace Culture Motion fell squarely within Council’s authority and responsibilities. I acted consistently with my statutory obligations under section 2.10 of the Local Government Act to represent the community, provide leadership, and participate in decision-making independently and transparently.</p> <p>Ratepayers can be assured that I will continue to follow all proper procedures and uphold all legislative and governance obligations in every future decision.</p>
<p>Provided by Councillor Viktor Ko</p>	
<p>A4.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question and for the work your company “Promo Factory”, contracted by the City for its promotion program. I was first elected in 2020, and over the past five years I’ve seen urgent motions and special meetings come forward with limited notice, this is part of the responsibility we accept as elected members. I have now stood for Council three times and been elected on each occasion, which has given me confidence that ratepayers trust my judgment even in difficult matters. In this instance, I supported the motion because the concerns raised were serious and, in my view, warranted independent examination to ensure a safe and respectful workplace. I acknowledge the importance of</p>

	engaging with the CEO and Governance, however, when allegations of bullying and psychological harm are presented, I believe acting promptly and in good faith is in the public interest.
Provided by Councillor Chris Patton	
A5.	I confirm I have completed my induction training and will follow the correct procedures
Provided by Councillor Lisa Ma	
A6.	I've completed all required induction and governance training since being elected. I will continue to follow the proper procedures and seek advice where appropriate.
Provided by Councillor Liam Gobbert	
A7.	The premise of the question is rejected - no training has been ignored.
Q4.	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, what date did you contact Mills Oakley initially to discuss their services?
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A4.	As noted in my 2 December statement, The initial approach to Mills Oakley occurred in mid-November. this was preliminary scoping only asking whether they undertake workplace culture reviews and seeking an indicative fee estimate. No procurement action, commitment, or engagement occurred.
Q5.	Can the CEO or Acting CEO speak publicly, or do they require your authorisation first?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	In accordance with Section 2.8(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 the Lord Mayor acts as the principal spokesperson for the local government. The CEO, or acting CEO, whichever the case may be, may speak on behalf of the local government with the approval of the Lord Mayor.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	A response to the question has not been provided by the Lord Mayor.
Q6.	Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, why have you allocated yourself as sole spokesperson for the City?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	In accordance with Section 2.8(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 the Lord Mayor acts as the principal spokesperson for the local government.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	A response to the question has not been provided by the Lord Mayor.
Stuart Chapman - West Perth 6005	
Q1.	How can Council ensure that any culture review undertaken by the Local Government Inspector gives elected members full and accurate information, given the concerns raised publicly about selective and deficient advice coming from the CEO and Administration?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A1.	It will be a matter for the Inspector whether and how any matters will be conducted.

Q2.	Will reports go directly to Council—not the CEO—to avoid any perception that findings could be influenced or constrained?
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A2.	It will be a matter for the Inspector whether and how any matters will be conducted.
Q3.	What safeguards can Council put in place to ensure that staff and community members can speak honestly, without fear of repercussions from the CEO or other City officers?
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A1.	Council Policy 2.16 Complaints Management applies to complaints made to or about the City. You are referred to that Policy for further information which is available on the city's website.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	I believe - Council's role is to ensure that appropriate governance, oversight and assurance frameworks are in place so that staff can raise concerns safely and confidentially. This includes ensuring there are clear and trusted pathways, that procedural fairness is upheld, and that matters raised are handled independently and without adverse consequence. Council also has a responsibility to satisfy itself that these safeguards are working in practice, not simply that they exist on paper.
Q4.	Will Council consider establishing a direct reporting channel to the Audit & Risk Committee for matters involving psychosocial safety interactions from both the community and "other persons in the workplace", so that information cannot be filtered or downplayed by Administration?
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A1.	Quarterly reports on Work Health and Safety are already provided to the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC). This reporting includes data on hazards, incidents and injuries over the previous quarter, year, and five-year trends.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	Council's Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee plays a critical role. From time to time, Council may consider whether existing reporting arrangements provide sufficient assurance, or whether additional or refined reporting mechanisms are warranted to support effective oversight.
Q5.	Given the strongly defensive reaction from Acting CEO's to shield away from independent culture review, is Council satisfied that Administration is acting in good faith?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	The Administration has been open and transparent with Council and its community regarding its approach to work health and safety, which includes workplace culture. More information can be found on the City's website at Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth The Acting CEO on 26 November 2025 requested the involvement of the Local Government Inspector in relation to matters concerning the Council.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	

A2.	Council must always act on the basis of good faith, while also exercising appropriate governance scrutiny. It is not Council's role to speculate on motives, but it is Council's responsibility to be satisfied that processes are robust, independent where required, and capable of maintaining staff and community confidence.
Q6.	How can Council strengthen its oversight to ensure that all staff surveys, exit data, and workplace records are preserved accurately and not altered, withheld, or reframed by Administration?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	The Administration is required to meet its record keeping and associated administrative obligations under the State Records Act and the Local Government Act. This is subject to audit and external reporting.
Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	Administration has addressed this matter. From a governance perspective, Council may, where necessary, seek additional assurance to satisfy itself that record-keeping and data integrity obligations are being met.
Q7.	In a previous answer to a question, I asked regarding the setting up of no loitering signs outside Government House, it appeared that the Council indicated that loitering was synonymous to obstructing a footpath. Is this correct? Does this mean that if someone was not obstructing a footpath, then they could not be accused of loitering. In other words what is the Council definition of loitering?
Provided by Acting General Manager Community Development	
A7.	We refer you to Part 2 of the City of Perth <i>Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017</i> which sets out activities that are prohibited in public thoroughfares unless a permit is obtained, including provisions regarding the obstruction of footpaths.
Michelle Wright – Perth 6000	
Q1.	Notice of Motion – Revocation of Council Decision – Item 19.1 In 2 December 2025 meeting, the acting CEO that the staff surveys were mixed management oversight (external and administration) - please advise when the last completely independent staff survey was conducted by an independent third party (including: questions, summaries and representations of those responses in the final report?)
Provided by General Manager Corporate Services	
A1.	In 2025, the City committed to the CultureAmp platform to analyse the employee experience at a sophisticated and rigorous level. CultureAmp is a third party platform which receives and analyses information independently. All feedback is deidentified and is provided anonymously by employee participants. The City invests \$40,000 per annum to utilise this tool and has already conducted staff surveys using it. In 2022, as part of its Evolution to Excellence program, the City engaged CATALYSE to conduct a staff survey, called an 'Employee Scorecard'.

	The results of this survey were then used to guide 'pulse check surveys' and focus groups activity in 2023 and 2024 on specific matters.
Q2.	Ms Mabbs mentions in her paper that <i>metrics currently indicate a stable workforce</i> (page 733), please list personnel changes in the past five years for executive staff – including support staff to those executives.
Provided by Acting Executive Director Governance and Strategy	
A2.	The City does not provide information regarding employees which is private or may identify individuals. To do so represents a breach of the LG Act. The City's staff turnover has shown a downward trend since 2022/23 and is currently below the Local Government average.
Q3.	On behalf of large number of ratepayers, we are keen to hear why there has been such an intense reaction to what should be a very straightforward activity? Is there something to conceal?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A3.	Thank you for the question. It's important I think to understand that the system of health and safety at the city including culture and employee experience is structured. It's legislatively compliant. And it's underpinned by active commitment to continuous improvement. But in terms of is there something to conceal? No, there is not something to conceal.
Q4.	On behalf of a large number of ratepayers that I have spoken with, we urge all councillors consider that an urgent and independent workplace culture review (regardless of who conducts and how). If the review is not progressed now, or is delayed how will councillors meet their duty of care and guarantee the psychological safety for staff should there be serious concerns in administration?
Provided by Acting Chief Executive Officer	
A1.	The system of health and safety at the City, including culture and employee experience, is structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement. Staff have a range of opportunities to provide confidential feedback on their experience or to seek assistance with issues of concern. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and wellbeing focus, can be found on the City's website at Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth The Lord Mayor recently advised the A/CEO that any matters of workplace safety are appropriately managed by the Administration, and he has full confidence that the City's WHS system will continue to operate in accordance with those obligations. The Lord Mayor and elected members have been invited, on a number of occasions (including in the Agenda paper) to discuss with Administration issues of concern that prompted the Lord Mayor's original notice of motion. Under the <i>Work Health and Safety</i>

Act all Elected Members have a responsibility to bring matters affecting the health and safety, including psychosocial hazards promptly to the attention of the Administration.

No matters have been brought forward.

Additionally, Council Policy 2.16 *Complaints Management* applies to complaints made to or about the City.

You are referred to that Policy for further information.

Provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

A2. Council takes its duty of care seriously. That duty includes ensuring that systems for managing psychosocial risk are effective, trusted and capable of early intervention where required. It also includes ensuring that Council has sufficient assurance to meet its governance responsibilities.

The question for Council is not whether staff safety matters, but what form of oversight, review or assurance is proportionate, lawful and effective in the circumstances. Council must balance timeliness, independence and organisational stability in making that determination.

The following members of the public submitted questions in writing less than 24 hours' prior to the meeting. These questions have been taken on notice and responses will be included in the Agenda for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 24 February 2025:

Vicki Raniszewski– East Perth 6004	
Q1.	Can the Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds please advise who will be responsible for paying the initial \$70,000 you state had commenced as Phase One work by Mills Oakley, given the subsequent decision not to proceed with that review? Will this cost be met personally by anyone involved, or will it be charged to the City of Perth and therefore the ratepayers?
Q2.	What was the actual date you contacted Mills Oakley?
Response provided by Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	
A2.	17th November

7. Confirmation of Minutes

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-001)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council CONFIRMS the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 18 November 2025 and Special Council Meeting held on 25 November 2025 as true and correct record

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

8. Questions by Members which due Notice has been Given

8.1 Councillor Raj Doshi

In accordance with cl. 4.7 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009 Councillor Raj Doshi submitted Questions for which due Notice has been Given. The responses are detailed below:

Question 1	It was noted in the last meeting by DLM Goncalves that he was in Sydney on council business. Can administration advise: a. When did DLM Goncalves depart Perth, arrive in Sydney, and return back?
Answer 1	Deputy Lord Mayor Goncalves made his own travel arrangements to attend this event as he was already travelling at the time his attendance was requested. The administration does not have these details.
Question 2	What was the purpose of this City trip, as this is the first occasion I have been made aware?
Answer 2	The purpose of the trip was for City representatives to attend a Climate Leaders Forum as arranged by the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors (CCCLM). Attendance at the forum and workshop supported the City's sustainability agenda and provided the business case for an outbound delegation. It was an opportunity to showcase local government role in national and global climate policy.
Question 3	Previously, the Lord Mayor circulated a process for elected members whereby Expressions of Interest (EOI) were required for extra opportunities, including speaking events, to ensure fairness and that the best-skilled members serve the community. Why was this process not followed for this trip? Many councillors, including myself, had no prior knowledge, which excluded us from the opportunity to grow and develop skills, especially regarding a travelling opportunity such as this trip.
Answer 3	The Deputy Lord Mayor attended this event on behalf of the Lord Mayor, who could not attend, meaning that he was undertaking the functions of the role of Deputy Lord

	Mayor in accordance with Section 5.34 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> . The EOI process included in the National and International Engagement Policy does not apply when the Deputy Lord Mayor is fulfilling the functions of his role.
Question 4	When was this trip first approved or known to City administration and the Lord Mayor Reynolds?
Answer 4	The Deputy Lord Mayor's attendance was approved by the Lord Mayor on 20 November 2025.
Question 5	Who attended from administration, if anyone? What was the total cost to the ratepayer, including flights, accommodation, and any other expenses associated with councillor participation or the event itself?
Answer 5	The Alliance Manager Sustainability attended the forum at a cost of approximately \$2,255.00. No additional requests for reimbursement have been received by the administration.
Question 6	DLM Goncalves did not attend, physically or virtually, the ARIC Committee meeting on 24 November. Can he advise why?
Answer 6	<p>Response provided by the Deputy Lord Mayor:</p> <p>I did not attend the ARIC Committee meeting on 24 November because I was physically travelling at that same time to represent the City of Perth at the Lord Mayors' Climate Change Forum.</p> <p>This was an approved event undertaken on behalf of the City, and my attendance was part of our ongoing commitment represent the Lord Mayor and the City of Perth as Deputy Lord Mayor.</p>
Question 7	DLM Goncalves did attend virtually the Special Council meeting held at short notice on 25 November at 3:00pm. Why did he choose to attend, and was this coordinated with the Lord Mayor Reynolds?
Answer 7	<p>Response provided by the Deputy Lord Mayor:</p> <p>I attended the Special Council Meeting on 25 November because, having just concluded a speech at the Lord Mayors' Climate Change Forum, I was able to make myself available remotely from a side room at the venue.</p> <p>My attendance was prompted by an email from the Lord Mayor to all councillors advising of the intention to call a Special Council Meeting. Following that notification, I contacted Governance to confirm my availability and coordinate the arrangements for remote attendance in accordance with the City's procedures and policies.</p>
Question 8	Did the Lord Mayor seek any advice from administration regarding the necessity of councillor attendance at this trip?
Answer 8	<p>It is understood that the Lord Mayor as ex officio member of the CCCLM was invited to attend and in his absence the Deputy Lord Mayor would be requested to attend. I did reach out to the acting CEO for an opinion, and I acted on that opinion.</p> <p>So just for clarity and for the record you acted upon the instruction of the acting CEO in conjunction?</p> <p>Yes. In conjunction with the acting CEO.</p>

Question 9	From an administrative perspective, was it necessary for DLM Goncalves to attend this event? If so, why?
Answer 9	Deputy Lord Mayor Goncalves was requested to attend to represent the City at the request of the Lord Mayor who was not able to attend. So can so if this was a national and global climate policy event as Lord Mayor would you not be best placed as a senior member of the city of Perth? I certainly would have been but that week I was committed.
Question 10	How did DLM Goncalves' presence provide tangible value to the City?
Answer 10	It was considered that representation by the City was desirable in order to support the opportunity to showcase local government's role in national and global climate policy and to support the city's membership and commitment to the CCCLM.
Question 11	Will elected members be provided with a report and presentation on the outcomes of this trip, in accordance with previously agreed protocols?
Answer 11	It is understood that the Deputy Lord Mayor did not attend the forum as an 'additional elected member attendance' under the national and International Engagement Policy but in his role as Deputy Lord Mayor, therefore the policy provisions do not apply. But I don't think there would be an issue with councillor Goncalves DLM providing a report on what he achieved, and I guess the itinerary of the time was there.

8.2 Councillor Catherine Lezer

In accordance with cl. 4.7 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009 Councillor Catherine Lezer submitted Questions for which due Notice has been Given. The responses are detailed below:

Question 1	How many emails, or calls, with dates and times, were from the Lord Mayor to the acting CEO or Governance asking to convene a workplace culture committee meeting?
Answer 1	As far as can be ascertained within the timeframes given, the following emails were received: Governance 2 emails were received specifically requesting that a Workplace Culture Committee Meeting be convened: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 November 2025 - 6:51pm • 19 November 2025 - 9:37am Acting CEO 1 email was received specifically requesting that a Workplace Culture Committee Meeting be convened: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 November 2025 - 9:37am Further emails were received relating to the implementation of the Workplace Culture Committee resolution (passed by Council on 18 November 2025).
Question 2	What reasons did the acting CEO give for her resignation?

Answer 2	The City does not discuss confidential employee information about its employees.
Question 3	How many emails, with dates and times, has the been sent by the Lord Mayor, Deputy Lord Mayor and Cr Gobbert to the CEO, acting CEO or Governance since 5 November 2025?
Answer 3	<p>The following have been received from 5 November 2025:</p> <p>From Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds to:</p> <p>CEO:</p> <p>Total – 45</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/11/2025 8:25 • 7/11/2025 7:59 • 7/11/2025 7:41 • 6/11/2025 13:50 • 6/11/2025 4:18 • 4/12/2025 3:31 • 2/12/2025 3:52 • 2/12/2025 1:15 • 2/12/2025 0:21 • 2/12/2025 0:05 • 26/11/2025 10:51 • 24/11/2025 2:50 • 21/11/2025 1:11 • 20/11/2025 5:09 • 13/11/2025 8:34 • 13/11/2025 8:33 • 13/11/2025 7:54 • 13/11/2025 7:48 • 13/11/2025 7:43 • 12/11/2025 4:05 • 12/11/2025 3:39 • 12/11/2025 0:58 • 11/11/2025 22:49 • 11/11/2025 7:22 • 11/11/2025 7:21 • 11/11/2025 7:01 • 11/11/2025 6:41 • 11/11/2025 4:57 • 11/11/2025 1:47 • 10/11/2025 16:56 • 10/11/2025 9:43 • 10/11/2025 4:49 • 10/11/2025 3:17 • 10/11/2025 3:14 • 10/11/2025 2:58 • 10/11/2025 2:56 • 10/11/2025 1:20

- 10/11/2025 0:01
- 9/11/2025 23:49
- 9/11/2025 23:47
- 9/11/2025 23:40
- 9/11/2025 23:34
- 9/11/2025 22:54
- 9/11/2025 22:52
- 9/11/2025 22:52

Acting CEO:

Total - 69

- 27/11/2025 2:52
- 26/11/2025 6:15
- 26/11/2025 6:13
- 26/11/2025 5:38
- 26/11/2025 5:36
- 26/11/2025 4:52
- 25/11/2025 14:02
- 25/11/2025 8:00
- 25/11/2025 6:38
- 25/11/2025 5:21
- 25/11/2025 4:13
- 25/11/2025 2:57
- 25/11/2025 2:33
- 24/11/2025 14:53
- 24/11/2025 7:28
- 24/11/2025 7:21
- 24/11/2025 5:40
- 24/11/2025 4:19
- 24/11/2025 4:13
- 24/11/2025 3:29
- 24/11/2025 3:06
- 22/11/2025 5:13
- 21/11/2025 14:15
- 21/11/2025 8:27
- 21/11/2025 1:52
- 20/11/2025 12:05
- 20/11/2025 5:49
- 20/11/2025 5:09
- 20/11/2025 2:35
- 19/11/2025 23:14
- 19/11/2025 8:33
- 19/11/2025 7:39
- 19/11/2025 7:17
- 19/11/2025 6:59
- 19/11/2025 6:42

- 19/11/2025 6:41
- 19/11/2025 1:37
- 19/11/2025 1:12
- 18/11/2025 10:58
- 18/11/2025 7:35
- 18/11/2025 3:56
- 18/11/2025 3:48
- 18/11/2025 3:48
- 17/11/2025 9:04
- 17/11/2025 6:17
- 17/11/2025 6:16
- 14/11/2025 7:43
- 14/11/2025 7:42
- 14/11/2025 7:07
- 8/12/2025 23:09
- 8/12/2025 23:08
- 8/12/2025 7:37
- 8/12/2025 5:08
- 5/12/2025 9:40
- 5/12/2025 9:15
- 5/12/2025 9:13
- 5/12/2025 9:05
- 5/12/2025 8:54
- 5/12/2025 8:53
- 5/12/2025 8:50
- 5/12/2025 8:46
- 5/12/2025 6:11
- 5/12/2025 3:45
- 4/12/2025 6:51
- 4/12/2025 6:39
- 4/12/2025 3:34
- 4/12/2025 3:31
- 3/12/2025 7:47
- 2/12/2025 3:56

Governance:

Total – 56

- 8/12/2025 23:09
- 8/12/2025 23:08
- 8/12/2025 22:39
- 8/12/2025 7:37
- 5/12/2025 9:15
- 4/12/2025 6:51
- 4/12/2025 6:34
- 4/12/2025 3:34
- 3/12/2025 5:27

- 3/12/2025 5:25
- 2/12/2025 16:01
- 2/12/2025 3:56
- 27/11/2025 2:52
- 26/11/2025 10:51
- 26/11/2025 6:15
- 26/11/2025 6:13
- 25/11/2025 6:28
- 25/11/2025 4:13
- 25/11/2025 2:57
- 25/11/2025 2:33
- 24/11/2025 14:53
- 24/11/2025 7:28
- 24/11/2025 7:21
- 24/11/2025 5:40
- 24/11/2025 4:19
- 24/11/2025 4:13
- 22/11/2025 5:13
- 21/11/2025 14:15
- 21/11/2025 8:27
- 21/11/2025 1:11
- 20/11/2025 6:02
- 20/11/2025 5:09
- 19/11/2025 23:14
- 19/11/2025 8:33
- 19/11/2025 7:39
- 19/11/2025 7:17
- 19/11/2025 6:59
- 19/11/2025 1:37
- 18/11/2025 8:54
- 18/11/2025 7:35
- 18/11/2025 3:48
- 18/11/2025 3:48
- 17/11/2025 7:35
- 14/11/2025 7:42
- 12/11/2025 4:05
- 12/11/2025 3:39
- 11/11/2025 7:01
- 11/11/2025 6:41
- 11/11/2025 4:57
- 11/11/2025 1:47
- 10/11/2025 16:56
- 10/11/2025 4:49
- 9/11/2025 23:49
- 9/11/2025 23:47
- 9/11/2025 23:40

- 9/11/2025 23:34

From Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves to:

CEO:

Total - 6

- 13/11/2025 3:26
- 13/11/2025 2:13
- 11/11/2025 8:50
- 11/11/2025 7:31
- 11/11/2025 5:32
- 11/11/2025 5:27

Acting CEO:

Total - 12

- 25/11/2025 2:48
- 21/11/2025 2:11
- 21/11/2025 1:44
- 21/11/2025 1:29
- 21/11/2025 1:23
- 21/11/2025 1:10
- 18/11/2025 13:50
- 16/11/2025 10:26
- 13/11/2025 22:48
- 9/12/2025 1:46
- 9/12/2025 1:32
- 8/12/2025 13:04

Governance:

Total – 30

- 7/11/2025 13:50
- 5/11/2025 3:55
- 9/12/2025 1:46
- 9/12/2025 1:32
- 8/12/2025 13:04
- 8/12/2025 5:42
- 8/12/2025 4:38
- 8/12/2025 4:32
- 4/12/2025 6:52
- 3/12/2025 6:01
- 1/12/2025 15:05
- 1/12/2025 15:00
- 28/11/2025 7:49
- 28/11/2025 0:51
- 25/11/2025 3:07
- 25/11/2025 2:48
- 21/11/2025 1:29

- 21/11/2025 1:23
- 19/11/2025 22:27
- 18/11/2025 21:45
- 18/11/2025 10:43
- 18/11/2025 8:18
- 17/11/2025 21:49
- 16/11/2025 10:07
- 13/11/2025 3:26
- 13/11/2025 2:13
- 11/11/2025 8:50
- 11/11/2025 7:31
- 11/11/2025 5:27
- 11/11/2025 4:55

From Councillor Liam Gobbert to:

CEO:

Total – 6

- 7/11/2025 3:53
- 6/11/2025 2:44
- 18/11/2025 5:40
- 16/11/2025 6:18
- 14/11/2025 3:39
- 11/11/2025 9:43

Acting CEO:

Total – 15

- 25/11/2025 6:47
- 19/11/2025 12:39
- 19/11/2025 9:03
- 19/11/2025 7:13
- 18/11/2025 5:40
- 16/11/2025 6:18
- 14/11/2025 3:39
- 9/12/2025 2:39
- 8/12/2025 14:17
- 8/12/2025 7:05
- 8/12/2025 2:32
- 4/12/2025 6:58
- 2/12/2025 1:49

Governance:

Total – 20

- 7/11/2025 3:53
- 6/11/2025 2:44
- 9/12/2025 2:39
- 8/12/2025 14:17

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/12/2025 7:05 • 8/12/2025 2:32 • 4/12/2025 6:58 • 3/12/2025 9:55 • 2/12/2025 1:57 • 2/12/2025 1:49 • 27/11/2025 0:32 • 27/11/2025 0:08 • 25/11/2025 6:47 • 19/11/2025 12:39 • 19/11/2025 9:03 • 19/11/2025 7:13 • 18/11/2025 5:40 • 16/11/2025 6:18 • 14/11/2025 3:39 • 11/11/2025 9:43
Question 4	Why did you fail to liaise with the CEO or acting CEO prior to 18th November Council Meeting?
Answer 4	<p>Response provided by the Lord Mayor:</p> <p>Under the Local Government Act and our Standing Orders, councillors including the Lord Mayor are entitled to bring forward motions, including as urgent business, without requiring CEO pre-approval.</p> <p>The motion related directly to Council’s strategic oversight responsibilities under sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Act, particularly in relation to culture, WHS concerns and governance. It was not an operational directive, and therefore did not require CEO authorisation beforehand.</p> <p>That said, the rationale was simple: serious psychosocial and WHS concerns had been raised including by the CEO herself and Council has a duty to act promptly when credible risks to staff safety are identified.</p> <p>The motion was brought in accordance with Standing Order 4.14.</p> <p>The meeting followed proper procedure, and the motion passed by an absolute majority.</p>
Question 5	In your interview on ABC radio 3 December 2025, you stated there is a purchasing policy exemption for legal services. You failed to mention ONLY the CEO can authorise an exemption. Did you ask the CEO or acting CEO for this exemption?
Answer 5	<p>Response provided by the Lord Mayor:</p> <p>The ABC interview referred to a factual and longstanding element of our Purchasing Policy that legal services fall within an exemption from the City’s normal procurement thresholds. That exemption exists as a policy setting regardless of who ultimately exercises it.</p> <p>If Council had later resolved to engage a firm, the CEO would of course have been required to implement that resolution in accordance with the Act and the City’s policies. But at the time of the 18 November motion, we were not at that stage.</p>

	<p>No exemption was sought, because no procurement occurred.</p> <p>The interview correctly reflected the policy setting, not a procurement action.</p> <p>And just to clarify the governance principle:</p> <p>Policies guide the administration, but they do not override the Local Government Act or the Regulations. The Act and the law always prevail over a policy document that's the legal framework all councillors must work within.</p>
Question 6	<p>On what specific legal basis do you maintain your motion was lawful? What advice have you received? From whom and when? If not, why did you make this statement?</p>
Answer 6	<p>Response provided by the Lord Mayor:</p> <p>The motion was moved under correct Standing Orders, which expressly allows urgent business where there is a reasonable basis to treat an item as urgent. Workplace health and safety concerns including psychosocial risk create a clear basis for urgency. That is consistent with the WHS Act and with the obligation on Council to take reasonably practicable steps when credible risks are raised.</p> <p>Second, the subject matter workplace culture, governance interface and independent review mechanisms falls within Council's strategic oversight responsibilities you can refer to the sections of the Local Government Act that support that. It did not direct the CEO on operational matters, nor did it interfere with day-to-day management.</p> <p>Third, on procurement, the motion aligned with Regulation 11A and the City's Purchasing Policy, which includes an exemption for legal services. As already stated, no contract was entered into, and no expenditure occurred.</p> <p>I have received a range of commentary since 18 November, including differing views, which is normal when governance issues become politicised. Reasonable lawyers often reach different interpretations on complex interface questions. However, nothing put to me to date has demonstrated that Council acted outside its powers.</p> <p>My statement that the motion was lawful was based on the Standing Orders, the Act, the Purchasing Policy, and the information available to me at the time.</p> <p>That said, the legal debate has since become a distraction. With a State-appointed Inspector now imminent, Council has chosen a cleaner, higher-authority mechanism to achieve the same outcome.</p>

8.3 Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

In accordance with cl. 4.7 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009 Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds submitted Questions for which due Notice has been Given. The responses are detailed below:

Question 1	<p>To Councillor Catherine Lezer:</p> <p>In your media statements and on social platforms, you have indicated that you had many questions about the motion of 18 November.</p> <p>I wrote to all elected members on 19 November, expressly inviting anyone with questions to contact me directly.</p> <p>Can you confirm whether, at any time between 19 November and 5 December, you contacted me to seek clarification or to ask any questions about that motion?</p>
Answer 1	<p>Response provided by Cr Catherine Lezer:</p> <p>Yes.</p>
Question 2	<p>For the record, do you describe the motion passed on 18 November as unlawful — yes or no?</p>
Answer 2	<p>Response provided by Cr Catherine Lezer:</p> <p>Refer to 17.6 points 11. 12. and 13.</p>
Question 3	<p>To Administration</p> <p>Question to the Administration</p> <p>By way of a clear yes or no: in the opinion of the City and its legal advisers, was the motion passed on 18 November unlawful?</p>
Answer 3	<p>As has been previously advised, the motion passed on 18 November regarding a workplace culture committee was not passed in accordance with the provisions of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. As such it was unlawful.</p>

9. Correspondence

Nil.

10. Petitions

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-002)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Second: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That the officer recommendation for items 11.3, 12.1, 15.1, 15.2 and 17.4 be adopted en bloc, and the remaining items be dealt with separately.

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

The following procedural motion is moved to allow section 19 to be considered prior to the Officer Reports.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-003)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Second: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council APPROVE the agenda section 'Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given' to be brought forward for consideration Prior to 'Officer Reports'.

CARRIED (8/1)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillor Raj Doshi

Item 19 was brought forward to be considered prior to Officer Reports.

19. Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given

19.1 Notice of Motion - Revocation of Council Decision – 18 November 2025 – Item 21.1

The following Notice of Motion was submitted in accordance with clause 4.12 of the *Standing Orders Local Law 2009*.

Councillor	Councillor Catherine Lezer
Date Received	21 November 2025
Motion	That Council <u>REVOKES</u> the Council Resolution for Item 21.1, decided at the 18 November 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.
Reasons Provided	<p>I propose the revocation of the decision titled 'Workplace Culture Committee & Independent Review Motion' for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Due Diligence: The motion was distributed to Councillors only six minutes prior to the commencement of the meeting. This provided insufficient time for Councillors to read, analyse, or obtain advice on the proposal, preventing informed decision-making as required. The usual administration information and recommendation was missing. The Local Government Act requires Councillors consider information before making a decision committing significant public funds and establishing a new committee. I raised at the beginning of the November 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting that I was not afforded adequate notice and that I had not read nor considered the motion.</p> <p>2. Procurement Integrity The decision authorises a budget of \$125,000 (plus GST) and specifically appoints 'Mills Oakley' as the consultant. There is no information presented that a competitive procurement process was undertaken to test the market for value for money, nor was a rationale provided for sole-sourcing this specific firm. There is no information regarding compliance with the City's Purchasing Policy, nor where the \$125,000 (plus GST) figure was derived from and whether this is or isn't a necessary use of ratepayer funds. Again I was not afforded adequate notice nor given adequate time to seek this inform</p> <p>3. Potential Duplication of Existing Resources As Chair of the City's Audit and Risk committee for 4 years, I can confirm Councillors are regularly updated on the City's efforts around City culture. Councillors are aware the Administration already undertakes robust workplace culture assessments, including:</p> <p>Culture surveys /pulse checks reported to Councillors.</p> <p>Quarterly Health and Safety reporting to the Audit and Risk Committee.</p> <p>Utilisation of the 'CultureApp' analytics tool.</p> <p>Staff feedback mechanisms (which can be anonymous).</p>

Substantial training including induction, management training, wellness initiatives and ongoing work health and safety training and refreshers.

Establishing a new committee at an unknown cost and engaging external consultants at a \$125,000 cost to the ratepayers, appears to duplicate these existing, functional mechanisms. Again I was not afforded adequate notice nor given adequate time to seek this information.

In conclusion Councillors have a statutory right and obligation to seek information and professional advice necessary to properly discharge their duties to the community and to ensure responsible use of ratepayer funds in compliance with the Local Government Act. Not having this information nor adequate notice is contrary to the expected standards of good governance and responsible use of ratepayer funds, necessitating this revocation.

Administration Response to Notice of Motion

Responsible Officer	Wendy Attenborough – A/Chief Executive Officer
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Nil.

Discussion

1. On the 18 November 2025 the City of Perth Council decided to (amongst other things):
 - a. establish a new Committee of Council (Workplace Culture Committee) with Terms of Reference set out in an Attachment to the decision;
 - b. appoint Mills Oakley as an Independent Consultant to undertake a Workplace Culture Review and prepare a written Workplace Culture Review Report;
 - c. authorise the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor to sign an engagement agreement with Mills Oakley as an Independent Consultant; and
 - d. authorise a total project budget not to exceed \$125,000 plus GST, to be funded from the 2025/26 budget
2. It is the Administration's view that this decision ignores Council's statutory responsibilities to make informed decisions; is a poor use of ratepayer funds; fails to meet accepted good governance principles and good government; shuns the legislated role of the CEO as the principal advisor to Council; contravenes Council's Code of Conduct and the *Local Government Act 1995*; and contravenes the Council's Purchasing Policy and regulation 11A(1) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*. It is not a lawful decision and is therefore unable to be implemented.
3. In the CEO's Performance Review, held in August 2025, no issues were raised by elected members regarding workplace culture. Indeed, the review unanimously recognised the high performance of the CEO and her achievements. In establishing KPI's for the 2025-26 year workplace culture was not indicated as an issue requiring attention by Council.
4. **The proposed engagement of Mills Oakley to conduct a review of workplace culture at a cost of at least \$125,000 to ratepayers does not constitute value for money given the sophistication of the City's work health and safety system and the comprehensive nature of reporting on it both to the Executive and the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee.**
5. The Administration understands that \$77,000 (inc. GST) of the \$125,000, represents a cost indicated for 'Stage 1' of the proposed Mills Oakley review, with no current advice before Council as to further stages and associated costs, excepting reference to possible future litigation. Any future stages or litigation have not been the subject of any discussion before Council or with the Administration.

The Primary Notice of Motion

6. A Notice of Motion to establish the Committee and the Review was moved by the Lord Mayor as a matter of urgency at the end of the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) of 18 November 2025. The Lord Mayor circulated his Notice of Motion (Primary NoM) to all elected members and limited members of the Administration at 16.54 hrs, six minutes before the start of the OCM.
7. The A/CEO first became aware of the Motion when it was distributed in hard copy format towards the end of the OCM, when the Lord Mayor introduced the item.
8. Early in the business of the 18 November OCM the Lord Mayor asked all elected members to acknowledge they had sufficient time to consider the agenda items presented. Councillor Lezer

indicated she had not had sufficient time to review the item distributed by the Lord Mayor at 16.54. The Lord Mayor responded, “that’s ok, we will review that a little bit later in the evening”.

9. Once the Agenda Item was reached, the Lord Mayor did not provide any information or background to the OCM as to why his motion was urgent, other than to say that the nature of it meant it was not advisable to wait until the next OCM. No further information was provided, other than a reading of the motion itself and a short comment from the Deputy Lord Mayor indicating he was honoured to second it.
10. No questions or debate were allowed at the OCM regarding the Lord Mayor’s Primary NoM, with a procedural motion (seconded by the Lord Mayor) moved to put the matter to an immediate vote. This is inconsistent with the Lord Mayor’s indication to Cr Lezer that the matter would be reviewed when the agenda item was reached.
11. This is a probable breach of the *Local Government Act 1995* which requires (amongst other things) that Council members facilitate and maintain good working relationships with fellow councillors and the CEO.
12. It is also a likely breach of Council Standing Orders, the purpose of which are intended to result in better decision-making at meetings, the orderly and efficient conduct of meetings, and greater community understanding of the business of Council.
13. It is entirely inconsistent with the fundamental objects and purposes of the Local Government Act, including those set out in section 3.1(2) relating to –
 1. ‘(a) better decision making by local governments; and
 2. (b) greater community participation in the decisions and affairs of local governments; and
 3. (c) greater accountability of local governments to their communities; and
 4. (d) more efficient and effective local government’.

The first revocation motion

14. After the OCM Councillor Lezer advised the Administration that she intended to move a revocation motion at the next OCM, scheduled for 9 December 2025. The effect of this revocation motion, if passed, would have been to revoke the Primary NoM (ie the decision of Council at the OCM of 18 November 2025).
15. On Friday 21 November the A/CEO advised the Lord Mayor that Councillor Lezer intended to move a revocation motion at the next OCM. Councillor Lezer subsequently circulated a draft motion to her elected member colleagues, as is usual practice, on 22 November 2025.
16. Later that day, Councillor Lezer sent to the Acting CEO a formal notice of motion to revoke the Council resolution made on 18 November 2025 (in accordance with the provisions of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* and the City of Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2009 (Standing Orders)). The notice of motion, as required by the Standing Orders, nominated the next Ordinary Meeting of the Council (OCM) as the date on which she would move her motion. This did not constitute a formal ‘moving’ of the motion by Councillor Lezer, which can only occur at a meeting of Council.
17. On Saturday 22 November 2025 the Lord Mayor requested that a Special Council Meeting (SCM) be convened on Tuesday 25 November 2025, for the sole purpose of considering a revocation motion.
18. The Administration provided advice that, as there had been no formal lodgement of a revocation motion that could be considered at the proposed SCM on 25 November 2025, the agenda for that SCM would contain no reports for Council’s consideration. The Lord Mayor subsequently advised the Administration

that a SCM does not require an item to already exist, and that the meeting should be convened. The Lord Mayor also took the opportunity to add another item to the agenda of the OCM.

19. There is no legislative basis for such a position to be pursued and the Lord Mayor's insistence on proceeding with this course of action is inconsistent with the City's Standing Orders Local Law.
20. Prior to the SCM the Administration provided legal advice to all elected members which outlined significant legal and governance issues with the decision of 18 November 2025. Elected Members were urged to consider the legal advice ahead of the SCM.
21. Due to the short notice given for the SCM, a number of elected members were not able to attend. This included Cr Lezer and each of the other 2 elected members who voted against the resolution adopted at the OCM on 18 November 2025. As a result, the only elected members in attendance at the SCM were those who voted in favour of the resolution adopted by the Council at the OCM on 18 November 2025.

The Second Revocation Motion

22. At 1447 hrs on the 25 November 2025 (ie 13 minutes ahead of the 1500 hrs SCM start time) Cr Gobbert provided advice of his intention to move a revocation motion (the Second Revocation Motion) at the SCM. The Second Revocation Motion was moved at the SCM, but was not supported by those in attendance at the meeting, including Cr Gobbert.
23. The decision at the SCM on the Second Revocation Motion is invalid and of no effect. This is because a valid notice of revocation motion cannot lawfully be given by an elected member in circumstances where a valid notice of revocation motion in the same terms (or in substantially the same terms) has already been given to the CEO under clause 11.3 of the Standing Orders, and where the earlier revocation motion has not yet been considered and determined by the Council at the date of the Council meeting specified in the earlier revocation motion.
24. Given the Second Revocation Motion was invalid and that the First Revocation Motion (Cr Lezer's notice of revocation motion) remains valid, the Administration is barred, under the Standing Orders, from taking any steps to implement or give effect to the Council resolution of 18 November 2025 (including any steps to progress the engagement of Mills Oakley to conduct a review of workplace culture).

The proposed review

25. **No information has been provided to the CEO by the Lord Mayor or any other elected member which supports the need for an urgent and broad review of workplace culture.** The CEO is unaware of any matters which would require the urgent establishment of a Workplace Culture Committee to consider employee culture and wellbeing. If such matters do exist there is a responsibility upon the Lord Mayor and Council to bring them to the immediate attention of the CEO or the appropriate integrity body.
26. **However, concerns have been brought to the CEO's attention regarding the psychosocial wellbeing and safety of some elected members, and some of those staff who work closely with them.** In 2025, 10 complaints have been received from staff and elected members regarding the behaviour of elected members. Eight of those have been received since June 2025.
27. The CEO raised these concerns with the Lord Mayor on a number of occasions and particularly on 6 and 12 November 2025. This was done in accordance with her obligations under the *Work Health and Safety Act*.
28. At the meeting of 12 November 2025 the CEO advised the Lord Mayor of her intention to commission an independent risk assessment to consider the psychosocial wellbeing and safety of elected members and staff who work closely with them. The risk assessment has been commissioned.

29. The CEO took pre-approved personal leave on 14 November 2025.

Good government, good governance and the separation of powers

30. The *Local Government Act 1995* (section 3.1) establishes that the general function of a local government is to provide for good government. 'Good government' means (amongst other things) that decisions are made in the interests of the community the local government serves and are made in an informed manner.
31. Section 5.41(3) of the *Local Government Act* provides that the CEO is the council's principal advisor and, as such:
- (a) advises, and procures advice for, Council
 - (b) ensures that Council has the information and advice it needs to make informed and timely decisions.
32. No advice was given by the A/CEO to the Council in relation to the Proposed Motion, as no information was sought by the Lord Mayor ahead of his tabling of the motion. No questions or debate were allowed once the motion was moved.
33. The role of the Lord Mayor includes liaising with the CEO (section 2.8(1)(e)). There was no liaison by the Lord Mayor with the A/CEO in relation to the Proposed Motion. This constitutes an 'improper use' of the office of the Lord Mayor, and a breach of the Rules of Conduct, as set out in Division 4 of the *City of Perth Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates*. The Lord Mayor should have liaised with the CEO about the Proposed Motion from the time that he began to prepare it.
34. The role of the Lord Mayor also includes providing leadership and guidance to Council members, including guidance as to their roles (section 2.8(1)(a)).
35. In the circumstances presenting on 18 November 2025, where the Lord Mayor proceeded to ensure that the Proposed Motion, without notice, would be considered by the Council without any advice from the CEO, it was open to the Council to resolve to not proceed with consideration of the Proposed Motion until it had relevant advice and information from the A/CEO.
36. **This would have been consistent with Council's obligations**, under section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act* to respect the separation of powers (section 2.7(3)) and **to make its decisions 'on the basis of evidence, on the merits and in accordance with the law'** (section 2.7(4)).
37. It **would also have been consistent with fundamental principles of good decision-making**, whereby decisions of this nature are not made without the opportunity for all Council members to give proper consideration to the issues, after having been provided with all relevant information and advice.
38. **Instead, in adopting the Proposed Motion, the Council prevented the A/CEO from exercising the CEO's legislative role and deprived itself of advice and information** required to make an informed decision.

Responsibility for management and administration of the City

39. Under section 5.41(2)(g) of the *Local Government Act*, it is the CEO, not the Council, who is responsible for the management and administration of the City.
40. **The CEO is also responsible**, under section 5.41(5), for any other function imposed under another Act or another written law. Under the *Work Health and Safety Act 2020* (WHS Act), the principal responsibility **for workplace health and safety** is vested in the 'person conducting a business or undertaking' (PCBU). For a local government, this is the CEO (either alone or with other senior employees of the local government).

41. The primary duty of care of a PCBU is set out in section 19 of the WHS Act. It provides that a PCBU must ensure (so far as is reasonably practicable) the health and safety of workers. The responsibilities in this regard are extensive and include psychological health and psychosocial safety.
42. There is at least a significant overlap between the CEO's responsibilities for the management of the City's employees (under the *Local Government Act* and the WHS Act) and the proposed objectives of the Workplace Culture Committee. Given this, **it was particularly important for the Council to have obtained and properly considered advice and information from the A/CEO before making a decision.**

Work Health, Safety and Employee Experience at the City of Perth

43. The system of work health and safety at the City of Perth is **structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement**, including with respect to employee experience and workplace culture. The effectiveness of the WHS system is embedded in the City's Strategic Risk Register, providing the most senior level of visibility and accountability.
44. The City's WHS system efficacy is reported to Council through the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC). The last two reports were provided to ARIC in May and November 2025. The reports noted no known systemic or major areas of concern. Of particular note, employee turnover trends are below the local government sector average.
45. The City's WHS system is applied through a practical framework that is supported by best practice, organising our efforts around the five key pillars of:
- Management commitment and documentation
 - Hazard identification and awareness
 - Risk assessment and risk management
 - Training and consultation
 - Monitoring and reporting
46. Overall investment in staff through workplace culture and wellbeing initiatives was increased to \$1,328,664 in the 2025/26 Budget, up from \$1,245,733 in the previous financial year. This includes funding for (amongst other things) leadership development, professional development, WHS training, staff performance shaping, employee reward and recognition for high performance and respectful team-orientated behaviours, a comprehensive Employee Assistance Program, and staff healthy lifestyle subsidy.
47. Confidential employee experience surveys (including through the industry leading 'Culture Amp' on-line tool) and focus groups are conducted regularly (with two employee 'pulse-check' surveys in 2025). Together with injury and hazard metrics, survey results guide organisational continuous improvement activity, such as roll out of a new 'emerging leader program', updates to policies and procedures and risk assessments for front-line staff.
48. **Metrics currently indicate a stable workforce, effective incident management practices, and a proactive safety culture, including with respect to staff wellbeing and workplace culture. Continuous improvement activities are identified and executed.**
49. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and wellbeing focus, can be found on the City's website at [Our evolution to sustained excellence | City of Perth](#)

Purchasing Policy, procurement of Mills Oakley and value for money considerations

50. Regulation 11A(1) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* requires a local government to prepare and implement a purchasing policy in relation to contracts where the value is, or is expected to be, \$250,000 or less or worth \$250,000 or less.

51. Under regulation 11A(2), the Purchasing Policy must be 'followed by the local government'. The 'local government' in the case of the City of Perth, comprises the Council and the Administration.
52. Council last considered its Purchasing Policy in August 2025 when amendments were adopted, consistent with relevant statutory requirements. The Purchasing Policy is a policy of Council.
53. The Purchasing Policy is expressed to apply to 'all employees, appointed representatives or agents ... involved in the procurement of goods and services for the City'. Construed in the context of regulation 11A(2), the Purchasing Policy must apply to the Council to the extent that it is 'involved in the procurement of goods and services for the City' – either because it is an 'agent' or, in any event, because that is required by regulation 11A(2) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations*.
54. In authorising the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor to finalise and sign an engagement agreement with Mills Oakley on behalf of the City, Council has not given appropriate consideration to the separation of roles established within s2.7(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
55. If an individual Council member, including the Lord Mayor, sought quotations of the type described in the Purchasing Policy they may be in breach of clause 19 of the *City's Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates*.
56. **The question as to whether or not Council may undertake what would otherwise be considered to be administrative actions (ie procuring of legal advice) was considered by the Authorised Inquiry into the Town of Cambridge.** Specifically, that Inquiry found that by authorising the Mayor to undertake administrative tasks:
 - Council failed to ensure good governance processes with respect to procuring law firms and the appropriate allocation of the Town's finances, and
 - Council interfered in administrative matters by engaging law firms which is a function of the administration.
57. Leaving aside the question of whether the Lord Mayor (or any other Council member) has breached clause 19 of the *City's Code of Conduct*, no information has been provided to Council regarding:
 - the process of selecting law firm Mills Oakley as the Independent Review consultancy and its appropriateness for the task
 - how the project budget was established, particularly given it is understood Mills Oakley will provide a Senior Council (amongst others in a legal team) to conduct the review
 - the scope of work, methodology, resourcing, milestones and deliverables of the review
 - the contract management arrangements.
58. If, as it appears from the information currently available, Mills Oakley was appointed by the Council without complying with the requirements of the Purchasing Policy, that appointment is invalid. As a result, the Administration cannot take any steps to implement or give effect to that decision (such as the review of the proposed terms of engagement of Mills Oakley).
59. All of these matters go to questions of best practice and compliance in procurement processes and ensuring value for money and transparency.

Next steps

60. It is recommended that the Motion of Revocation before Council is supported in the interests of good governance and good government.
61. Any engagement between Mills Oakley and any elected members, including the Lord Mayor, should cease as it contravenes Council’s Code of Conduct and the *Local Government Act 1995*
62. The CEO is keen to discuss with elected members issues of interest or concern that prompted the Lord Mayor’s original notice of motion. Such action would be consistent with the provisions of the *Local Government Act* to enable advice to be provided to Council by the CEO, and liaison between the Lord Mayor and the CEO.
63. Such engagement will ascertain where confidence needs to be built in relation to the City’s WHS system and provide data and suggestions for subsequent actions.
64. Importantly, it will provide the community the opportunity for an open and transparent discussion about matters of importance to Council and activities of the Administration.

Decision Implications

65. Should Council decide not to support the Revocation Motion it will represent significant legal and governance risks, as described within this report. A failure to support the Revocation of the decision of 18 November OCM will mean that Council has failed to meet its obligations under the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategic Community Plan	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032 Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 <i>Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates.</i>

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Local Government Act 1995</i> <i>Standing Orders Local Law 2009</i>
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council.
Policy:	CP 2.2 - Purchasing Policy

Financial Implications

Nil.

Further Information

66. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Can governance please provide a copy of the briefs issued to Macleod that supported the legal advice being issued in response to the OCM item 21.1 on 18 November 2025, 25 November 2025 SCM item 1 (revocation motion) and also provide any draft versions held of the instructions and the advice received.	McLeods Lawyers were provided copies of the relevant motions of Council ahead of short teleconferences to seek advice regarding the validity of those motions. No drafts were provided or received.
2.	If the Purchasing Policy exempts the CEO to allow direct engagement of a Legal Services Provider where they are a WALGA-preferred supplier and within the threshold, why does the non-binding nature of a policy as set out in the Act not extend to Council, and how can Council's decision to engage a LSP then be characterised as unlawful?	As set out in the report to the Council, under regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, the Purchasing Policy (in relation to contracts where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000) must be 'followed by the local government' and 'the local government', in the case of the City of Perth, comprises the Council and the Administration. In relation to any proposed contract where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000, the Council and the Administration must, as a matter of law, have regard to, and genuinely consider, the Purchasing Policy. There is no record of any evidence that the Council, before appointing Mills Oakley, had regard to and genuinely considered the Purchasing Policy. As a result, that decision was in breach of regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 because it resulted in the Purchasing Policy not being 'followed by the local government'.

		<p>The Purchasing Policy, adopted by the Council, provides for an exemption to be given to the CEO in respect of the engagement of Legal Services Providers. There is no similar exemption that is given to the Council.</p>
3.	<p>Is it an error of law to inflexibly apply a policy to the Council that created it?</p>	<p>It is an error of law (being a failure to take into account relevant considerations) not to have regard to a policy in circumstances to which the policy applies.</p> <p>The fact that the Purchasing Policy was adopted by the Council is not relevant to the question whether, as a matter of law, the Council is required, under regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 to follow the Purchasing Policy.</p>
4.	<p>Can governance please confirm that the Council is not bound by a Council Policy?</p>	<p>See answer to Q2 and 3 above.</p>
5.	<p>What section of the Act prevents the Council from seeking advice about the administration that is not via the CEO?</p>	<p>The Administration is not aware of any 'advice about the administration' that has been sought by the Council 'that is not via the CEO'.</p> <p>Under section 2.7(3) of the Local Government Act 1995, the Council must respect the separation between the Council's 'governing role and the CEO's executive role as described in section 5.41'. Under section 5.41(3), the CEO is the Council's principal advisor and, as such, does the following –</p> <p>(a) advises, and procures advice for, the Council in relation to the local government's affairs and the performance of the local government's functions; and</p> <p>(b) ensures that the Council has the information and advice it needs to make informed and timely decisions.</p>
6.	<p>Is the McLeod's advice able to be reviewed by a Barrister/SC prior to the OCM?</p>	<p>The Administration does not intend to seek legal review of the advice which has already been provided. The advice was provided by a well respected practitioner</p>

		in local government law. If Council wishes to request the administration to seek further legal review, a decision of Council would be required.
7.	Does the McLeod's advice expressly state that the decisions of Council at the most recent OCM/SCM are unimplementable?	<p>McLeods' advice confirms that –</p> <p>(1) the decision of the Council at the OCM on 18 November 2025 cannot be implemented, under clause 11.4 of the Standing Orders at least until the notice of revocation motion lodged with the CEO by Cr Lezer is considered by the Council at the OCM on 9 December 2025; and</p> <p>(2) the revocation resolution at the SCM on 25 November 2025 was invalid and of no effect because the revocation motion by Cr Gobbert was invalid and of no effect.</p>
8.	So the first question is can governance please provide a copy of the briefs that were issued to McLeod's to support the legal advice being issued and the response says that the lawyers were provided copies of the motions but that's not what I'd ask for. I'd ask for the briefs that were sent to the lawyers to support the advice coming back. So if we could be provided with those records?	<p>See response to question 1. As advised, instructions were issued during teleconference meetings with McLeod's and the advice provided responds to those instructions.</p> <p>Those instructions related to questions regarding the lawfulness of the original motion (ie was it in accordance with the law) passed at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 18 November 2025, the implications and obligations for the administration; and the validity of the revocation motion passed at the Special Council Meeting of 25 November 2025.</p>
9.	I might just add that I did send an email probably 3 days ago or two days ago before your question asking for a copy of the brief to the lawyers as well. I haven't received that yet?	See response to question 8.
10.	Point six to the question I've asked if the advice could be reviewed by a barrister, or an SC and the administration's response was the administration has re sought the advice but would recommend the action that they have is that action able to be taken.	Please see question 6 above. The Administration does not intend to seek legal review of the advice which has already been provided. The advice was provided by a well-respected practitioner in local government law.

11.	Mills Oakely would have it sounds like it from what I have seen it looks like they will have done work. So, who will have pay who will have to pay that invoice when it comes in?	The City has not engaged Mills Oakley and no purchase order has been raised to enable payment.
12.	Do you have any plans to address any impact these events and decisions may have had on the city team including staff and elected members morale as a leader?	<p>“Yes. The wellbeing of both staff and elected members is extremely important to me.</p> <p>Over the coming weeks I will be focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restoring calm and stability, • reinforcing respectful working relationships, and • making sure Council is united on our priorities for the City. <p>We have a significant amount of work ahead of us, and my intention is to ensure we move forward constructively, support the administration, and maintain public confidence in the City of Perth.</p> <p>I am committed to doing that as Lord Mayor.”</p>
13.	<p>1.I would like to ask that question formally and that email I said in Miss Peta Mabb's recent email to us as elected members which was a elected member newsletter. She indicated that quote unquote she would be departing the city which I myself had understood in previous earlier advice and discussions around the city that she was transitioning towards retirement. So it was a surprise to me that subsequent media reports use the language such as quit and I take note of Councillor Doshi's characterisation as saying that the acting CEO has quit themselves. So my email further goes that in the interest of accuracy, transparency and compliance with our statutory obligations as elected members that I'd appreciate clarification over the appointment of who the acting CEO is governed by sections 5.36 and 5.39 of the local government act particularly around the requirement that the CEO position be filled by a suitably qualified person and that council to be properly informed of matters affecting the office. The four five questions that I had was whether a formal resignation had been tended.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to publicly discuss the employment arrangements of City employees.</p> <p>Answers to most of these questions were provided in the Agenda Briefing Session.</p> <p>With regard to the arrangements for the Acting CEO, information was provided during the ABS meeting.,</p>

<p>2. if so, the date that it was submitted and the effective date of departure.</p> <p>3. Confirmation of who is the acting CEO?</p> <p>4. The arrangements going forward to ensure that we have continuous compliance with section 5.36 regarding the requirement of the local government act or always to employ a CEO at all times.</p> <p>5. Whether an urgent confidential information briefing note can be issued to clarify the situation for elected members. I reiterated the importance for us as elected members and to ensure council had could exercise its oversight responsibilities. So I'd like those five particular questions answered. I understand it may need to be taken on notice but for the moment I would particularly like to know the arrangements around acting CEO. There was a statement there from councillor Doshi saying that the acting CEO Peta Mabbs had quit. So I'd like to at least the immediate information to be made available and shared at this meeting.</p>	
--	--

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-004)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Raj Doshi

That Council REVOKES the Council Resolution for Item 21.1, decided at the 18 November 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.

CARRIED (8/1) BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillor Viktor Ko

11. Planning and Sustainability Alliance Reports

6:21pm Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds disclosed a Proximity Interest in relation to Item 11.1 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

6:21pm Councillor Catherine Lezer disclosed a Proximity Interest in relation to Item 11.1 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

6:21pm Councillor Liam Gobbert disclosed a Proximity Interest in relation to Item 11.1 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

6:21pm Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves assumed the Chair.

11.1 Outcomes of Consultation – Planning Scheme Amendments and Policies for Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Short-Term Rental Accommodation

Responsible Officer	Maria Cooke – General Manager Planning and Sustainability
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 11.1A – Amendment No.53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 Attachment 11.1B – Amendment No.7 to Local Planning Scheme No.26 Attachment 11.1C – Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4 Attachment 11.1D – Draft Revised Planning Policy Section 3.9 - Special Residential (Serviced and Short-Term Accommodation) Policy Attachment 11.1E – Draft Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Local Planning Policy Attachment 11.1F – Schedule of Submissions

Purpose

For Council to:

- consider the submissions received on Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2), Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26 (LPS26) and Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4 (TPS4), and draft revised *Planning Policy 3.9 – Special Residential and Short-Term Rental Accommodation* and draft *Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Local Planning Policy*.
- resolve whether to support the scheme amendments and adopt the planning policies.

Recommendation

That Council:

- SUPPORTS without modification:
 - Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 as detailed in **Attachment A**,
 - Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26 as detailed in **Attachment B**,
 - Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4 as detailed in **Attachment C**.
- ADOPTS the revised *Planning Policy 3.6 – Special Residential and Short-Term Rental Accommodation* and draft *Specialised Accommodation Local Planning Policy* as per **Attachment D** and **Attachment E**

subject to the gazettal of Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2, Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26, and Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4.

3. NOTES the scheme amendments will be forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission for consideration in accordance with Clause 22 in this report.
 4. NOTES the submissions (including late submissions) received during the formal consultation period as per **Attachment F**.
-

Background

1. At its Ordinary Council Meeting held on 27 May 2025, Council resolved to prepare amendments to the following local planning schemes to align with the amended *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (LPS Regulations) that introduced state-wide regulation for short-term rental accommodation (STRA):
 - a. Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2), which applies to Central Perth, East Perth, West Perth, and parts of Crawley and Northbridge.
 - b. Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26 (LPS26), which applies to Normalised Redevelopment Areas in Claisebrook and Northbridge.
 - c. Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4, which applies to land in Nedlands-Crawley.
2. At the same meeting, Council also resolved to advertise two related local planning policies that underpin the scheme provisions and guide the exercise of discretion when determining applications for development approval:
 - a. a revised *Planning Policy 3.9 – Special Residential and Short-Term Rental Accommodation Policy*, which applies to all scheme use areas under CPS2 and LPS26.
 - b. a new *Tourist and Visitor Accommodation and Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation Local Planning Policy* which will apply to land zoned under TPS4.
3. The amendments respond to the Minister for Planning's instruction for all local governments to align their schemes with the LPS Regulations for STRA.
4. The amendments introduce the new land uses 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation', 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' and 'Tourist and Visitor Accommodation', assign each land use a permissibility, and remove redundant land uses that are no longer required under the LPS Regulations.
5. The Environmental Protection Authority did not require environmental assessment of the amendments, and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), on behalf of the Minister for Planning, provided consent to advertise the amendments as follows:
 - a. Amendment No. 26 to TPS4 with no modifications required.
 - b. Amendment No. 53 to CPS2 with minor modifications that did not change the intent of the amendment.
 - c. Amendment No. 7 to LPS26 with modifications to existing site-specific provisions for 20 Royal Street (Majestic Rise and Majestic Crest), 50-60 Royal Street (East Perth Suites Hotel), and 11 Regal Place (Regal Apartments), East Perth. These modifications removed all references to 'Serviced Apartments' and 'Short Stay Accommodation', replacing them with 'Multiple Dwelling' and 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation'.

Discussion

6. *Council Policy 3.5 – Initiation of Local Planning Scheme Amendments* (CP 3.5) provides a framework to assess the appropriateness of preparing scheme amendments ahead of draft *Local Planning Scheme No. 3* (LPS3). The amendments satisfy the provisions of CP 3.5 as presented at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 27 May 2025.
7. As a result of advertising, three objections were received, and one submission from Tourism WA providing comments. The key concerns raised:

- a. A lack of analysis on the implications of STRA for long-term housing supply and affordability, and adequacy of policy mechanisms to manage the conversion of long-term residential dwellings to STRA and protect the hotel industry and residential housing stock.
 - b. Request for clarification to be included that the existing approvals for 20 Royal Street, East Perth, remain valid.
8. No changes are proposed to the amendments as a result of the submissions.
9. As at the end of October, less than 4% of dwellings in the city are registered as Unhosted STRA on the State Government Short-Term Rental Accommodation Register, with the majority of these having current approvals as 'Serviced Apartments'. Therefore, STRA is not considered to have a current significant impact on the availability of long-term rental in the city or hotel industry.
10. The approach to the land use permissibility in the amendments aligns with the WAPC's expectations set out through the *Planning Bulletin 115: Short-term Rental Accommodation* and *Planning for Tourism Position Statement*. These state that for metropolitan local governments:
- a. Hosted STRA should be a permissible 'P' use in all zones.
 - b. Unhosted STRA should be a discretionary, or subject to advertising where any type of dwelling is capable of approval.
11. Under the proposed amendments, 'Unhosted STRA' is a 'Contemplated' or 'Discretionary' use and will require an application for development approval. Currently under both CPS2 and LPS26, short-term rental accommodation is 'Preferred' in some areas, and the use cannot be refused solely on the appropriateness of the use and does not require community consultation.
12. Having 'Unhosted STRA' as a 'Contemplated' and 'Discretionary' land use means an application for development approval can be refused based on the appropriateness of the use and may also be advertised for community consultation.
13. The requirement for development approval, and the State Government Short-Term Rental Accommodation Register provides greater visibility of the amount of STRA in operation in the city. This provides an effective way to monitor its impact and adjust policy settings if necessary.
14. In addition to the above, the Local Planning Strategy (Strategy) was endorsed by the WAPC in 2023 and sets the long-term strategic planning direction for land use and development of the City of Perth. The Strategy sets a residential population target of 55,000 by 2036 and includes actions to promote greater housing diversity and density. This is being implemented in draft *Local Planning Scheme No. 3* (LPS3), which will replace the current local planning schemes. The City will monitor and review implementation of the Strategy and LPS3 to ensure it is delivering the desired outcomes. This includes tracking residential development and feasibility, population growth, housing supply and affordability, rate of conversion of long-term residential dwelling into Unhosted STRA and uptake of development incentives for residential.
15. To address concerns regarding the existing approvals for 20 Royal Street, additional commentary has been included in the Scheme Amendment Report for Amendment No. 7 to LPS26. This clarifies that current planning approvals for the site remain valid, and the amendment does not require existing serviced apartments to seek a new approval to continue operating in accordance with these approvals.
16. The validity of existing approvals is protected through more general provisions of the LPS Regulations and local planning scheme. Including specific references to existing approvals in the scheme text is not standard practice and could inadvertently imply that only those mentioned are protected. It could also have implications should landowners seek further approvals for the property that modify these existing approvals.

Consultation

17. The amendments and planning policies were advertised for a period of 42 days in accordance with Clause 47 (3) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.
18. The method of advertising included a notice placed in the newspaper, notices placed in the Council House foyer, information displayed on the Engage Perth website, and letters to landowners (through the strata management bodies) who are directly affected by modifications to site specific scheme provisions under LPS26, being 20 Royal Street, 50-60 Royal Street and 11 Regal Place.
19. The following matters were raised in the submissions:
 - a. Lack of information to determine the impact of the amendments on long-term housing supply and affordability in the City;
 - b. Lack of strategic framework to control or manage the uptake of Unhosted STRA; and
 - c. Request for changes to clarify the scheme amendments do not remove property owners' rights with regards to existing planning approvals for Serviced Apartments in East Perth;
20. The submissions and the Administration's response is provided in Attachment F.

Decision Implications

21. Council has the option to support the scheme amendments and planning policies with or without modifications, or not support the amendments or planning policies.
22. If Council supports the recommendation:
 - a. the amendments will be forwarded to the WAPC for consideration and recommendation to the Minister for Planning for a final decision.
 - b. Should the Minister approve the amendments, the planning policies will come into effect following the Minister's decision.
23. If Council does not support the recommendation:
 - a. the amendments will be forwarded to the WAPC for its consideration and recommendation to the Minister for Planning for a final decision.
 - b. the existing *Planning Policy Section 3.9 – Special Residential (Serviced and Short-Term Accommodation) Policy* will remain unchanged, and no guidance will be provided under TPS4.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategic Community Plan	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	<p>Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 The scheme amendments and planning policies will manage Unhosted STRA and Special Residential land uses, ensuring residential amenity is maintained and aligns with the 'Liveable' pillar of the Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032.</p> <p>Local Planning Strategy 2023 The Local Planning Strategy seeks to ensure land use and development</p>

	<p>positively contributes to the public realm and desired character of the Perth city neighbourhoods. The amendments and planning policies seek to deliver high quality ‘tourist and visitor accommodation’ and ‘short-term rental accommodation’ that supports local businesses and minimises the impact on the long-term residential population.</p> <p>Events Strategy 2025 The Events Strategy sets a vision for Perth to be a destination and includes an action to promote and encourage visitors to stay and enjoy Perth for longer. The provision of a diverse variety of well-designed and managed ‘tourist and visitor accommodation’ and ‘short-term rental accommodation’ supports this vision.</p> <p>Economic Development Strategy 2022 – 2032 The scheme amendments and planning policies provide certainty to the tourism industry, supporting the objective of the strategy to celebrate and leverage Perth’s unique position in the world and strong international connections.</p>
--	---

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
<p>Legislation:</p>	<p><i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 75 provides legislative power to the Council to prepare changes to its local planning scheme. • Section 84 requires a local scheme amendment to be advertised and for submissions to be considered by the local government. • Section 87 outlines the Minister’s approval process for a local planning scheme amendment. <p><i>City of Perth Act 2016</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8(1)(a) to provide for the good government of persons in the City of Perth, including residents, ratepayers and visitors. • 8(1)(b) to represent the community and encourage community participation in decision-making. • 8(1)(d) to continuously improve the services and facilities that the City of Perth provides to the community and to local, interstate and international visitors and tourists. • 8(1)(g) to maintain and strengthen the local, national and international reputation of the Perth metropolitan area as an innovative, sustainable and vibrant global city that attracts and welcomes everyone. <p><i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation 49 and 50 outline the process for the consideration of submissions on a standard amendment to a local planning scheme. • Regulation 53 outlines the information required to be provided to the WAPC for the Minister’s consideration of a standard amendment to a local planning scheme. • Regulation 4(1) specifies the requirements for advertising local planning policy amendments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 5(3) of the Deemed Provisions sets out the process for considering submissions on a local planning policy. <p>City Planning Scheme No. 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 2 refers to Use Group Categories and Use Group Tables Schedule 4 refers to Definitions <p>Local Planning Scheme No. 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 1.6 refers to the relationship to the City of Perth Planning Scheme. <p>Town Planning Scheme No. 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 refers to Definitions. Table 1 refers to Zones and Land Uses and their permissibility.
Authority of Council/CEO:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> and <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> gives local governments powers in relation to Local Planning Schemes and Local Planning Policies. The above provisions of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> requires a decision to amend a Local Planning Scheme be by Council resolution. Clause 5(3) of the Deemed Provisions requires a local government to make a decision on a local planning policy following the consideration of submissions
Policy:	<p>Council Policy 3.5 – Initiation of Local Planning Scheme Amendments</p> <p>CP 3.5 provides a framework to guide the preparation of scheme amendments ahead of the new Local Planning Scheme No. 3. The amendments meet the requirements of CP 3.5.</p> <p>Planning Policy Section 3.9 – Special Residential (Serviced and Short-Term Accommodation) Policy</p>

Financial Implications

- The advertising notice of the scheme amendments and local planning policies in the local newspaper was \$650.
- Should the Minister approve the amendments, the costs associated with gazettal of the amendments will be approximately \$900.

Further Information

- Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 11 November 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Point 13 states DA's and government register provides an "effective" way to monitor. Is the City aware of complaints, contraventions, or action taken as part of this monitoring?	The Short-Term Rental Accommodation (STRA) Register became effective January 1 2025 and provides the City with an opportunity to monitor registered STRA to track matters such as number of days

		<p>booked, number of persons booked, and analyse trends to inform decision making.</p> <p>To date, the City has already used the STRA Register as a tool to successfully identify where there has been a contravention to the Planning and Development Act 2005 which has resulted in compliance enforcement.</p>
2.	<p>How will the city plan to protect or manage existing approvals if strata rules change later? If a strata building changes its by-laws to ban STRA after the city has already approved an unhosted STRA, does the operator keep their approval, or would the strata change override it?</p>	<p>A landowner and STRA operator is required to comply with all relevant legislation applicable to them. A planning approval issued under the Planning and Development Act 2005 does not override a landowners responsibility to comply with strata by-laws registered under the Strata Titles Act 1985.</p> <p>A local government has powers to enforce the Planning and Development Act 2005, however, the Strata Titles Act 1985 is enforced by each individual strata scheme. A local government does not have oversight of, or enforce, strata by-laws.</p> <p>Should a strata scheme introduce by-laws to restrict Short-Term Rental Accommodation (STRA), affected properties (including existing STRA operators) have a responsibility to comply with these by-laws and the strata scheme is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the by-laws.</p>
3.	<p>Given “Hosted” STRA is exempt from approval under State regulations, what safeguards does the City have to prevent operators falsely claiming to be “hosted” when they are not genuinely living on the property. How will the city prevent circumvention, e.g. owners registering as hosted but being minimally present?</p>	<p>Under the State Government’s Short-Term Rental Accommodation Act 2024 it is mandatory to register premises being used as STRA. The Register is maintained by the Department of Local Government, Industry, Regulation and Safety. To register, owners/occupiers must confirm they will reside at the premises at the same time it is being rented. The City is able to view the registration details of premises within the City of Perth. Should a premises be used in a way that is contrary to the exemption and/or an approval, the City can carry out a compliance investigation if necessary. This would be determined on a case by case basis.</p>
4.	<p>How will the City practically monitor and enforce the 90-day exemption for unhosted</p>	<p>Operators of a ‘Unhosted’ STRA are required to register the premises on the State’s STRA</p>

<p>STRA? Will this require new technology, data-sharing with platforms, or dedicated compliance staff not currently budgeted?</p>	<p>Register. The STRA Register captures the number of nights a registered premises is being rented, either automatically if the premises is advertised on a booking platform or manually if an operator manages the property independently of a booking platform. The Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety manages the STRA Register and monitors compliance with the Metro-Exemption period and sends reminders to relevant parties when 80 and 90 nights are booked.</p> <p>The STRA Register effectively assists the City to manage compliance of the registered premises within the City of Perth within current budget and resource levels.</p>
---	--

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-005)

Mover: Councillor Viktor Ko

Seconded: Councillor Chris Patton

That Council:

1. SUPPORTS without modification:
 - a. Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 as detailed in **Attachment A**,
 - b. Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26 as detailed in **Attachment B**,
 - c. Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4 as detailed in **Attachment C**.
2. ADOPTS the revised *Planning Policy 3.6 – Special Residential and Short-Term Rental Accommodation* and draft *Specialised Accommodation Local Planning Policy* as per **Attachment D** and **Attachment E** subject to the gazettal of Amendment No. 53 to City Planning Scheme No. 2, Amendment No. 7 to Local Planning Scheme No. 26, and Amendment No. 26 to Town Planning Scheme No. 4.
3. NOTES the scheme amendments will be forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission for consideration in accordance with Clause 22 in this report.
4. NOTES the submissions (including late submissions) received during the formal consultation period as per **Attachment F**.

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (6/0)

For: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Viktor Ko, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.



City of Perth
City Planning Scheme
No.2

Amendment No. 53

[View Amendment No. 53 on the website](#)



Amendment No. 53

This page has been left intentionally blank



CITY of PERTH

City of Perth
City Planning Scheme No. 2

Amendment No. 53

Summary of Amendment Details

Update scheme text to introduce new and revised land use classes and general definitions to facilitate State Government reforms for short-term rental accommodation.

This page has been left intentionally blank

FORM 2A

Planning and Development Act 2005

**RESOLUTION TO PREPARE AMENDMENT
TO CITY PLANNING SCHEME**

City of Perth

City of Perth City Planning Scheme No. 2

Amendment No. 53

Resolved that the Local Government pursuant to section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, amend the above Local Planning Scheme by:

1. In Clause 15(2):
 - A. Insert the following additional use group categories:
 - (a) 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation'; and
 - (b) 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation'.
2. In Schedule 1, 'Scheme Use Area - Description':
 - A. Amend the description of the City Centre scheme use area by inserting the use groups 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' and 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' after 'Special Residential'.
 - B. Amend the description of Residential scheme use area by inserting the use group 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' in between the words 'Residential' and 'Home Occupation', and 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' after 'Special Residential'.
 - C. Amend the description of Residential/Commercial scheme use area by inserting the use groups 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' in between the words 'Residential' and 'Home Occupation', and 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' after 'Special Residential'.
 - D. Amend the description of Office/Residential scheme use area by inserting the use groups 'Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' and 'Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation' after the words 'preferred use groups are Residential,'.

3. In Schedule 2, 'Use Group Categories':

A. Insert the following additional use group categories:

<p>Hosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation</p>	<p>has the same meaning given to it in clause 1 of the Deemed Provisions.</p> <p><i>Note: Clause 1 of the Deemed Provisions defines "hosted short-term rental accommodation" as</i></p> <p><i>"means any of the following —</i></p> <p><i>(a) short-term rental accommodation where the owner or occupier, or an agent of the owner or occupier who ordinarily resides at the dwelling, resides at the same dwelling during the short-term rental arrangement;</i></p> <p><i>(b) short-term rental accommodation that is an ancillary dwelling where the owner or occupier, or an agent of the owner or occupier who ordinarily resides at the other dwelling on the same lot, resides at that other dwelling during the short-term rental arrangement;</i></p> <p><i>(c) short-term rental accommodation that is a dwelling on the same lot as an ancillary dwelling where the owner or occupier, or an agent of the owner or occupier who ordinarily resides at the dwelling, resides at the ancillary dwelling during the short-term rental arrangement."</i></p>
<p>Unhosted Short-Term Rental Accommodation</p>	<p>has the same meaning given to it in clause 1 of the Deemed Provisions.</p> <p><i>Note: Clause 1 of the Deemed Provisions defines "unhosted short-term rental accommodation" as "means short-term rental accommodation that —</i></p> <p><i>(a) is not hosted short-term rental accommodation; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) accommodates a maximum of 12 people per night."</i></p>

B. Amend the description for the Special Residential use group by replacing 'serviced apartment' with 'tourist and visitor accommodation'.

4. In Schedule 4, 'Definitions':

- A. Amend the definition for 'Hotel' as per Schedule 1 – Model provisions for local planning schemes.

Hotel	means premises the subject of a hotel licence other than a small bar or tavern licence granted under the Liquor Control Act 1988 including any betting agency on the premises;
--------------	--

- B. Delete the definitions for:

- i. 'Serviced Apartment'; and
- ii. 'Short Term Accommodation'.

- C. Insert the definition 'Tourist and Visitor Accommodation' as per Schedule 1 – Model Provisions for Local Planning Schemes.

Tourist and Visitor Accommodation	<p>(a) means a building, or a group of buildings forming a complex, that —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) is wholly managed by a single person or body; and (ii) is used to provide accommodation for guests, on a commercial basis, with no individual guest accommodated for a period or periods exceeding a total of 3 months in any 12-month period; and (iii) may include on-site services and facilities for use by guests; and (iv) in the case of a single building — contains more than 1 separate accommodation unit or is capable of accommodating more than 12 people per night; and <p>(b) includes a building, or complex of buildings, meeting the criteria in paragraph (a) that is used for self-contained serviced apartments that are regularly serviced or cleaned during the period of a guest's stay by the owner or manager of the apartment or an agent of the owner or manager; but</p> <p>(c) does not include any of the following —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) an aged care facility as defined in the Land Tax Assessment Act 2002 section 38A(1); (ii) a caravan park;
--	--

	(iii) hosted short-term rental accommodation;
	(iv) a lodging-house as defined in the Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911 section 3(1);
	(v) a park home park;
	(vi) a retirement village as defined in the Retirement Villages Act 1992 section 3(1);
	(vii) a road house;
	(viii) workforce accommodation;

5. In Schedule 3 'Use Group Tables' insert the following land use categories and permissibilities:

P1 Northbridge (CC)

Use Group	Use Symbol	
	East of Russell Square	West of Russell Square
Hosted short-term rental accommodation	P	P
Unhosted short-term rental accommodation	C	C

P3 Stirling (CC)

Use Group	Use Symbol
Hosted short-term rental accommodation	P
Unhosted short-term rental accommodation	C

P4 Victoria (CC)

Use Group	Use Symbol
Hosted short-term rental accommodation	P
Unhosted short-term rental accommodation	C

P5 Citiplace (CC)

Use Group	Use Symbol	
	King Street Heritage	Rest of Precinct
Hosted short-term rental accommodation	P	P
Unhosted short-term rental accommodation	C	C

P6 St Georges (CC)

Use Group	Use Symbol
Hosted short-term rental accommodation	P
Unhosted short-term rental accommodation	C

6:23pm Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds, Councillors Catherine Lezer and Liam Gobbert returned to the meeting, prior to Item 11.2.

6:24pm Councillor Chris Patton disclosed an Indirect Financial Interest in relation to Item 11.2 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds disclosed an Impartiality Interest in relation to Item 11.2 (as detailed at Item 5)

Councillor Viktor Ko disclosed an Impartiality Interest in relation to Item 11.2 (as detailed at Item 5)

11.2 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth - Proposed Helipad Addition ('Unlisted Use') to the Existing Office Development (DA-2025/5209)

Responsible Officer	Maria Cooke – General Manager Planning and Sustainability
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 11.2A – Location Plan Attachment 11.2B – Development Plans Attachment 11.2C – Helideck Location and Design Report Attachment 11.2D – Flight Envelope Study Attachment 11.2E – Acoustic Report Attachment 11.2F – Helicopter Downwash Assessment Attachment 11.2G – Schedule of Submissions

Purpose

For Council to determine a development application for proposed additions and alterations to an existing office building including a helipad addition at 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. In accordance with the provisions of City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2), the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes, REFUSES the application for alterations including a helipad addition ('Unlisted Use') to the existing office development at 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth as indicated on the Application for Development Approval dated 10 June 2025 and as shown on the revised plans received on 3 October 2025 for the following reasons:
 - a. Pursuant to clauses 67(2)(m), (n), (x) and (za) of *the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development will have an adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residential land uses, as the proposal does not demonstrate that the noise and vibration impacts associated with the use can be mitigated.
 - b. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(a) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and intentions of the City Planning Scheme No. 2 in regard to health, safety and general welfare under clause 6(3)(c) as the proposal does not adequately demonstrate how the proposal can be managed and operated to ensure the ongoing preservation of the amenity of the surrounding area.

- c. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(y) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the locality as outlined in the written objections received from the surrounding owners and occupiers.
 - d. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(fa) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the proposed development is incompatible with the objectives of the City of Perth Local Planning Strategy which prioritises an increase in the residential population as part of medium scale mixed use developments in the locality. The proposal has the potential to restrict surrounding sites from being able to achieve prescribed development heights and residential development.
 - e. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(zb) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, approval of the proposed development would be contrary to orderly and proper planning given the proposed development:
 - i. is incompatible with its setting and is considered to cause an adverse impact on the amenity of the locality for no discernible wider benefit to the community; and
 - ii. has the potential to detrimentally impact the City's aspirations for increased residential population as referenced in the City's Local Planning Strategy given the associated amenity impacts constraining future residential development in the vicinity.
 - f. The proposed development does not warrant approval as an 'Unlisted Use' pursuant to clause 34(1)(b) of City Planning Scheme No.2 and would set an undesirable precedent as it is not consistent with the matters listed in clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions as outlined above.
2. ADVISE the applicant that other approval pathways are available for the proposed amendments not related to the helipad as detailed in this report.
-

Background

1. The subject site is bounded by Thomas Street to the west, Ord Street to the north, Walker Avenue to the east and a right of way to the south. The site has a total area of 6,055m² and contains a five storey commercial office building with an associated two level car parking structure and extensive landscaping.
2. On 7 August 2023, the City, under delegated authority granted conditional approval for the refurbishment of the existing office building at the subject site. The approved development included:
 - a. a new façade feature spanning the north, west and east elevations of the main building;
 - b. new raised terrace area above the existing car park, with a connecting bridge to the main building;
 - c. revised landscaping within the frontage to Ord Street and between the car park and main building; and
 - d. addition of green balcony spaces on the main building including the first floor, third floor, and rooftop.
3. On 12 September 2024, the City, under delegated authority granted conditional approval for amendments to the abovementioned approval. The amended approval included the following modifications to the original:
 - a. reduction in the overall number of tenant car parking bays;
 - b. changes to the ground level landscaping;
 - c. revised location for the level 1 raised landscaped area and bridge link;
 - d. amendments to the roof terrace level, including new presentation room and eating area, as well as plant rooms; and
 - e. removal of the façade feature from the southern elevation.
4. Numerous building permits associated with the above approved refurbishment works have been issued by the City, with construction works being well advanced at the site.
5. The refurbishment works also included a ‘ceremonial driveway’, the purpose of which was to allow for occasional vehicular access to the complex’s main entry by the site owner and their corporate guests. Accommodating this feature required installation of a separate, sole purpose/use crossover and relocation of an existing street tree.

Discussion

Proposal

Landowner	Ord Street Holdings Pty Ltd
Applicant	Element Advisory
Zoning	(MRS Zone) Urban (City Planning Scheme Precinct) West Perth (P10) (City Planning Scheme Use Area) Office/Residential
Approximate Cost	\$500,000

6. Approval is sought for the provision of a rooftop helicopter landing site (helipad) at the subject site, along with some further minor modifications to the abovementioned approved development. In support of the proposal, the applicant advises:
 - a. *“The helipad will be used for a maximum of 12 times per year, limited to daylight hours (7am to 7pm), and will accommodate a Bell 429 aircraft.*
 - b. *The purpose of the helipad is to enable occasional corporate transport.*

- c. *The helipad will be located centrally on the building rooftop at approximately RL 64.906m AHD, consistent with the parapet level of the approved development.*
 - d. *Supporting infrastructure includes appropriate helideck markings, fall protection mesh, safety netting and a designated clear zone, all designed in accordance with international aviation guidelines.*
 - e. *The indicative flight path has been designed to align with prevailing east-west wind conditions and avoid conflicts with existing and proposed built form.*
 - f. *The proposal is accompanied by technical reports addressing aviation safety, acoustic impact, and wind downwash. These assessments confirm the helipad can operate safely and appropriately within the existing and future inner city context, without generating unreasonable amenity impacts to surrounding properties or the public realm.”*
7. In addition to the proposed helipad being the predominant focus of the application and this report, the applicant proposes the following minor design refinements to the approved development:
- a. Reverting (increasing) to the originally approved 186 tenant car parking bays, via the introduction of several car stackers to the internalised car parking area.
 - b. Introducing a number of motorcycle bays to the car parking area.
 - c. Revised design to some of the landscaping areas including simplification for the purposes of ongoing maintenance. No change/reduction to the extent of landscaped area is proposed as part of the modifications.
 - d. Refinement of the building entry canopy, final perforation pattern to the car park screening and updating the external building cladding material from GRC cladding to ‘Ultrasure’ aluminium cladding and updated frit pattern to the petal glass.

Consultation

8. As the proposed helipad development is considered an ‘Unlisted’ use under City Planning Scheme No.2 (CPS2), the application was advertised to surrounding landowners, including landowners located in the City of Subiaco, for a period of 28 days, in accordance with clause 34 of CPS2. A total of 33 submissions were received, with two in support of the proposal, two advising conditional support and 29 objecting to the proposal. The comments received are summarised below (refer to Report attachment for full submissions):

Issue Raised	Officer comments
<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p><i>‘The helicopter will be flying at a low level altitude whenever it passes over our building – which will only increase the noise level, thus disturbing our peaceful living.’</i></p> <p><i>‘Helicopters are a source of noise pollution. The use of the helipad would lead to excessive noise impact on close by residents.’</i></p> <p><i>‘Helicopter operations generate significant noise, which can be highly disruptive to the quiet enjoyment of homes in the vicinity. Even occasional take-offs and landings create noise levels exceeding 85 decibels, which could affect</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Matters relating to noise are discussed in detail in the ‘Noise and Amenity’ section of this report.</p>

<p><i>the health, wellbeing, and sleep of nearby residents, including families and elderly persons.'</i></p>	
<p><u>Safety/Amenity</u></p> <p><i>'Concerned about the safety aspects of a helicopter flying at a low altitude over our building (and other buildings).'</i></p> <p><i>'Any malfunction or emergency event could have serious implications given the density and proximity of surrounding buildings, including heritage properties and apartments.'</i></p> <p><i>'Safety risks are heightened in urban areas. Low-altitude operations increase the likelihood of accidents and limit safe approach paths, particularly in confined environments.'</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The applicant confirms all flights will be undertaken during daytime, good weather with good visibility conditions to ensure suitable visual flight paths are possible, at all times. The applicant also submitted a report prepared by a qualified consultant which provides appropriate aviation technical advice on the suitability of the location and layout of a proposed helipad.</p>
<p><u>Compliance</u></p> <p><i>'Although the application states the helipad will be used no more than 12 times per year...without robust oversight, there is a risk that occasional use could escalate.'</i></p> <p><i>'The helipad is intended for "infrequent use, estimated at approximately 12 flights per year... the report does not specify any enforceable conditions or monitoring mechanisms to ensure this usage limit is upheld.'</i></p> <p><i>'How will the number of landings and take-offs be controlled and what consequences will there be for any breaches over and above the specified limit in the application?'</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Any approval for the proposed helipad would include specific condition/s with regards to the management and use of the facility. This includes number of permitted landings/take offs within a specified period. It is noted that enforcing compliance of such requirements may be difficult.</p>
<p><u>Wind</u></p> <p><i>'We should not be placed in a situation where we must avoid walking along Ord St or Walker Avenue just in case the helicopter does fly over.'</i></p> <p><i>'As outlined in the consultant's report there will be downward and outward winds created by the rotors which will affect people on the ground.'</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The applicant submitted a revised Helicopter Downwash/Occupant Comfort Assessment which concludes that a helicopter hovering directly above the helipad (i.e. 28 metres above ground level), will produce predicted wind speeds at ground level of approximately 11 metres/second which is within the maximum 15 metres/second prescribed by the 'Lawson criteria' threshold.</p>
<p><u>Lack of community benefit</u></p> <p><i>'This application offers no benefit to the community considering the disturbance it will cause to the community of West Perth and surrounding areas.'</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Although the applicant advises the helipad is ancillary to an approved commercial building and is proposed for occasional, managed use only, the helipad is for private use only.</p>

<p><i>'It's difficult to see any direct or indirect benefit to nearby residents. In fact, the impact would fall entirely on the community, while the benefits would go to a very small number of users.'</i></p> <p><i>'We accept emergency services flying because of the benefit to the community. This proposal is an externalised cost to the community with no offset.'</i></p>	
<p><u>Vibration</u></p> <p><i>'The powerful air currents and low-frequency vibrations could cause long-term, irreversible damage, including foundation cracks, structural instability, and damage to roofs and facades.'</i></p> <p><i>'Based on the close proximity of the helipad and the proposed landing directions there will be a major impact to our building with excessive noise, vibrations and wind down force.'</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The applicant submitted a revised acoustic report which covers (in part) matters related to potential vibration impacts. Further detailed assessment is outlined in the 'Noise and Amenity' section of this report.</p>

9. The application was referred to the Environmental Noise Branch of the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) for comment given the proposal's potential environmental impact not only within but outside the City's boundaries. DWER's Noise Branch advised:

"We note the reference to Air Services Australia's Guideline 'Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise (2002)' in the applicant's acoustic report. Although the report lists the principles that would be applicable, there is no addressing of 'Part B - Strategy for Working through a Hierarchical Set of Environmental Standards'. Specifically, section C.1. prescribes that - "Standard departure and arrival procedures should be designed so that helicopters do not overfly residential areas".

Relevant to this proposal, in previous advice to local governments in relation to helicopter noise (including a 2006 Perth Helipad Study and 2015 floating heliport), the Environmental Noise Branch recommended the following outdoor criteria at residential receivers:

- a. *L_{Amax} = 77 dB; and*
- b. *L_{Aeq, T} = 50 dB for the period from 7am to 10pm, (after 10pm emergency flights only).*

The applicant's acoustic report concludes the 77 dB(A) max criterion would be exceeded at all the residential receivers identified.'

City officers concurred with the above advice, particularly as noise emissions associated with aircraft are outside the remit of local government authorities. The applicant's response to the above DWER advice and overall implications of noise associated with the proposal are discussed further in this report.

10. The proposal was referred to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) for comment given their expertise in administering and moderating aircraft including helicopters. In response to the referral, CASA advised:

“Regarding this proposal, please note that CASA regulations do not apply to uncertified landing sites. The relevant requirement under the Civil Aviation Regulations is that the pilot in command must not land at a location that is unsuitable for the aircraft type or the intended operation. It is therefore the pilot’s responsibility to assess the site’s suitability, including consideration of weather conditions on the day of the operation.”

11. Noting the proposed increase in tenant car parking bays proposed by the application (albeit reverting to the 186 bays as approved in the 2023 development approval), the proposal was referred to the Department of Transport and Major Infrastructure (DTMI) for review and comment in relation to the Perth Parking Policy 2014 (PPP). The DTMI advised of support for the licensing of the 177 tenant (non-residential) parking bays subject to the provision of two ACROD parking bays, 14 motorcycle bays, additional bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities, a Parking Management Plan and a Travel Plan.
12. It is noted that the 186 bays approved as part of the 2023 development approval was in contrast to the DTMI’s advice at the time recommending a maximum of 174 tenant car parking bays on site. City officers at the time considered the refurbishment proposal to be a positive activation of both the site and the West Perth locality. Whilst noting the car parking maximums prescribed PPP may be a potential barrier to achieving the broader outcomes that the redevelopment of the site was intending achieve. Therefore, while the advice of the DTMI was noted, the variation was considered acceptable and capable of support. With regards to the subject application, it is again considered reasonable that 186 tenant (non-residential) car parking bays be provided on site. However, noting the recommendation for refusal of the application in its entirety, in the interests of orderly and proper planning and procedural consistency, it is considered that any proposed changes to existing car parking arrangements be dealt with as a separate application for approval.

Compliance with Planning Scheme

Land use

13. The subject site is located in the West Perth Precinct (P10) under CPS2. The Precinct provides for a wide range of office and residential activities together with restaurants (including cafes) and other uses which serve the immediate needs of the work force and residents and add to the area's vitality and attraction.
14. The proposal includes minor amendments, separate to the helipad addition, which are potentially capable of support under the relevant development and design provisions of CPS2. It is however noted that these minor amendments are pre-dominantly detailed design matters which can be addressed via conditions of the existing approval and/or pursued at the relevant building permit stage.
15. A ‘helipad’ does not readily fall within any of the Land Use Categories contained within CPS2. As such, in accordance with Clause 15(4) of CPS2, the proposal is deemed an ‘Unlisted Use’.
16. Clause 34 of CPS2 outlines the process for the determination of an application for an ‘Unlisted Use’. It prescribes that approval for an unlisted use is unable to be granted unless it has been advertised and satisfies the matters listed in clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions.
17. With regards to the overall proposal, it is considered that the following matters outlined within clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions are appropriate, noting the existing site conditions and context:
 - “(a) the aims and provisions of this Scheme and any other local planning scheme operating within the Scheme area;*
 - (fa) any local planning strategy for this Scheme endorsed by the Commission;*
 - (m) the compatibility of the development with its setting, including —*
 - (i) the compatibility of the development with the desired future character of its setting; and*

- (ii) *the relationship of the development to development on adjoining land or on other land in the locality including, but not limited to, the likely effect of the height, bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of the development;*
 - (n) *the amenity of the locality including the following —*
 - (i) *environmental impacts of the development;*
 - (ii) *the character of the locality;*
 - (iii) *social impacts of the development;*
 - (x) *the impact of the development on the community as a whole notwithstanding the impact of the development on particular individuals;*
 - (y) *any submissions received on the application;*
 - (za) *the comments or submissions received from any authority consulted under clause 66; and*
 - (zb) *any other planning consideration the local government considers appropriate.”*
- 18. The subject site is located within the ‘Office/Residential Area’ of the West Perth Precinct (P10), where the development of independent residential uses is strongly encouraged. The protection and enhancement of the amenity of existing and future residential development in and around the Precinct is important. Ensuring the compatibility of commercial and residential uses is therefore necessary and building design seeks to avoid conflict between the two uses.
- 19. The applicant, in support of the proposed use, has provided detailed reports and undertakings to demonstrate, as far as reasonable, that the proposed use is compatible with the locality. With the main reasoning for this being that the helipad will only be used on an infrequent basis, thereby limiting any negative offsite impacts to isolated instances. The applicant acknowledges that whilst off-site impacts are inevitable, dissimilar to a standard airfields or certified land sites (e.g. airports, hospitals), these will not be ongoing and more akin to nuisance impact for surrounding sites.
- 20. It is noted that the infrequency (notionally once a month) and timing (day light hours only) of use of the helipad means its potential amenity impacts cannot readily be compared to a standard airport facility. It could be considered comparable to an emergency hospital landing facility which are located within urban areas. However, the need for such facilities is recognised and serves a wider community benefit. Whereas the subject proposal is for a private facility with no associated wider community benefits, thereby limiting any offsets to the inconvenience and nuisance factors associated with the helipad.
- 21. Whilst the proposed infrequent use of the helipad is noted, it would be difficult via associated conditions of development approval to both limit and manage such use. The applicant, in response to comments received during public advertising, has proposed imposition of an appropriately worded condition to ensure ongoing compliance with frequency of use of the helipad. The operator can provide the City with flight details/logs to demonstrate compliance with any use restrictions. However, it would be difficult for the City to undertake any compliance action should the parameters for use not be adhered to. There are practicalities of trying to limit use of an approved helipad, where the offsite impacts have been considered and accepted as part of the original approval. With little to distinguish between the suitability of the facility being used once, twice or more times a month as there is no associated cumulative effect of the use, rather each time it is used for landing and take off.
- 22. City Planning Scheme No. 2 prescribes a maximum building height for the subject site and sites within the immediate vicinity of 29 metres or approximately nine storeys. It is noted that building height can be varied under CPS2, and there are existing developments in the West Perth neighbourhood that exceed this height.
- 23. The subject site is located in the future West Perth Neighbourhood. The City of Perth Local Planning Strategy (LPS) identifies the priority for this neighbourhood is to *increase the residential population to create more vibrancy and activity outside of office hours, while maintain the neighbourhoods function*

as a Secondary Office Area. The Strategy identifies that an additional 2,261 dwellings are required in West Perth to assist the City in achieving a population of 55,000 by 2026. The City's draft planning framework responds to this by increasing the development potential of lots in West Perth. The draft Ord and Outram Street Character Area Local Planning Policy proposes to increase the maximum building height in the West Perth Neighbourhood to 44.1 metres or 12 storeys.

24. The proposed development is considered to be incompatible with the objectives of the LPS and has the potential to negatively impact on the City's residential targets for the West Perth Neighbourhood given such a development may discourage development in the Neighbourhood due to the amenity impacts associated with the proposed use.
25. It is also noted that the proposed development could impact on the development of surrounding properties. Although the applicant has confirmed that the flight envelope will not impact on the development potential of surrounding sites as the path can be modified to suit any future development it has the potential to create uncertainty about the full development potential of surrounding sites and the presence of a flight envelope in close proximity to adjoining sites may increase the need to attenuate future developments from a noise source not commonly associated with an office/residential precinct.
26. Given the uncertainty over the wider impacts and sole benefit derived from the proposal, it is difficult to assert that the proposal satisfies the matters outlined in clauses 67 (a) – aims/provisions of Scheme; (m) – compatibility with setting; (n) amenity of the locality; (x) – impact on community; which are the primary considerations with regards to whether an 'Unlisted Use' is capable of support. It is also noted, as outlined previously, the existing refurbishment approvals and works included a 'ceremonial driveway' to the complex. Whilst a different transport mode, this is considered to already fulfil the 'occasional corporate transport' proposed by the helipad addition.

Development Requirements

27. There are no specific criteria or requirements for development of a 'helipad' that relate to the West Perth Precinct (P10) under CPS2. All development is required to be generally consistent with the Statement of Intent for the Precinct in which it takes place.
28. The proposed helipad is located centrally within the roof level and is proposed to largely be contained within the existing roof level design with minor additions to accommodate its use. It is proposed to be contained generally within the existing approved building envelope and maintain compliance with the maximum 29 metre height limit prescribed by CPS2 for the Office/Residential Area.
29. The applicant has provided an indicative flight envelope study which outlines the proposed flight paths of the helicopter flying to and from the helipad facility. The study demonstrates that if the surrounding buildings are built-out to the future maximum heights prescribed by the City's Draft Local Planning Scheme No.3 the helicopter can still manoeuvre safely to/from the proposed helipad, via a vertical landing/departure (i.e. 25 metre vertical). It is also noted that helicopters can manoeuvre as required to avoid obstacles, so should surrounding sites accommodate buildings (beyond the draft LPS3 maximum heights) in the future, the helicopter could still safely access/egress the proposed helipad.
30. Whilst the design and integration of the proposed helipad facility may be suitable as a physical addition to the building, its function, as outlined in this report, is considered to be incompatible with the Statement of Intent for the Precinct. Particularly as it creates a potential conflict between an existing commercial development and existing and future residential uses in the locality, which the Precinct seeks to avoid.

Noise and Amenity

31. The provisions of the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulation 1997* are not readily applied to the assessment and attenuation of noise associated with helicopter aircraft. As such the applicant's supporting acoustic report referred to the 'Air Services Australia's Guideline 'Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise (2002)' for guidance on the potential noise impacts of the proposed helipad on the locality.
32. As outlined previously, DWER's review of the proposal concluded that the proposal would not comply with an applicable noise criterion applied to similar proposals. The applicant subsequently submitted a revised acoustic report using a potentially more suitable noise assessment criteria being 'Australian Standard AS 2021:2015 - Acoustics - Aircraft Noise Intrusion - Building Siting and Construction'. The revised report demonstrates that the proposal would generally be in accordance with the Standard and helicopter operations will not significantly impact the current noise environment.
33. However, City officers and DWER are of the view that the application and use of AS 2021:2015 is not of particular relevance in this case. Particularly as the Standard is best suited to larger airports/airfields to establish Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) contours and to guide land use planning in the vicinity of established airports/airfields, for example for new residential uses moving into a 'noisy' environment. It also seeks to protect such established facilities from encroachment of incompatible or sensitive uses. However in this case, it is the converse with a noise emitting aircraft proposing to be accommodated within an established urban commercial/residential area.
34. Based on the forecast noise emissions of the helicopter arriving and departing from the site, under the above Standard, numerous adjacent sites would fall within the 'conditionally acceptable' uses in terms of noise attenuation requirements. The implication of 'conditionally acceptable' premises was not suitably addressed in the revised acoustic report. However City officers contend that under the provisions of the Standard, the impacted sites would need to potentially upgrade existing construction (e.g. glazing, doors) to accommodate and attenuate against noise emitted by the helicopter. This would also be applicable to any future redevelopments which need to account for the revised noise conditions in the locality when preparing acoustic reports in support of proposals.
35. As outlined previously, potential offsite impacts related to vibration caused by the helicopter arriving and leaving the site were raised by City officers and the community. The applicant's revised acoustic report included some details related to vibration which concluded that while noticeable vibration from helicopter overflight may occur at adjoining properties, levels are not expected to be excessive relative to recommended targets (e.g. structural or cosmetic damage risk or human comfort). The report states that residents in the most affected areas could experience rattling of loose elements (e.g. windows in degraded condition) and that a detailed building-by-building vibration study would require intrusive field inspections. Following which it is unlikely that there would be any additional management measures beyond those already recommended in the report.
36. Whilst it is noted that there are no state policies or regulations with respect to vibrations from aircraft or helicopters, the lack of any mitigation measures should levels prove intolerable for surrounding sites remains a concern. It is noted that such impacts are proposed to be infrequent given the projected limited use of the facility, however the absence of any surety over offsite impacts being minimal makes it difficult to determine levels of tolerance for nuisances associated with the use. Meaning once established and approved for use, it would be nearly impossible for City officers to request retrospective changes to the facility or management of flights in response to any complaints related to nuisance or structural issues from surrounding landowners.
37. In order to try and minimise potential adverse offsite impacts the applicant, in the revised flight envelope study and acoustic report have modified the proposed arrival and departure arc of the helicopter. The net result being that the helicopter changing direction from a higher vertical position,

28 metres in lieu of 15 metres as originally proposed, reduces its noise and vibration impacts on immediately surrounding properties. However as outlined above, the noise levels anticipated at these properties will still be an issue for its occupants. The applicant has acknowledged the mitigation measures will not fully resolve these matters however the infrequency and short time span of arrival and departure of the helicopter means any inconvenience will be time limited. Whilst its acknowledged offsite impacts related to noise won't be ongoing, there is still concern that allowing any offsite impacts of this nature could unduly affect surrounding landowners.

38. Noting the overall lack of relevant guidance for noise assessment and attenuation (as required) for helicopter aircraft the applicant has tried to address and minimise the impacts of noise as far as possible. However based on the above, there are too many variables and unknowns in relation to the impact of the facility on the locality with regards to noise and vibration which remain a concern.

Conclusion

39. Given the above, it is considered that the proposal does not satisfy the relevant criteria under clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions in order to be granted development approval as an 'Unlisted 'Use' under clause 34 of CPS2. Whilst it is noted that the helipad will be used infrequently, thereby limiting its negative impacts to specific occasions, approval for the use is considered contrary to orderly and properly planning given the impact on local amenity and lack of certainty over mitigation of such impacts. The applicant has addressed and proposed management measures in support of the proposal, noting its unique nature and lack of associated guidelines or criteria within the planning framework. However, despite these efforts, it is considered that there is too much uncertainty and lack of finality in relation to the proposal being appropriately located with manageable offsite impacts.
40. As such, the proposal is recommended for refusal. Whilst the proposal includes other minor amendments, separate to the helipad element, which are potentially capable of support, in the interests of procedural consistency it is recommended that the application be refused in its entirety. The minor amendments (largely detailed design matters) are therefore able to be pursued separate either via at the relevant building permit stage or separate development application.

Decision Implications

41. The Council may:
- Refuse the application as recommended.
 - Approve the application, with or without conditions of approval.
42. Should Council refuse the application, or should the applicant disagree with any conditions of approval, the applicant has the right to apply to the State Administrative Tribunal for a review of Council's decision.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategic Community Plan	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Local Planning Strategy The Local Planning Strategy sets out the City's Strategic objectives for future land uses and development within the city.

	The Strategy identifies the vision for the West Perth Neighbourhood to increase the residential population to create more vibrancy and activity outside of office hours, while maintaining the neighbourhood’s function as a Secondary Office Area. To enable this, it will be vital to facilitate diverse, affordable housing options suited to future residents housing needs.as a place of commerce and enterprise, culture and artistic endeavour, recreation and entertainment.
--	--

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> <i>City Planning Scheme No.2</i> <i>Metropolitan Region Scheme</i> <i>City of Perth Act 2016</i>
Authority of Council/CEO:	The authority to determine this development application has been delegated by Council to the CEO, the General Manager Planning and Economic Development and the Alliance Manager Development Approvals under the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> . However, in accordance with delegation 9.2(2.)(b.) the application is now required to be determined by Council, noting the nature of the objections received as a result of public consultation.
Policy:	Local Planning Policy 4.1 – City Development Design Guidelines

Financial Implications

Nil.

Further Information

43. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Given that the helipad is considered an unlisted use can you please clarify how approving this proposal may influence future applications of a similar nature?	All development applications, regardless of their proposed land use, are assessed on their individual merits. Precedent is not a determining factor for approval. Any similar proposal would be required to address the same considerations associated with assessing an unlisted use.
2.	Are there any other alternatives that City can offer to users who would like to use helicopters and helipads in the City of Perth?	The City can consider helicopter landings, for tourism and promotional purposes, on application. Langley Park is considered as the best place for landings, however other locations may be considered via the

		associated assessment process. https://perth.wa.gov.au/forms-and-payments/building-planning-and-development/undertaking-work/obstruction-permit
3.	Can administration confirm whether any health authorities particularly WA Health Royal Perth Hospital or the state trauma unit has specifically requested or endorsed a need for a backup helipad at this location?	Given the alternative use of the proposed helipad was not included or sought as part of the application, the requirement or suitability of the proposed structure has not been referred to external health or emergency management authorities or agencies for feedback.
4.	Has the department of fire and emergency services DFES, Saint John of God or state emergency management committee confirmed any of their operational requirements or endorsement?	As above
5.	Is there any precedent other capital cities or private corporate building's being used as overflow or backup facility for emergency medical helicopters and how did they manage their existing protocols regarding health infrastructure and needs of those been transported?	This specific aspect of the proposed helipad has not been considered given the proposal is for private corporate use only. Should a new or amended application be submitted to include alternative/emergency use, the suitability will need to be demonstrated which may include reference to similar arrangements in other localities.
6.	Does the proposed helipad meet the required aeromedical retrieval standards required for lifting critically injured and unstable patients including risks around turbulence rotor wash impact zones and medical transfer space needs?	This specific aspect of the proposed helipad has not been considered given the proposal is for private corporate use only. Any use for alternative purposes such as medical emergencies would need to demonstrate it is appropriately designed to accommodate all requirements associated with such a use.
7.	Administration can provide any evidence or otherwise of any helicopter landings been diverted away from either Royal Perth Hospital or Sir Charles Gardner Hospital that would necessitate the need for secondary or tertiary backup?	This information cannot readily be obtained at this time however may be a consideration as part of any proposed alternative use of the proposed helipad for medical emergency purposes.
8.	When we were contemplating the scheme amendment for royal Perth Hospital, we had a massing diagram that shows that. Is there any possibility of receiving any visual representation of what that might look like before the OCM next week?	The impact of the notional helicopter flight path was considered and assessed by City officers via inclusion of the path in the City's 3D model with the draft LPS3 building height envelopes. It is noted that these heights are indicative as building heights are capable of

		variation via the relevant planning framework.
--	--	--

Officer Recommendation

Mover: Councillor Lisa Ma

Secunder: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. In accordance with the provisions of City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2), the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes, REFUSES the application for alterations including a helipad addition ('Unlisted Use') to the existing office development at 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth as indicated on the Application for Development Approval dated 10 June 2025 and as shown on the revised plans received on 3 October 2025 for the following reasons:
 - a. Pursuant to clauses 67(2)(m), (n), (x) and (za) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development will have an adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residential land uses, as the proposal does not demonstrate that the noise and vibration impacts associated with the use can be mitigated.
 - b. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(a) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and intentions of the City Planning Scheme No. 2 in regard to health, safety and general welfare under clause 6(3)(c) as the proposal does not adequately demonstrate how the proposal can be managed and operated to ensure the ongoing preservation of the amenity of the surrounding area.
 - c. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(y) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the locality as outlined in the written objections received from the surrounding owners and occupiers.
 - d. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(fa) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the proposed development is incompatible with the objectives of the City of Perth Local Planning Strategy which prioritises an increase in the residential population as part of medium scale mixed use developments in the locality. The proposal has the potential to restrict surrounding sites from being able to achieve prescribed development heights and residential development.
 - e. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(zb) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, approval of the proposed development would be contrary to orderly and proper planning given the proposed development:
 - i. is incompatible with its setting and is considered to cause an adverse impact on the amenity of the locality for no discernible wider benefit to the community; and

- ii. has the potential to detrimentally impact the City's aspirations for increased residential population as referenced in the City's Local Planning Strategy given the associated amenity impacts constraining future residential development in the vicinity.
 - f. The proposed development does not warrant approval as an 'Unlisted Use' pursuant to clause 34(1)(b) of City Planning Scheme No.2 and would set an undesirable precedent as it is not consistent with the matters listed in clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions as outlined above.
2. ADVISE the applicant that other approval pathways are available for the proposed amendments not related to the helipad as detailed in this report.
-

During debate, Councillor Adam Pacan moved an Alternate Motion as follows:

Alternate Motion (OCM-25/12-006)

Mover: Councillor Adam Pacan

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

The Lord Mayor foreshadowed the Officers Recommendation in the event that the motion under debate is lost.

That Council in accordance with the provisions of City Planning Scheme No. 2, the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes, APPROVES the application for alterations including a helipad addition ('Unlisted Use') to the existing office development at 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth as indicated on the Application for Development Approval dated 10 June 2025 and as shown on the revised plans received on 3 October 2025 subject to:

Conditions

1. The approved alterations and additions being constructed with high quality and durable materials and finishes and to a level of detailing that is consistent with the submitted elevations and perspectives, with final details of the materials, colours and finishes being submitted for approval by the City prior to applying for a building permit.
2. The helipad being in use for a maximum of 12 times per calendar year, unless otherwise approved by the City, with an Operational Management Plan being submitted for approval by the City prior to the commencement of use and thereafter implemented to the City's satisfaction.
3. The recommendations contained in the Helicopter Operations Noise Assessment prepared by SLR dated 1 October 2025 regarding the noise amelioration construction specifications and other noise management measures being implemented in full by the owner/operator on an ongoing basis to the satisfaction of the City

4. The recommendations contained in the Helideck Location and Design Report prepared by Flysafe Aviation Consulting dated 26 May 2025 being implemented with final details being submitted for approval by the City prior to applying for a building permit.
5. A maximum of 186 commercial tenant car parking bays being provided on site, for the exclusive use of staff and visitors of the development and not being leased or otherwise reserved for use of the tenants or occupants of other buildings or sites to the satisfaction of the City.
6. The dimensions of all new and/or modified car parking bays, vehicle entrance, aisle widths and circulation areas complying with the Australian Standard AS2890.1, ensuring that vehicles can enter and exit the building in forward gear with a certificate of compliance by an architect or engineer being submitted for approval by the City prior to applying for a building permit.
7. A low level of illumination is to be used and no part of the approved illuminated elements are to contain flashing, pulsating or flickering lights.
8. The approved landscaping being installed prior to occupation of new/modified areas and thereafter maintained to a high standard to the satisfaction of the City.
9. On-site stormwater disposal/management being to the City's specifications with details being submitted for approval by the City prior to applying for a building permit.
10. The existing street trees located in the road verges on Ord Street and Walker Avenue being retained and protected from damage throughout any demolition and development works with tree protection zones being established and maintained during the demolition and construction periods in accordance with the Australian Standard S4970-2009 – Protection of Trees on Development Sites, to the satisfaction of the City.
11. A construction management plan for the development prepared in accordance with the City's pro-forma and requirements being submitted for approval by the City prior to applying for a building permit.

Advice

- A. With regard to Condition 2, the Operational Management Plan is to address matters including but not limited to:
 - Definition of 'use': being one landing and one take-off (i.e., 12 landings and 12 take-offs per year).
 - Flight movements and hours of use (daylight only unless emergency).
 - Advance notification protocol to surrounding properties for planned operations.
 - Flight logging procedures (date/time, aircraft type, approach/departure direction), annual summary to the City, and complaints procedure.
- B. The applicant is advised that any non-residential/tenant car parking bays provided and/or modified as part of the development will need to be licensed by the Department of Transport and Major Infrastructure (DTMI) in accordance with the requirements of the Perth Parking Management Act. Development approval facilitating the modification/construction and use of bays under relevant

planning legislation should not be construed as implied approval from the DTMI for the future licensing and use of any car parking bays.

LOST (3/5)

For: Councillors Catherine Lezer, Lisa Ma and Adam Pacan

Against: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert and Viktor Ko

Debate reverted back to the Officers Recommendation:

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-007)

Mover: Councillor Lisa Ma

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. In accordance with the provisions of City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2), the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes, REFUSES the application for alterations including a helipad addition ('Unlisted Use') to the existing office development at 53 (Lot 800) Ord Street, West Perth as indicated on the Application for Development Approval dated 10 June 2025 and as shown on the revised plans received on 3 October 2025 for the following reasons:
 - a. Pursuant to clauses 67(2)(m), (n), (x) and (za) of *the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development will have an adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residential land uses, as the proposal does not demonstrate that the noise and vibration impacts associated with the use can be mitigated.
 - b. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(a) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and intentions of the City Planning Scheme No. 2 in regard to health, safety and general welfare under clause 6(3)(c) as the proposal does not adequately demonstrate how the proposal can be managed and operated to ensure the ongoing preservation of the amenity of the surrounding area.
 - c. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(y) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the locality as outlined in the written objections received from the surrounding owners and occupiers.
 - d. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(fa) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the proposed development is incompatible with the objectives of the City

of Perth Local Planning Strategy which prioritises an increase in the residential population as part of medium scale mixed use developments in the locality. The proposal has the potential to restrict surrounding sites from being able to achieve prescribed development heights and residential development.

- e. Pursuant to clause 67(2)(zb) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, approval of the proposed development would be contrary to orderly and proper planning given the proposed development:
- i. is incompatible with its setting and is considered to cause an adverse impact on the amenity of the locality for no discernible wider benefit to the community; and
 - ii. has the potential to detrimentally impact the City's aspirations for increased residential population as referenced in the City's Local Planning Strategy given the associated amenity impacts constraining future residential development in the vicinity.
- f. The proposed development does not warrant approval as an 'Unlisted Use' pursuant to clause 34(1)(b) of City Planning Scheme No.2 and would set an undesirable precedent as it is not consistent with the matters listed in clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions as outlined above.

2. ADVISE the applicant that other approval pathways are available for the proposed amendments not related to the helipad as detailed in this report.

CARRIED (6/2)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Catherine Lezer and Adam Pacan

6:39pm Councillor Chris Patton returned to the meeting prior to Item 11.3.

11.3 Hay Street - Two Way - Elder to Thomas - Final Concept Plan

Responsible Officer	Maria Cooke – General Manager Planning and Sustainability
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 11.3A – Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street - Final Concept Plan

Purpose

To present the Final Concept Plan for Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street for approval.

Recommendation

That Council APPROVES the Final Concept Plan for Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street as provided in **Attachment A** – Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street - Final Concept Plan.

Background

1. Following the roll out of various projects in the 1990's as part of the State Government's Perth City for People – Central Perth Access Plan, it became evident the City's one-way street system was having a negative effect on pedestrian amenity and the local economy by:
 - a) Creating an environment which encourages the city as a through route rather than a place to visit and shop.
 - b) Encouraging higher traffic speeds which creates unpleasant street environments and affects safety.
 - c) Limiting access options which can constrain new urban development.
 - d) Limiting CAT bus routes to one direction only which can create confusion for visitors trying to navigate to and from major tourist attractions.
 - e) Increasing journey distances as drivers and cyclists negotiate the one-way network.
 - f) Requiring more traffic lanes at the expense of footpaths.
 - g) Making the streets harder to navigate for people unfamiliar with the one-way system.
 - h) Filling streets with cars at the expense of other kerbside uses like outdoor dining, trees, and street furniture.
2. The Two-Way Street Program was developed in the mid-2000s to address the issues resulting from the City's one-way system. The project ensures pedestrians and place making are prioritised over cars by:
 - a) Creating destinations, not through routes.
 - b) Providing permeability, legibility, choice of routes and ease of access for city residents and businesses.
3. Since the long-term program was endorsed, the City has successfully converted streets to two-way operation, many of which enabled major developments such as Elizabeth Quay and Perth City Link to proceed.
4. Converting Hay Street (Elder Street to Thomas Street) to two-way traffic will ensure continuity with the recent Hay Street (William to Elder) project.
5. Hay Street (Elder Street to Thomas Street) is the final remaining section to be converted, marking the completion of Hay Street's transition to two-way traffic.
6. The two-way street conversion of Hay Street presents an opportunity to enhance connections between Subiaco and West Perth. The City will continue to work collaboratively with the City of Subiaco to strengthen cross-boundary linkages into the future.
7. At the 1 July 2025 meeting, Council approved a Draft Concept Plan for Hay Street Two-way (Elder to Thomas) for the purpose of community consultation.

Discussion

8. The Hay Street Two-Way (Elder to Thomas) project aims to complete the conversion of Hay Street to two-way traffic, continuing the upgrades from the Hay Street (William to Elder) project. It also addresses existing road safety issues, including the redesign of the Harvest Terrace and Hay Street intersection. The project encompasses the following key elements:
 - a) Focussed changes: The design centres around changes to intersections - to achieve compliant two-way traffic, ensuring good value for money and minimising disruption to local businesses.
 - b) New entry to the city from freeway: The design allows vehicles to turn right into the city from the Mitchell Freeway exit ramp, reducing pressure on other freeway entry routes.
 - c) Service legibility: CAT bus can operate in both directions along Hay Street providing better service legibility.
 - d) Pedestrian safety: The design reduces crossing distances at intersections where possible and a safer Principal Shared Path (PSP) connection at George Street.
 - e) Road safety: The two-way conversion will significantly reduce the risk of vehicles driving the wrong way, improving overall road safety.

9. Overall project objectives include:
 - a) Strategic alignment with other City strategies and plans.
 - b) Greater accessibility to support the future growth of West Perth.
 - c) Enhance traffic flow and safety through two-way conversion.
 - d) Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

10. Community Engagement was undertaken on the Draft Concept Plan from 4 July – 15 August 2025. The detail of the engagement provided later in this report.

11. A summary of feedback in response to the Hay Street Two Way (Elder to Thomas) Draft Concept Plan together with the design response included in the Final Concept Plan is as follows:

Name	Feedback	Final Concept Response
Engage Perth	Concerned two-way will generate more traffic congestion on Hay Street.	<p><i>The City is currently progressing with transportation modelling works, as required by Main Roads. If needed, traffic signal timing adjustments will be implemented during peak hours to manage congestion.</i></p> <p><i>In the future, Murray Street will also be converted to two-way traffic, which will improve westbound capacity and help reduce pressure on Hay Street.</i></p>

	Concerned difficult to exit the properties on Hay St due to congestion.	<i>There is no evidence to suggest that the conversion to two-way will generate additional congestion or safety issues along Hay Street. Inner city roads are subject to congestion during peak periods regardless of traffic movements. The two-way will offer drivers alternative turning options when leaving properties.</i>
	Request to allow right-turn entry into properties between George Street and Harvest Terrace	<i>The design of the median island between George Street and Harvest Terrace has been modified to allow right turn entry and exit at adjacent properties.</i>
	Vehicles currently block the pedestrian crossing at Harvest Terrace and Hay Street intersection.	<i>The location of the crossing has been moved to avoid queuing vehicles blocking pedestrians across Harvest Terrace.</i>
Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA - Traffic Management Systems)	Supports two-way conversion.	<i>Signal modifications have progressed through MRWA.</i>
	Required Traffic Signal Approval Process (TSAP) Stage 2 endorsement from Main Roads	<i>The City is currently progressing with transportation modelling works to secure TSAP Stage 2 endorsement from Main Roads.</i>
	Concerns safety of cyclists accessing cycle head start box without cycle lanes.	<i>The City's' requested exception for providing cyclist head-start facilities without cycle lanes in the Town Centre area (Colin Street to Outram Street), where space is constrained due to mature trees was not approved. The painted head start boxes within the town centre have been removed from the Final Concept Design.</i>
MRWA (Bridges and Assets Management)	Required structural assessment of the bridge over Michelle Freeway.	<i>Technical study completed and endorsed by MRWA.. The bridge structure has been assessed as safe in accordance with the design criteria.</i>
	Required Traffic Guardrail barriers on the bridge for safety.	<i>Following the bridge feasibility assessment, completed in August 2025, — which included drainage, structural load rating, and traffic safety—MRWA's consultant advised that the guardrail required a different more complex specification. This will need to be completed in the current financial year as part of the concept design.</i>

Perth Transport Authority (PTA)	Supports two-way conversion, enabling the Red CAT service to operate in both directions.	<i>Noted. New bus stops have been captured in the Final Concept Plan.</i>
	Request for road geometry to allow for buses to turn at key intersections.	<i>Swept path has been tested and no modifications to the design are required.</i>
	Request for Hay St West Perth bus stop (id: 16919) to be maintained closer to Outram intersection for better catchment area.	<i>The City has advised PTA of its preference to relocate the bus stop from Outram Street to better serve the Town Centre and align it with the new paired bus stop. A new stop is proposed on Outram Street to improve accessibility around the intersection and expand the catchment area.</i>
	PTA will fund the construction of new bus stops.	<i>Noted – the City will continue to negotiate a funding agreement with PTA for construction of new bus stops.</i>
Department of Transport and Major Infrastructure (DOTMI)	Supports the conversion of remaining sections of Hay Street to a two-way street.	<i>Noted</i>
	Concern on reducing footpath at few locations to accommodate for vehicle turning movement	<i>Changes to intersection kerbs have been minimised to reduce the impact on footpath widths.</i>
Parliament House	Suggest restricting vehicle access from Harvest Terrace to Hay Street.	<i>Noted. No changes have been made to the Final Concept Plan as Harvest Terrace provides a convenient and vital link between Malcolm Street and Hay Street. Closure would divert drivers to other local streets and impact them unnecessarily.</i>

12. The proposed cycling facilities in the Town Centre (Colin Street to Outram Street) could not be supported by MRWA as shown in the Draft Concept because cycle lanes to the painted head start boxes are now required. While precedent exists for head start boxes without cycle lanes, MRWA's new requirement could not be accommodated due to existing street trees. As a result, this element was removed from the Final Concept Plan. Alternative options to improve safety and driver awareness for on road cycling such as pavement marking will be investigated for inclusion.
13. The installation of traffic barriers on the bridge (over Michelle Freeway) required the engagement of a specialist consultant and contractor to ensure compliance with Main Roads' specifications and guidelines. This has progressed to a concept level with a detailed design to be completed before detail civil design commences.
14. The following has been used to inform the Final Concept Plan:

- a. Pedestrian volumes, activity, and desire lines.
 - b. Urban Forest Street & Parkland Tree Audit 2024/25.
 - c. Traffic data and modelling.
 - d. Parking data analysis.
 - e. Best practice and lessons learnt from previous projects.
 - f. Alignment with the City's Design and Construction standards.
 - g. PTA and Main Roads WA feedback.
15. The following key considerations will also underpin the detailed design:
1. Ease of ongoing maintenance.
 2. Crime prevention through environmental design.
 3. Relevant Australian Standards and Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995.
 4. Traffic modelling.
 5. Road Safety Audits.
 6. PTA and Main Roads WA requests and approval requirements.

Consultation

16. Community Engagement was undertaken on the Draft Concept Plan from 4 July – 15 August 2025.
17. The following engagement tools were used:
- a) Letter Drop – Approximately 575 letters were hand delivered to properties and businesses along Hay Street from Elder to Thomas Street.
 - b) Mailouts – Approximately 1,236 letters were sent to all property and business owners along Hay Street from Elder to Thomas Street and adjoining side streets.
 - c) Engage Perth project page
18. A total of 127 survey responses were received at the close of the consultation on 15 August 2025.
- a) The engagement page received 182 visits
 - b) 25 respondents chose not to provide written feedback
19. Key themes from the survey responses included:
- a) **Access** - Community feedback was mixed. Some said two-way traffic would provide more direct routes, reduce detours, and improve access for residents and businesses. Others raised traffic concerns, including congestion, intersection choke points and poor access to properties. These concerns appear to have arisen due to a lack of clarity about the project's scope and limited communication of the benefits associated with the two-way conversion.

- b) **Street Amenity** - other feedback highlighted that the project presents an opportunity to strengthen West Perth by attracting more customers to local businesses. Respondents also expressed aspirations for enhanced amenity, including improved safety, more urban greenery, better lighting and CCTV which was out of scope of the current project.
 - c) Suggestions to fully pedestrianise the street (including removing all parking).
 - d) Suggestion to create a bicycle friendly street (including removing all parking).
 - e) Requests for more loading zones and pick up and drop off.
 - f) Overall support for the project including requests for decluttering and more greening.
20. In addition to this engagement, City gathered feedback from various government agencies including PTA, DOTMI, Parliament House and MRWA. These stakeholders expressed support for the project.
21. Feedback received during consultation has informed updates to the design, which are reflected in the Final Concept Plan for Hay Street, from Elder Street to Thomas Street. Key changes include:
- a) Adjustments to the Harvest Terrace and Hay Street intersection to reduce instances of drivers blocking the pedestrian crossing.
 - b) Redesign of the median island between George Street and Harvest Terrace to accommodate turning movements into adjoining properties.
 - c) The proposed cycling facilities in the Town Centre (Colin Street to Outram Street) could not be supported by MRWA as shown in the Draft Concept because cycle lanes to the painted head start boxes are now required. While precedent exists for head start boxes without cycle lanes, MRWA's new requirement could not be accommodated due to existing street trees. As a result, this element was removed from the Final Concept Plan.
 - d) A new bus stop is proposed along Outram Street to expand the public transport catchment as well as provide a terminus for bus services as requested by PTA.

Decision Implications

- 22. Council has the option to support the Final Concept Plan with or without modifications, or not support the Final Concept Plan.
- 23. If Council supports the recommendation the Final Concept Plan will progress to detailed design, commencing in 2026.
- 24. If Council does not support the recommendation, the project will not progress to the next stage of design.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Corporate Business Plan 2022/23 - 2025/26 Local Planning Strategy

	Urban Greening Strategy 2023 – 2036 Transport Strategy Two Way Streets Program Urban Forest Plan 2016 Street Tree Guide Sustainability Strategy 2022-2032 Sustainability Implementation Plan Social, Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023 – 2033 Public Lighting Framework
--	--

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Nil.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Nil.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

25. The following budgets have been allocated to Hay Street Two Way (Elder to Thomas) - in the City's Long Term Financial Plan. These will be adjusted to the cost estimate following detailed design and is subject to the proposed timing of delivery:

FY 2026/27	FY 2027/28	FY 2028/29
\$500,000	\$6,000,000	\$3,000,000 (Two Way Street Enhancements budget)
Detailed design	Delivery	Delivery

26. During the draft concept design stage, it was identified that a bridge feasibility assessment would be required to address uncertainties related to MRWA's Hay Street bridge assets and that any changes required would inform the Final Concept Plan.
27. Following the bridge feasibility assessment, completed in August 2025, — which included drainage, structural load rating, and traffic safety—MRWA's consultant advised that the guardrail required a different specification, which is more complex and costly to install. This new specification for the bridge guardrail has increased the costs to deliver the project.
28. Due to these complexities, the total cost estimate for the Final Concept Plan has increased to approximately \$9.24 million, up from \$8.44 million reported in the OCM report dated 1 July 2025.

29. For the construction of new bus stops, the PTA has agreed in principle to fund the infrastructure for future CAT bus stops; however, a formal funding agreement is still under negotiation.
30. The Final Concept Plan cost estimate includes a 10% contingency and a 15% escalation as the works are scheduled for construction in 2027/28. This estimate will be further refined during the detailed design phase.

Further Information

31. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Has the administration looked into how we can support the small businesses, obviously given the impact the two-way Hay Street had in East Perth. Has there been any thoughts around small businesses and how these works will affect them?	<p>The project has been designed so that any changes are limited to the intersection works, helping to minimise disruption to nearby businesses during construction.</p> <p>More broadly, officers have held discussions about the best way to support business before, during and post- the construction period.</p> <p>Elements of the business support activities are expected to include: an dedicated contact officer throughout the project; marketing support via VisitPerth and social media; connection to service providers such as the Small Business Development Corporation; support for micro-events and activations; and possible targeted use of the City's sponsorships and grants programs.</p>

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-008)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council APPROVES the Final Concept Plan for Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street as provided in **Attachment A** – Hay Street Two way – Elder to Thomas Street - Final Concept Plan.

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

6:40pm Councillor Liam Gobbert disclosed a Proximity Interest in Item 11.4 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

6:40pm Councillor Viktor Ko disclosed a Proximity Interest in Item 11.4 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

6:40pm Councillor Adam Pacan disclosed a Proximity Interest in Item 11.4 (as detailed at Item 5) and departed the meeting accordingly.

Councillor Raj Doshi disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 11.4 (as detailed at Item 5)

11.4 Preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to introduce the Additional Uses 'Entertainment' (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' to 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth

Responsible Officer	Maria Cooke – General Manager Planning and Sustainability
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 11.4A – Scheme Amendment Report Attachment 11.4B – Location Plan - Hyatt Centre Attachment 11.4C – Modifications to Precinct Plan Policy No. 13 Adelaide

Purpose

For Council to consider the preparation of Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2) to allow 'Entertainment' ('Amusement Parlour' and 'Small Bar'), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' as additional land use groups at 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. **RESOLVES** to prepare Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to allow the Additional Uses of 'Entertainment' ('Amusement Parlour' and 'Small Bar'), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' at 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth as detailed in Attachment A – Scheme Amendment Report;
2. **RESOLVES** that Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 is a Standard Amendment for the following reasons, pursuant to Regulation 35(2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*:
 - a. The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area.
 - b. The amendment is consistent with the City of Perth Local Planning Strategy that has been endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission.
3. **RESOLVES** to amend Precinct Plan Policy No. 13 – Adelaide as detailed in Attachment C, in accordance with Schedule 2 - Deemed Provisions Clauses 4 and 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

Background

1. The City has received a request from PTS Planning on behalf of Grand Hotel Management Pty Ltd to prepare a scheme amendment to include 'Entertainment' ('Amusement Parlour' and 'Small Bar'), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' as additional land use groups to the southern portion of 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth.
2. The site forms part of the 'Hyatt Centre' buildings comprising 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, 10 and 40 (Lots 11 and 12) Terrace Road, East Perth. It is bound by Plain Street to the east, residential apartments to the west, Adelaide Terrace to the north, and Terrace Road to the south. A location plan is provided as Attachment B.
3. The northern portion of the site is located within the Office/Residential scheme use area of CPS2, while the southern portion is located within the Residential scheme use area (refer to Attachment C). The boundary between these two scheme use areas traverses the existing Hyatt Centre buildings, resulting in the building being divided across two different scheme use areas.
4. The original planning approval for the site was for a hotel, retail, office, residential health club and squash courts.
5. In 2017, the site received planning approval for a mixed-use redevelopment. This approval comprised a supermarket, retail and restaurant tenancies, a community theatre, gallery, performance venues, child-care centre, health and wellness centre, and a medical centre.
6. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 27 February 2024, Council resolved to support Amendment No. 51 to CPS2, to add the Additional Use 'Healthcare 2' to the southern portion of site..
7. The landowner now seeks the option to develop the existing podium buildings for a mix of entertainment (limited to an amusement parlour and small bar), business services and education facility (comprising tertiary institution, business college or employment training centre). These would replace the existing squash courts and commercial floor space in the southern half of the podium building. A copy of the Scheme Amendment Report is included in Attachment A, which includes further details of the proposal and site context.
8. This scheme amendment does not give development approval to the land uses, it provides the ability for the landowner to apply for development approval.

Discussion

City Planning Scheme No. 2

9. The relevant land uses as they currently apply to Lot 10 and how they would apply as a result of this scheme amendment are as follows.

Use Group	Use Symbol		Use Symbol
	Office/ Residential	Residential R160	Proposed Additional Uses for southern portion of Lot 10
Business Services	P	X	C *
Education 2	C	X	C *

Entertainment (Amusement Parlour and Small Bar)	C	X	C
---	---	---	---

NOTE: * denotes that an application for development approval involving this land use would require to be advertised for consultation.

10. The 'Entertainment' use group means '*premises used for the purpose of amusement, entertainment or similar purposes and operated generally on a commercial basis including: amusement parlour, betting agency, cinema/theatre, club, function centre, nightclub, tavern.*'

The term 'Amusement parlour' means '*premises - (a) that are open to the public; (b) the predominant use of which are for amusement by means of amusement machines; and (c) that have at least 3 amusement machines operating within the premises during operating hours.*'

The term 'Small Bar' means '*premises - (a) used to sell liquor for consumption on the premises; and (b) that are the subject of a small bar licence under the Liquor Control Act 1988.*' Under the Liquor Control Act, a small bar is limited to a maximum of 120 people.

11. The 'Business Services' use group means '*premises used for the provision of services which are predominantly administrative in nature and which – (a) are dependent on direct access to the public; and (b) generally have a retail shop front, and includes a bank or building society, post office, real estate agency and travel agency.*'
12. The 'Education 2' use group means: '*Educational facility – upper' premises used for – (a) a secondary school; or (b) post-secondary education, including a tertiary institution, business college, employment training centre or academy.*'
13. 'Entertainment', 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' are classified as Prohibited land uses in the Residential scheme use area. Under the existing planning framework, there is no ability for the City to consider issuing planning approval for these uses.
14. Schedule 5 of CPS2 allows for additional land uses to be considered where the land use would otherwise be prohibited. Clause 19 (1)(c) specifies that an Additional Use listed in Schedule 5 is treated as a 'Contemplated' land use for that lot. A local government can either approve (with or without conditions) or refuse a contemplated land use.
15. Clause 19 (3) of CPS2 specifies the criteria the local government must consider when initiating an amendment to Schedule 5 – Additional Uses. Amendment No. 54 is considered to satisfy the provisions of Clause 19 (3) of CPS2 as outlined below:

- a. **Orderly and proper planning:** The site is not typical of a residential area, given the existing commercial development across the site. The site comprises an existing four-storey building developed with offices, food outlet, supermarket, gym, shops and medical centres/consulting rooms. A restaurant and childcare premises are due to open.

The objectives for the Residential scheme use area support a limited range of complimentary non-residential land uses provided the amenity of the surrounding residential area is preserved. However, the southern portion of the site has never operated as a residential development nor included residential land uses.

The proposed additional land uses of 'Entertainment' (limited to 'Amusement Parlour' and 'Small Bar'), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' are considered to generally have a similar impact on amenity to that of the existing commercial uses. The inclusion of these further additional uses within a mixed-use development is consistent with the principles of orderly and proper planning.

The development approval process provides the opportunity to consider the amenity impact of a specific proposal. This would include the location of the land use and operating hours.

- b. **Conservation of local amenities:** These land uses are not considered to negatively impact local amenity that would warrant not considering them.
- c. **Precinct Plan:** The statement of intent for Precinct Plan Policy No. 13 – Adelaide is to develop the precinct as a *“residential quarter accommodating a wide range of residential and visitor accommodation and employment opportunities serviced by activities which support these uses”*. The proposal is consistent with the intent of the Precinct as the proposed additional land uses would provide employment opportunities and commercial services that will support an increased residential population.
- d. **Clause 67 of Deemed Provisions:** The ‘Entertainment’, ‘Business Services’ and ‘Education 2’ use groups are capable of being appropriately developed on the subject site. There is merit in allowing these uses to be assessed through the development approval process.

Noting that the adjoining property contains a residential apartment building, a condition of the ‘Small Bar’ additional use will be that it must not be located within 30 metres of the western boundary. The development approval process will determine if any proposal is suitable for its setting in accordance with clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions.

- e. **Undue adverse effect:** The proposed additional uses are not considered to have an undue adverse effect on the users of the development or properties within the locality, as the site is already developed as a mixed-use commercial centre. As stated above, the land use ‘Small Bar’ must not be located within 30 metres of the western boundary to provide separation to the existing residential development to the west to reduce any potential impact on those residents.
16. To ensure appropriate consideration for any future development for the use group ‘Entertainment’, the following modification is proposed to the ‘Residential Area’ of the Precinct Plan Policy No.13 – Adelaide (refer to Attachment B):
- a. Insert the requirement for an application for development approval for the land use of ‘Amusement Parlour’ and ‘Small Bar’ to be advertised in accordance with clause 64 of the Deemed Provisions.

Council Policy 3.5 Initiation of Local Planning Scheme Amendments

17. Council Policy 3.5 (CP 3.5) provides a framework to assess the appropriateness of initiating scheme amendments ahead of the draft Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS3). Amendment No. 54 satisfies the provisions of CP 3.5 for the following reasons:
- a. The Local Planning Strategy (Strategy) continues the split zoning of the subject site with the northern portion designated high scale mixed use and the southern portion high scale residential. The addition of ‘Entertainment’, ‘Business Services’ and ‘Education 2’ at the subject site was not directly anticipated by the Strategy. Nevertheless, the proposal will assist in delivering the outcomes envisioned for the East Perth neighbourhood. Although the Strategy seeks to maintain the residential nature of Terrace Road, the site has never been developed for residential purposes. The proposed additional uses align with the nature of the existing commercial development on the site. The proposed additional uses align with the action of the Strategy to review land use permissibility to activate underutilised properties and landholdings.

- b. The amendment does not propose any significant changes to the existing development controls or result in any significant change to the development potential of the subject site.
- c. Consultation on the draft LPS3 has not yet commenced. Nevertheless, the proposal forms part of the redevelopment of the site and is considered unique and site specific. As the proposal is for additional uses to the site and not the greater Residential scheme use area, the proposal would not set an undesirable precedent for the Residential scheme use area ahead of the new scheme.

Draft Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS3)

18. Draft LPS3 continues the split zoning across the site (in line with the Strategy) with the northern portion zoned 'Mixed Use' and the southern portion zoned 'Residential'.
19. Draft LPS3 identifies the southern portion of the site as Additional Use 21. This allows a Child Care Premises, Consulting Rooms, Office and Shop-Supermarket as 'D' uses, and a Hospital and Medical Centre as 'A' uses.
20. In relation to the additional uses proposed by this amendment and draft LPS3:
 - 'Amusement Parlour' is no longer a defined land use. However, 'Recreation - Private' includes amusement and is an 'A' use. That is, discretionary land use that requires community consultation.
 - 'Small Bar' is a 'D' use. That is, a discretionary land use.
 - 'Business Services' is not defined. However, it falls within the 'Office' definition. 'Office' is a 'D' use (Additional Use 21).
 - 'Education 2' is not a defined land use. The equivalent land use 'Educational Establishment' is a 'X' use.
21. Draft LPS3 was considered by the Council in April 2024. It is with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and is yet to be presented to the Statutory Planning Committee and Minister for Planning for approval to commence consultation.
22. Given the context of the existing development, there is merit in reviewing the zoning of the site under draft LPS3, following consultation. The site contains a single building that straddles two different scheme use areas, yet operates as one integrated development. Aligning the zoning of the southern portion with the northern portion will provide a consistent planning framework and reflect the established development pattern. This would bring the site more closely into line with its existing approval and current use, supporting flexibility for future redevelopment while maintaining strategic planning objectives.

Precinct Plan Policy No. 13 - Adelaide

23. It is proposed to amend this policy to specify that the Amusement Parlour and Small Bar land uses would require consultation as part of seeking development approval. This proposed policy amendment would be advertised alongside the scheme amendment.

Scheme Amendment Classification

24. The *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* includes three categories for amending local planning schemes - basic, standard, and complex. Amendment No. 54 is classified as a Standard Amendment as:
 - a. The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area.

- b. The amendment is consistent with the City of Perth Local Planning Strategy that has been endorsed by the Commission.

Consultation

25. Following a Council decision to prepare Amendment No. 54, the City is required to refer the scheme amendment to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) to determine whether formal assessment is required. The EPA has 30 days to make this determination.
26. The *Planning and Development Act 2005* requires the City to obtain approval from the Minister for Planning to commence formal consultation. If approval is granted, the City is required to advertise the scheme amendment for public comment for a period of 42 days. The amendment will be advertised online, via letters in the mail to adjoining landowners and a notice displayed in the Council House foyer.
27. Following consultation, the consultation outcomes and recommendation on progression of the amendment will be put back to Council for a decision.

Decision Implications

28. The decision to prepare Amendment No. 54 rests with the Council. The final decision on the Amendments rests with the Minister for Planning.
29. Should Council choose not to prepare Amendment No. 54, there is no right of review of this decision through the State Administrative Tribunal. However, the applicant may approach the Minister for Planning who has the power to invoke Part 5, Division 2 Section 76 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* and order the local government, within such time specified in the order, to prepare and submit for the approval of the Minister an amendment to the local planning scheme.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategic Community Plan	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Prosperous
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	<p>Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032 The proposed scheme amendment aligns with the ‘Prosperous’ pillar of the Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032, as the proposed additional land uses would provide employment opportunities that support an increased residential population.</p> <p>Local Planning Strategy 2023 <i>“East Perth is situated on the doorstep of the Swan River. It is the eastern gateway to the Central Perth. East Perth is a vibrant neighbourhood with a bustling neighbourhood centre, community facilities and beautiful parks. East Perth offers diverse housing options and is well placed to accommodate a larger resident population.”</i></p> <p>The proposed additional land uses will support the increased residential population through offering employment opportunities and commercial services in East Perth. This is consistent with the vision of the Strategy.</p>

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p><i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 75 provides legislative power to the Council to prepare changes to its local planning scheme. • Section 81 requires referral of scheme amendments to the Environmental Protection Authority prior to advertising. • Section 84 sets out advertising requirements. <p><i>City of Perth Act 2016</i></p> <p>8(1)(d) - Ensuring Perth continuously improves the services and facilities that the City of Perth provides to the community and to local, interstate and international visitors and tourists.</p> <p><i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulations 34 and 35(2) require an amendment to be classified as basic, standard or complex. • Regulation 47 specifies requirements for advertising a Standard Amendment. • Regulation 76A specifies requirements for making documents available to public. Schedule 2, Part 2, Cl 4(1) specifies the requirements for advertising local planning policy amendments. <p><i>City Planning Scheme No. 2 (CPS2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 19 sets out the criteria for Additional Land Uses. • Schedule 1 refers to Scheme Use Areas. • Schedule 5 refers to Additional Land Uses. <p><i>Minor Town Planning Scheme No. 14 - Withernsea (MTPS14)</i></p> <p>The subject site is located within the MTPS14 area. MTPS14 allows a permissible plot ratio of 4.0:1.0 within the subject site to be shared across the lots. MTPS14 does not include any provisions that relate to land use. Therefore, Amendment No. 54 does not impact or require amendment to this scheme.</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	<p>The <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> gives local governments powers in relation to Local Planning Schemes and Local Planning Policies. The above provisions of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> require a decision to amend via Council resolution.</p>
Policy:	<p>City of Perth City Planning Scheme No.2 Precinct Plan No. 13 (P13) – Adelaide Precinct</p> <p>The intent for the Adelaide Precinct is to develop the Precinct as a “residential quarter accommodating a wide range of residential and visitor accommodation and employment opportunities serviced by activities which support these uses”. The proposal is consistent with the Statement of Intent as the addition of proposed additional land uses provides employment opportunities that support an increased residential population.</p> <p>Terrace Road Design Policy</p> <p>The subject site is located within the Terrace Road Design Planning Policy Area which guides the built form outcomes of the area. Amendment No. 54 relates to land use and does not propose any built</p>

form modifications. Therefore, the Terrace Road Design Policy is unaffected by the scheme amendment.

Council Policy 3.5 (CP 3.5)

CP 3.5 provides a framework to assess the appropriateness of initiating scheme amendments ahead of the new local planning scheme (refer assessment above).

Financial Implications

30. In accordance with the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulation 2015*, local government costs associated with the assessment, advertising and gazettal of the scheme amendment are met by the applicant.

Further Information

31. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	<p>Given that this amendment seeks to introduce two new commercial uses (small bar and amusement parlour) within a mixed-use complex where parking is already shared between the IGA supermarket, retail tenancies, and residential apartments.</p> <p>Could the Administration please clarify if any parking or traffic impact assessment was undertaken, and whether the City has baseline data on current parking utilisation and/or vehicle movements to demonstrate that the existing bays and surrounding streets can accommodate any additional demand without affecting residential amenity or local traffic conditions?</p>	<p>This scheme amendment, if supported by the Council and ultimately approved by the Minister for Planning, provides the ability for the landowner to submit an application for Development Approval (DA). It is considered that the development application stage is the appropriate mechanism to assess and determine whether the size and scale of a proposed land use is appropriate and considers matters such as amenity, traffic and car parking.</p>

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-009)

Mover: Councillor Raj Doshi

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council:

1. RESOLVES to prepare Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 to allow the Additional Uses of 'Entertainment' ('Amusement Parlour' and 'Small Bar'), 'Business Services' and 'Education 2' at 99 (Lot 10) Adelaide Terrace, East Perth as detailed in Attachment A – Scheme Amendment Report;
2. RESOLVES that Amendment No. 54 to City Planning Scheme No. 2 is a Standard Amendment for the following reasons, pursuant to Regulation 35(2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*:
 - a. The amendment does not result in any significant environmental, social, economic or governance impacts on land in the scheme area.
 - b. The amendment is consistent with the City of Perth Local Planning Strategy that has been endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission.
3. RESOLVES to amend Precinct Plan Policy No. 13 – Adelaide as detailed in Attachment C, in accordance with Schedule 2 - Deemed Provisions Clauses 4 and 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (6/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

12. Community Development Alliance Reports

6:48pm Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko and Adam Pacan returned to the meeting, prior to Item 12.1.

12.1 Review of Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement

Responsible Officer	Wendy Attenborough – General Manager Community Development
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 12.1A – Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement

Purpose

For Council to review and affirm Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. ADOPTS the reviewed Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement (**Attachment A**), noting that no changes have been made.
 2. APPROVES that minor typographical amendments and placement of the policy into future templates may be made, provided the materiality of the policy is not affected, to improve presentation and/or correct errors.
-

Background

1. The City of Perth's (City) Corporate Business Plan 2025/26–2028/29 recognises six distinct neighbourhoods, each with unique characteristics, points of interest, and amenities.
2. The Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement Policy (Policy) was adopted at the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) on 29 September 2020 to provide a framework to support communication, coordination, cooperation, and project delivery across the City's neighbourhoods.
3. The Policy was amended at the 30 March 2021 OCM to remove repetitive and operational principles.
4. The Policy was further amended for grammar and clarity at the 22 November 2022 OCM.
5. In line with Operational Policy 26 – Policy Framework, Council Policy 4.1 is now due for review.

Discussion

6. The Policy aims to help the City address each neighbourhood's unique needs and opportunities through close community collaboration in decision-making, planning, and project delivery.
7. Upcoming local government reforms will include changed community engagement requirements. At this stage regulations have not been drafted, so detail of the new requirements is not known.
8. The current Policy is fit for purpose. However, amendment may be required once the new engagement provisions are clear. It is recommended that no amendments be made to this Policy until the State Government provides regulatory guidance on the new community engagement provisions.

Consultation

9. Elected members were given the opportunity to review the Policy. Feedback supported the Administration's recommendation to wait for the outcome of local government reforms before considering amendments to the Policy.

Decision Implications

10. No significant risks have been identified in relation to this review.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p><u>Local Government Act 1993: Section 3.1 (2)</u> This Act is to provide for a system of local government in Western Australia ... This Act is intended to result in –</p> <p>(b) greater community participation in the decisions and affairs of local governments</p> <p><u>City of Perth Act 2016: Section 8(1)</u> The objects of the City of Perth are as follows –</p> <p>(b) to represent the community and encourage community participation in decision-making;</p> <p>(h) to nurture and support the initiatives and innovations of the diverse precincts of the City of Perth</p> <p>(j) in achieving its objects, to use its best endeavours to strike an appropriate balance among the complementary and competing civic, economic, social, cultural and environmental considerations, including considerations relating to visitors and tourists.</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	<p><u>Local Government Act 1995: Section 2.7 Role of council</u> (1) The council governs the local government’s affairs and, as the local government’s governing body, is responsible for the performance of the local government’s functions.</p> <p>(2) (c) planning strategically for the future of the district;</p> <p><u>Local Government Act 1995: Section 5.41 Role of the CEO</u> (3) The CEO is the council’s principal advisor and, as such, does the following –</p> <p>(a) advises, and procures advice for, the council in relation to the local government’s affairs and the performance of the local government’s functions;</p> <p>(b) ensures that the council has the information and advice it needs to make informed and timely decisions.</p>
Policy:	<p>Council Policy 4.1: Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement</p> <p>This policy guides the City’s response to unique characteristics, needs and opportunities within each neighbourhood, ensuring close collaboration with the community when making decisions, undertaking planning and delivering services, infrastructure, activation, and other projects.</p>

Financial Implications

11. Nil.

Further Information

12. Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-010)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. ADOPTS the reviewed Council Policy 4.1 Neighbourhood Place Planning and Engagement (**Attachment A**), noting that no changes have been made.
2. APPROVES that minor typographical amendments and placement of the policy into future templates may be made, provided the materiality of the policy is not affected, to improve presentation and/or correct errors.

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

13. Infrastructure and Operations Alliance Reports

Nil.

14. Commercial Services Alliance Reports

Nil.

15. Corporate Services Reports

15.1 Monthly Financial Statements - October 2025

Responsible Officer	Michael Kent – Chief Financial Officer
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 15.1A – Statement of Financial Activity P04-26 Attachment 15.1B – Notes on Significant Variances Attachment 15.1C – Supplementary Notes to Statement of Financial Activity P4_26 Attachment 15.1D – Monthly Financial Statistics P4-26 Attachment 15.1E – Statement of Financial Position P04-26 Attachment 15.1F – Alliance Operating Variances P04-26 Attachment 15.1G – Capital Variances P04-26 Attachment 15.1H – Investment Report P04-26 Attachment 15.1I – Rates Monthly Report - P04-26

Purpose

This suite of reports provides Council with timely, meaningful financial insights regarding the City’s operating activities, financial performance, and financial position.

Recommendation

That Council RECEIVES the following financial reports for the period ended 31 October 2025:

- a. Statement of Financial Activity (SFA) - **Attachment A**.
- b. Notes on Significant Variances - **Attachment B**.
- c. Supplementary Notes to the Statement of Financial Activity - **Attachment 15.1C**.
- d. Monthly Financial Statistics – **Attachment D**.
- e. Statement of Financial Position - **Attachment E**.
- f. Alliance Operating Variances - **Attachment F**
- g. Capital Variances - **Attachment G**
- h. Investment Report - **Attachment H**.
- i. Rates Monthly Debtors Report - **Attachment I**.

Background

1. Presentation of a monthly financial report to Council is both a statutory obligation and good financial management practice that:
 - a. Demonstrates the City's commitment to managing its operations in a financially responsible and sustainable manner.
 - b. Provides timely identification of variances from budget expectations for revenues and expenditures and identification of emerging opportunities or changes in economic conditions.
 - c. Ensures proper accountability to the community for the use of financial resources.
2. Preparation of a monthly Statement of Financial Activity (SFA) is the minimal statutory requirement of the *Local Government Act 1995* and regulation 34 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*. It is also a responsible financial management practice to allow Council to effectively execute their financial management responsibilities.
3. Financial information that is required to be reported directly to Council monthly includes:
 - a. Operational financial performance against budget expectations.
 - b. Explanations for identified variances from expectations.
 - c. Financial position of the City at each given month end.
4. This statutory financial information is supported by additional supplementary information including investments performance and reports on rates and general debtors.

Understanding the Financials

5. When reading the financial information provided in this report, 'variances' (deviations from budget expectations) are classified as being either:
 - a. Favourable variance.
 - b. Unfavourable variance.
 - c. Timing variance.
6. A timing variance relates to a budgeted revenue or expense that has not occurred at the time it was expected, but which is still expected to occur within the budget year. That is, the financial transaction will still occur - but just in a different month. There should be no impact on the projected budget surplus by year end.
7. A realised favourable or unfavourable variance is different to a timing variance. It represents a genuine difference between the actual and budgeted revenue or expenditure item.
8. A realised favourable year to date variance on a revenue item is a positive outcome for the City as it increases the projected budget surplus. An unfavourable variance on a revenue item has the opposite effect, resulting a decrease to the projected budget surplus.
9. A realised favourable variance on an expenditure item may have either of two causes - one being a saving because the outcome was achieved for a lesser cost, which has the effect of increasing the projected budget surplus. The other cause may be that the proposed expenditure may not have been undertaken and is not expected to be incurred in that financial year. Whilst this may seem positive from the financial position perspective, it may not be a positive outcome for the community if the service or project is not delivered.

10. A realised unfavourable year to date variance on an expenditure item, (over-expenditure) results in a decrease to the projected budget surplus.
11. The Schedule of Significant Variances (**Attachment B**) provides commentary on whether the nature of the variance is savings related, timing related or otherwise.
12. If a realised favourable or unfavourable variance is material in value (of significant size), it will be amended through a formal budget review process.

Discussion

13. It is a statutory requirement to present a set of Monthly Management Accounts within two months of the end of the month to which they refer.
14. The SFA by Nature & Type - **Attachment A** presents a whole of organisation perspective on the attainment of revenue and expenditure targets overall - classified by nature and type.
15. The headline data from the SFA at month end is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1:

Item Details	Annual Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual 25/26	Variance	F/ U
Operating Revenue	\$126.37 M	\$ 49.05 M	\$ 52.14 M	\$ 3.09 M	F
Rates Revenue	\$112.25 M	\$111.83 M	\$112.85 M	\$ 1.02M	F
Cash Operating Exp	\$197.28 M	\$ 62.04 M	\$ 60.57 M	\$ 1.47 M	F
Non-Operating Revenue	\$7.03 M	\$ 0.19 M	\$ 0.63 M	\$ 0.44 M	F
Property, Plant & Equip	\$36.69 M	\$ 8.57 M	\$ 10.39 M	\$ 1.82 M	U
Capital - Infrastructure	\$25.11 M	\$ 2.44M	\$ 1.89 M	\$ 0.55 M	F
Capital Contributions	\$15.25 M	\$ 0.00 M	\$ 0.00 M	\$ 0.00 M	-

16. Material operating revenue and expenditure variances from **Attachment A** are detailed (with explanatory comments) in the Notes on Significant Variances (**Attachment B**).
17. Each line item listed in the SFA by Nature & Type **Attachment A** can be cross referenced (using the Note reference) back to the relevant note.
18. Examining the SFA (**Attachment A**) in more detail; the aggregation of operating revenues and operating expenses reflects a year-to-date Net Cash Position from Operations of \$104.42M compared to a year-to-date budget of \$98.84M. This is a favourable variance of \$5.58M at the end of the month.
19. Investing activities reflect a result of (\$11.67M) compared to a year-to-date budget of (\$10.82M). This is a favourable variance of (\$0.85M).
20. Construction of infrastructure to month end is \$0.56M under budget expectations.
21. Acquisition of non-infrastructure to month end is \$1.82 M ahead of budget expectations which is considered to be a timing difference.

22. Adjusting for opening funds (Net Current Position), generates the Budget Deficiency before Rates. This then indicates the Amount Required to be Raised from Rates. The difference between the Rates amount, and the Deficiency before Rates, is the Closing Position.
23. The SFA for the period to 31 October shows a rate yield of \$112.85M has been levied compared to the budget of \$111.83M.
24. The disclosed SFA Closing Position of \$119.81M compares favourably to the projected year to date budget closing position of \$111.28M - due to improved operating revenue and reduced expenditure.
25. Key financial statistics at each month end are presented graphically in **Attachment D** as an alternative representation of the data.
26. The Net Current Position Note (**Attachment C**) at month end reflects an indicative adjusted Net Current Position value of \$119.81M compared the year to date value of \$111.28M and a year-end budget projection of \$5.68M.
27. Headline data from this month's Net Current Position report is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2:

Item Details	June 25 Actual	June 26 Annual Budget	YTD 26 Actual
Current Assets	\$ 244.36 M	\$ 211.31 M	\$ 350.05 M
Current Liabilities	(\$ 40.06 M)	(\$ 40.72 M)	(\$ 53.10 M)
Unadjusted Net Assets	\$ 204.30 M	\$ 170.59 M	\$ 301.15 M
Less Restricted Items & Adjustments	(\$ 160.92 M)	(\$ 164.91 M)	(\$ 296.95 M)
Adjusted Net Current Position	\$ 43.38 M	\$ 5.68 M	\$ 119.81 M

28. The Net Current Position at year end is impacted by the factors noted at paragraph 24 above.
29. A Statement of Financial Position as at month end (showing 2024/25 Actual balances, the Revised 2025/26 Budget and the 2025/26 Year to Date Actual balances) is presented as **Attachment E**.
30. In line with recent local government financial management reporting changes, **Attachments A to Attachment C** form the portion of monthly management accounts that is a statutory obligation.
31. The remaining **attachments D through to I** are supplementary information provided to give Council additional transparency of the City's financial management performance.
32. **Attachment H** - Investment Report for October 2025 presents detail of the City's cash investment portfolio in terms of performance, percentage exposure of total portfolio by credit risk, counterparty exposure and maturity profile.
33. The report indicates the City has adequate cash flow to meet its financial obligations as and when they will fall due; and it has achieved compliance with the various Investment Policy limits.
34. **Attachment I** - Rates Debtors provides a monthly update and analysis of rates collections by differential property rating category and overall. The 2025/26 rates notices were issued on 26 July and the first instalment due date was 3 September 2025. Collections currently represent 69% of total rates collectable at month end.

Consultation

35. Nil.

Decision Implications

36. Council's acknowledgement of receiving the Statement of Financial Activity and supporting documents will meet its statutory obligation in respect of overseeing the City's financial resources.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p>Section 6.4(1) and (2) of the Local Government Act 1995 Regulation 34(1) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996</p> <p>This section of the Act and the related regulation prescribe the requirement to prepare and present to Council a Monthly Financial Report including a Statement of Financial Activity (SFA). That Statement of Financial Activity (SFA) should contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Budget estimates, and approved revisions to these for comparison purposes. • Actual amounts of income and expenditure to the end of the month of the SFA. • Material variances between the comparable amounts and commentary on reasons for these variances. <p>The Monthly Financial Report should also contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Statement of Financial Position at the end of the month. • An explanation of the composition of the Net Current Position at the end of the month to which the SFA relates. <p>Any other information which the local government deems relevant.</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	The above legislation prescribes that this report be presented to Council on a monthly basis.
Policy:	CP 2.1 Management of Investments.

Financial Implications

37. There are no direct financial implications of receiving this report as it reflects a historical accounting of financial transactions. When material variances are noted, appropriate remedial action will be initiated by the administration in a timely and prudent manner.

Further Information

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-011)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Secunder: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council RECEIVES the following financial reports for the period ended 31 October 2025:

- a. Statement of Financial Activity (SFA) - **Attachment A**.
- b. Notes on Significant Variances - **Attachment B**.
- c. Supplementary Notes to the Statement of Financial Activity - **Attachment 15.1C**.
- d. Monthly Financial Statistics – **Attachment D**.
- e. Statement of Financial Position - **Attachment E**.
- f. Alliance Operating Variances - **Attachment F**
- g. Capital Variances - **Attachment G**
- h. Investment Report - **Attachment H**.
- i. Rates Monthly Debtors Report - **Attachment I**.

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

15.2 Schedule of Accounts Paid - October 2025

Responsible Officer	Michael Kent – Chief Financial Officer
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 15.2A – Schedule of Accounts Paid - October 2025

Purpose

For Council to note details of payments made under delegated authority for the month of October 2025.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the Schedule of Accounts Paid for the period ended 31 October 2025 as attached as **Appendix 15.2A**.
2. RECORDS in the Ordinary Council Meeting minutes the summary of accounts paid being:

Total Accounts Paid	
Municipal Fund	\$20,801,314.91
Trust Fund	\$0
Total - All Funds	\$20,801,314.91

Background

1. In accordance with Regulation 13(2) and 13(3) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, where this power has been delegated, a list of payments for each month is to be compiled and presented to the Council. The Chief Executive Officer is delegated this authority under Delegation 2.14.
2. This authority has then been subdelegated by the Chief Executive Officer.
3. The listing of payments with full disclosure of all required information, is presented as an attachment to this report.
4. The listing of payments was made available to the Elected Members via the Council Hub, ahead of the agenda distribution, to provide additional time for review.
5. This summary report then facilitates the acknowledgement of the listing having been received.

Discussion

6. The Schedule of Accounts Paid (**Attachment 15.2A**) contains the following payments made under Delegated Authority 2.14 - Payments from the Municipal & Trust Fund:

Schedule of Accounts Paid – October 2025		
Municipal Fund		
EFT & Cheque Payments	Direct Creditor Payments	16,639,281.63
Sub Total - EFT & Cheques		16,639,281.63
Direct Debits	Bank Charges and Merchant Fees	30,888.79
Sub Total - Direct Debits		30,888.79
Payroll	07/10/2025	2,057,799.59
	21/10/2025	2,048,753.13
Sub Total - Payroll		4,106,552.72
Corporate Cards		24,591.77
Sub Total - Cards		24,591.77
Total per Attachment 15.2A		20,801,314.91
Total Payments from Municipal Fund		20,801,314.91
Investments in Term Deposits		4,000,000.00
Trust Fund		
Trust EFT & Cheques		0
Total - Trust Funds		

Consultation

7. Nil.

Decision Implications

8. Council's acknowledgement of receiving the Schedule of Accounts Paid will meet its statutory obligation under Regulation 13(1) of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Prosperous
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Annual Budget

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p>Section 6.10 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. Regulation 13(1) of the <i>Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996</i>.</p> <p>This section of the Act and the related regulation prescribes the requirement to prepare a list of all payments made for each month and to present them to Council. The Schedule of Accounts Paid (the 'list') should contain, for each payment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payee Name. • Amount of the Payment. • Date of the Payment. • Sufficient information to identify the transaction.
Authority of Council/CEO:	In accordance with Regulation 13(2) and 13(3) of the <i>Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996</i> , where this power has been delegated, a list of payments for each month is to be compiled and presented to the Council.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

9. There are no direct financial implications of receiving this report as it reflects a historical accounting of financial transactions that were provided for in the adopted budget (as amended).

Further Information

10. Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-012)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the Schedule of Accounts Paid for the period ended 31 October 2025 as attached as **Appendix 15.2A**.
2. RECORDS in the Ordinary Council Meeting minutes the summary of accounts paid being:

Total Accounts Paid	
Municipal Fund	\$20,801,314.91
Trust Fund	\$0
Total - All Funds	\$20,801,314.91

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

15.3 Special Budget Review - Project Re-Prioritisation

Responsible Officer	Michael Kent – Chief Financial Officer
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 15.3A – Special Budget Review Projects - Reprioritisation

Purpose

This report is for Council to consider the Special Budget Review - Projects Re-prioritisation of the 2025/26 Annual Budget. The recommended adjustments arise from a comprehensive review of the City's capital projects financial performance relative to budget expectations to date.

Recommendation

That Council ADOPTS the Special Budget Review - Projects Re-prioritisation of the 2025/26 Budget as is presented in **Attachment A**.

Background

1. The Annual Budget is an informed financial forecast of the anticipated revenues and expenditures arising from the City's operations over the year. As such, it is reasonably expected that some variations will occur between those forecasts and the actual financial outcomes. These differences may arise from cost savings, change of project scope, release of project contingency, changed economic conditions, limited availability of suitable contractors, absence of tender bids due to an overheated market or receipt of unanticipated revenues.
2. The variations may be either favourable or unfavourable - and it is important that the budget is dynamically managed so that Council maintains an informed perspective on the City's financial position.
3. This requirement is recognised by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries (the Department) who have legislated that all local governments should conduct a review of their financial performance for the period commencing 1 July and ending no earlier than 31 December and consider their financial position at review date.
4. However, this statutory obligation to review the budget at this time does not preclude additional more timely reviews to the budgeted program of projects - especially when challenging market conditions manifest in the first half of the budget year.
5. Such economic circumstances have manifested in the first half of the 2025/26 financial year and the City has responded proactively to re-cast the adopted budget to ensure that the City's ratepayers continue to receive best value from the funds raised as rates in the 2025/26 financial year.

Discussion

6. A comprehensive review of the City's projects budget to date for the 2025/26 year was undertaken with engagement across all service areas. Items considered in the review schedules included the following:
 - Recognition of savings in project expenditure budgets.
 - Deferral of grant funded projects where the current year grant application was unsuccessful.
 - Bringing forward 30% deposits from 2026/27 year projects to secure items with extended delivery lead times.
 - Responding to market procurement approaches where tender responses exceeded preliminary estimates.
 - Changes in project scope to take advantage of synergies with other works, added scope or to accommodate specialised work restrictions / impacts.
 - New budgets requested for emerging opportunities or urgent remedial works.
 - Quarantining of funding for projects to or (from) Reserves until conditions precedent are achieved or until works can be undertaken in a future year.
 - Recognition of a revised (improved) year-end closing position for 2024/25 - which becomes the 2025/26 opening position.
7. Where a project is able to be completed for less than was estimated at budget time, the savings are realised and released back to the Municipal (general) fund to support dynamic treasury management (offsetting against cost over-run or supporting new initiatives).

8. In the case of projects that were anticipated to be funded by external grants, and the grant application was not successful in the current year, the project is recommended for withdrawal from the current budget and a new grant application will be submitted for a subsequent year.
9. For certain items with a very long procurement lead time (one year or more), the City may occasionally bring forward a portion of the next year's notional budget allocation to pre-pay a deposit to allow for the extended delivery timeline for such items.
10. Since the adoption of the budget, the City has had the benefit of time to seek tender responses from the market - and it now has a better understanding of the current heated contractor market for some services and the true costs of project delivery in this market. With the benefit of now knowing the extent of the delta between the budgeted (estimated) cost and the now known actual market costs, it is necessary to reset the budgets for some projects. To provide context, WT Australia's Construction Market Conditions Report shows a 6% escalation for the 2025 year and a projection of 6.5% for 2026.
11. Where a project has a natural synergy with an adjacent project or where the environment in which the delivery contractor works is constrained by either time, site restrictions or safety considerations, it may be necessary to adjust the project scope and budget request once those factors become known.
12. In some cases a request may be made as part of the project re-prioritisation process to address either urgent remedial works or emerging budget opportunities.
13. In certain situations, the City's project action can only be progressed once conditions precedent have been achieved or until the City has capacity to deliver the works. To ensure that funds remain available for the works when required, the project can be withdrawn from the current capital projects budget, and the allocated funds transferred to a cash-backed reserve to be held until required for project delivery in a future period . This transaction is cash flow neutral.
14. Also incorporated into this special budget review, is the required refinement of the projected 2024/25 year end closing position (estimated in June) once it is reconciled with the final 2024/25 year end closing position after completion of the final audited annual financial statements.
15. This closing position then becomes the actual (known) opening position for the 2025/26 budget necessitating a final (windfall) adjustment in this case.
16. Council adopted its 2025/26 Annual Budget on 15 July 2025 with a Projected Budget Closing Position (Surplus) of \$6,183,902 (approximately 2.6% of operating revenue).
17. The City practices dynamic treasury / budget amendment to ensure that we are delivering best value financial management to our community.
18. A reconciliation of all budget amendments since adoption is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1:

Details	Timing	Impact on Surplus \$	Impact
Projected Budget Surplus @ Budget Adoption	Jul 25	6,183,902	-
Budget Amendments adopted by Council – Net (Full transaction reconciliation in Finance System) (including Carry Forwards & Budget Amendments)	Jul – Nov	(504,321)	▲
Projected Budget Surplus before Projects Budget Review	Nov 25	5,679,581	-

Table 1 (Continued)

Details	Timing	Impact on Surplus \$	Impact
Budget Surplus before Projects Budget Review	Nov 25	5,679,581	-
Special Budget Review - Projects (Net)	Nov 25	(523,069)	▼
Sub Total		5,156,512	
Adjustment to 2025/26 Budget Opening Position		3,358,381	▲
Transfers (to) / from Reserves	Nov 25	(1,780,000)	▼
Revised Projected Budget Surplus		6,734,893	

19. An executive level summary of the amendments relating to this review is provided in Attachment A.
20. As a consequence of late changes to the value of carry forward projects, the post year end revision to the Budget Closing Position (which becomes the Budget Opening Position for 2025/26), and the changes to project budgets recommended in this report, Projected Budget Closing Position (Surplus) for 2025/26 will increase to 6,819,983.
21. This closing position represents approximately 2.9% of operating revenue – nearing the upper band of the target range of between 1% and 3% of operating revenue).
22. It should be noted that the estimated surplus noted above is contingent on all funding and expenditure patterns running true to budget for the remainder of the year.

Consultation

23. Consultation has been undertaken with all organisational service units with delivery responsibility for the projects identified in Attachment A to this report.

Decision Implications

24. Council's receipt of the Budget Review will meet its obligation under Regulation 33A of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	<p>Long Term Financial Plan and Annual Budget</p> <p>The purpose of the budget review is to ensure that the City's financial position remains sustainable in both the short term and longer term. It also helps to encourage value for money outcomes from the deployment of the City's financial resources and transparently demonstrates accountability for their use.</p>

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p>Section 6.8(1) and (2) of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> Regulation 33A of the <i>Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996</i></p> <p>This section of the Act and the related regulation prescribe the requirement to prepare and present to Council, a review of the Annual Budget for the period commencing 1 July and no earlier than 31 December.</p> <p>That review of the Budget must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local government’s financial performance for that period. • The local government’s financial position as at review date. • The financial outcomes as forecast in the budget for the end of the financial year. <p>A local government is not precluded from conducting additional reviews of the Budget considering the preceding factors at any stage of the year as is deemed prudent by the administration.</p> <p>It is timely to conduct a review of projects after the first quarter.</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	The above legislation prescribes that Council is to consider a review submitted to it within 30 days of the review being carried out.
Policy:	<p>2.3 Strategic Financial Planning & Budgeting</p> <p>2.6 Budget Variations</p>

Financial Implications

- 32 The Special Budget Review as presented will result in a (projected) budget surplus of \$6,819,581. This represents around 2.9% of Operating Revenues which is within the guidance target band of 1% to 3% referenced in Council Policy 2.3 Strategic Financial Planning & Budgeting.
- 33 The financial implications of receiving this report will be reflected in the revised Annual Budget once adopted by Council. This ensures that Council continues to receive current, complete and accurate assessments of the City’s financial performance and financial position each month.
- 34 Any other budget amendments arising from this Ordinary Council Meeting have not been included in this review as they are approved after the review date.

Further Information

25. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Given the recent change of council members and resignation of Acting CEO, Head of	Yes, with recent media attention there is likely widespread awareness of the current

	<p>Governance and Strategy, does the administration have concerns for attracting or retaining good staff members? Could there be a negative impact on the current timelines, or successful completion of the City's scheduled key strategic projects?</p>	<p>issues regarding recent Council decisions on a proposed Workplace Culture Committee proposal. This has the potential to influence individual employment decisions, in terms of people deciding to work for the City or continuing to work at the City in favour of other opportunities. It is understood this has already impacted at least one proposed senior appointment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the City's 700-strong team remain professional, committed and focused on delivering the City's key projects, along with the wide range of community services and activities.</p>
	<p>Can I please have some clarity over item 10784 (st George lighting) in item 15.3 Budget.</p> <p>I would like to understand how the allocated funds went from 250K to 900K? What changed in the scope?</p>	<p>The scope has been extended to now include revised intersection geometry and the upgrade of traffic signal infrastructure at the St Georges Terrace, Malcom St and Elder Street intersection to improve pedestrian safety.</p>

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-013)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council ADOPTS the Special Budget Review - Projects Re-prioritisation of the 2025/26 Budget as is presented in **Attachment A**.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds has disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 15.4 (as detailed at Item 5).

Councillor Catherine Lezer has disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 15.4 (as detailed at Item 5).

15.4 WACA - Request for Rates Concession

Responsible Officer	Michael Kent – Chief Financial Officer
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Nil.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to determine a request for a rates concession from the Western Australian Cricket Association (WACA).

Recommendation

That Council

1. APPROVES the following phased rate concessions to be applied to the annual local government rates for the WACA ground located at 39 Nelson Crescent in the nominated years (rates calculated using the Gross Rental Value [GRV] supplied by Landgate Valuation Services and the applicable Rate in the Dollar set by Council for the Commercial differential rates category):

2025/26 Rates Year	75% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)
2026/27 Rates Year	50% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)
2027/28 Rates Year	25% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)

2. NOTES that from the 2028/29 Rates Year, the WACA ground will be levied at the full Commercial differential rate.
3. REQUESTS the CEO to write to the Minister for Local Government, Sport & Cultural Industries informing her of the agreed rating concession outcome determined in relation the WACA cricket ground located at 39 Nelson Crescent.
4. REQUESTS the CEO to write to the WACA advising them of the Council decision.
5. REQUESTS the CEO engage with the WACA to develop a program of suitable community benefits and a mechanism for appropriate acknowledgement of the City, in recognition of the phased rate concessions.

Background

1. On 15 September 2025, Mr John Stephenson, CEO of the Western Australian Cricket Association (WACA) wrote to the City seeking consideration by the City of a proposal seeking 100% rates *exemption* for a ten year period.
2. The WACA ground is held in freehold title by the Western Australian Cricket Association. The WACA does **not** have entitlement to any of the statutory rate exemptions provided for by Section 6.26 (Rateable Land) of the Local Government Act (1995).
3. The City has an obligation to determine any and all requests for exemption from rates consistently, and in accordance with the legislative provisions of Section 6.26 (Rateable Land) of the Local Government Act (1995).
4. The only way that a full rate *exemption* could be granted to the WACA would be by exercise of ministerial discretion, should that be the minister's chosen course of action.
5. Council does have discretion under Section 6.47 to grant a *concession* in relation to rates - however, the granting of a discretionary concession is not consistent with the best practice principles of local government rating.

Discussion

6. Since 2013/2014, the WACA has benefitted from \$1.88M worth of (discretionary) ministerial rate exemptions - having paid just 10% of the total rate amounts levied using the same rating principles applied to all other ratable property within the city boundaries.
7. No other sporting entity holding freehold land in the City receives a rate exemption.
8. In each past instance where ministerial exemptions were granted, previous WACA administrations have made a direct approach to the minister denying the City the opportunity to try to negotiate a mutually acceptable outcome which still offered a contribution towards the cost of delivering City services and infrastructure used by the WACA and their patrons.
9. The most recent rate exemption for the WACA allowed by Minister Beazley was gazetted in Feb 2023 and provided exemption until 30 June 2025, taking into account the WACA's reduced ability to trade commercially during the construction period of the WACA ground re-development.
10. In her February 2024 letter advising the City of that determination, Minister Beazley indicated that she requested the City and the WACA to identify pathways forward once the WACA Ground Improvement Project was completed. Instead, the WACA sought from the City a full rates exemption for ten years.
11. From December 2025 (the scheduled opening date) for the redeveloped WACA ground including its aquatic facility, health and fitness facility, museum, café and event facilities, the WACA should have significantly enhanced revenue generation opportunities from those parts of the facility that support commercial operations.
12. Given this, it is appropriate to begin exploring options to secure a reasonable contribution from the WACA as a responsible corporate citizen operating within the city boundaries.
13. A request for a ten year 100% rate *exemption* as proposed by the WACA is not considered to be in the spirit of that outcome as the City's ratepayers would otherwise be covering that financial shortfall.
14. The WACA ground is owned freehold by the WACA and as such has no eligibility for statutory exemption - therefore, it is ratable land.

15. Landgate Valuation Services have advised the City that for rating purposes the GRV used for properties such as the WACA ground, is calculated differently to residential properties, in that the valuation uses a calculation of 5% of the value of land and buildings on the ratable land parcel(s).
16. That valuation approach infers that the commercial trading operations are not factors that the City should be explicitly taking into consideration.
17. The City has explored opportunities that allow the City to support the WACA ground redevelopment (beyond our existing \$25M capital contribution to the redevelopment) and in the spirit of wanting to see the project produce beneficial outcomes for all parties and our City of Perth community.
18. It is acknowledged that the WACA may benefit from short term support in the form of a time-limited rate *concession* to allow the WACA to resume operations after the challenges of the re-development project.
19. The preferred approach would see a phase-in of rates payable by the WACA over three years commencing with the 2025/26 rating year with a Council rate *concession* being allowed which proportionally reduces each year until the 2028/29 year at which time the WACA would have been operating commercially for three years and should have bedded down a stable commercial operating model.
20. The projected financial implications of this approach over the three year concessional period are shown below in Table 1.
21. As the 2026/27 year is a GRV revaluation year, an estimated change in GRV is used for future year's modelling. This may not reflect Landgate's valuation at that time - but it is a most informed estimate at present.

Table 1 - Proposed Phased Rate Concession Model (Estimated Impact):

Rating Year	Gross Rental Value	Rates Levied	Concession %	Concession \$	Net Rates
2025/26	\$ 3.00M	\$ 215.0K	75%	(\$ 161.25K)	\$ 53.75K
2026/27	\$ 3.50M	\$ 245.8K	50%	(\$ 122.90K)	\$ 122.90K
2027/28	\$ 3.50M	\$ 253.2K	25%	(\$ 63.30K)	\$ 189.90K
Total		\$ 714.0K		(\$ 347.45K)	\$ 366.55K

22. Full commercial rates would be payable by the WACA from 2028/29.

Consultation

23. The City administration has consulted with peer sporting associations regarding the land tenure and rating status of their facilities.

Decision Implications

24. Should Council approve the recommendation, rate concessions as detailed in Table 1 of this report will apply. This is currently not modelled into the Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 to 2033/34.

25. Should Council make a different decision, the potential adverse financial impact will be anywhere between zero and circa \$2.5M depending on the decision made. This is currently not modelled into the Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 to 2033/34.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Rates Methodology Statement Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 – 2034/35 (LTFP) The report recommendation is aimed at managing the potential adverse impact on future rates revenue assumptions that underpin the financial modelling in the LTFP.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Section 6.12 Local Government Act (1995) - Power to Defer, Grant Discounts, Waive or Write-Off Debts Section 6.47 Local Government Act (1995) - Concessions
Authority of Council/CEO:	Delegation 2.15 - Defer, Grant Concessions, Waive or Write Off Debts Condition 4 attaching to the relevant Council delegation provides that rates and service charges can only be waived where individual rate debts are valued equal to or below \$10.00 which will be dealt with administratively. Any debt valued above this value must be referred to Council for decision. A local government may at the time of imposing a rate or service charge or at a later date resolve to waive* a rate or service charge or resolve to grant other concessions in relation to a rate or service charge.
Policy:	

Financial Implications

26. Supporting the WACA request for rates exemption for ten years has significant financial implications, estimated to be circa \$2.5M.
27. Supporting recommended phased three year concession is estimated to have a financial impact of \$347,450 in total.

Further Information

28. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	<p>Since the WACA ground is freehold land and receives no statutory rates exemption, this three-year phased concession potentially constitutes a direct financial subsidy from the ratepayers to a private sporting body. Can administration explain how the city will make sure the community receives real, measurable benefits in return for this forgone revenue? For example, will the agreement require things like free community access days, discounted venue hire for local groups or support for youth sport programs and will these commitments be enforceable?</p>	<p>The current proposal does not include specific community benefit commitments, as the primary focus at this stage has been to transition the ratepayer away from a long-standing practice of rate concessions or exemptions. The proposed phased approach is intended to establish a more sustainable and equitable position for the City moving forward. The administration acknowledges the opportunity to strengthen the arrangement by incorporating measurable community benefit and recognition of the City through sponsorship or associated promotional activities.</p> <p>An amended officer recommendation can be prepared for Council, for the administration to work with WACA on a suitable program of community benefits in recognition of Council's rates concession.</p>

Officer Recommendation

Mover: Councillor Raj Doshi

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

That Council

1. APPROVES the following phased rate concessions to be applied to the annual local government rates for the WACA ground located at 39 Nelson Crescent in the nominated years (rates calculated using the Gross Rental Value [GRV] supplied by Landgate Valuation Services and the applicable Rate in the Dollar set by Council for the Commercial differential rates category):

2025/26 Rates Year	75% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)
2026/27 Rates Year	50% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)
2027/28 Rates Year	25% of levied Commercial differential rates (only)

2. NOTES that from the 2028/29 Rates Year, the WACA ground will be levied at the full Commercial differential rate.
3. REQUESTS the CEO to write to the Minister for Local Government, Sport & Cultural Industries informing her of the agreed rating concession outcome determined in relation the WACA cricket ground located at 39 Nelson Crescent.
4. REQUESTS the CEO to write to the WACA advising them of the Council decision.
5. REQUESTS the CEO engage with the WACA to develop a program of suitable community benefits and a mechanism for appropriate acknowledgement of the City, in recognition of the phased rate concessions.

During debate, Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves moved the following procedural motion:

Procedural Motion/Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-014)

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

That Council:

1. DEFERS consideration of the Item 15.4 WACA – Request for Rates Concession to the next available Ordinary Council Meeting; and
2. REQUESTS the CEO invite the WACA to present to a Council briefing session prior to that meeting to:
 - a. Outline their new operating model for the redeveloped WACA ground (including aquatic, fitness, events and museum facilities);

- b. Present their forward financial forecasts and capacity to meet their rates over the next 5-10 years; and
 - c. Answer questions from Elected Members regarding the impact of various rates concession scenarios
3. REQUESTS the CEO to include in the subsequent report any further analysis of:
 - a. The financial stress-testing of the proposed three-year concession model; and
 - b. Alternative options if council wished to adjust the quantum or duration of any concession
4. REQUESTS that the CEO waive interest payments until Council can consider the matter.

CARRIED (8/1)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillor Catherine Lezer

15.5 Audit Exit Interview and presentation of audited 2024/25 Financial Statements

Responsible Officer	Michael Kent – Chief Financial Officer
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 15.5A – 2024-25 Annual Audit Close Report Attachment 15.5B – 2024-25 Annual Financial Statement

Purpose

To present the City’s audited Financial Statements for the period ending 30 June 2025.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the following reports for the period ended 30 June 2025:
 - a. 2024/25 Annual Audit Close Report
 - b. 2024/25 audited Annual Financial Statements
 2. ACCEPTS the audited Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2025.
-

Background

1. The City's 2024/25 annual financial statements were audited by Ernst & Young (EY) as auditors for the Office of Auditor General (OAG).
2. The audit closing report provides details of audit work conducted as part of the 2025 annual financial statement audit in accordance with the Australian Auditing Standards and practices and the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) and the *Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996*.
3. The financial statements are required to be signed by the Chief Executive Officer upon acceptance by the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee.
4. Once approved by Council, the Financial Statements will be included within the 2025 Annual Report as required by Section 5.53 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Discussion

5. The City presented its draft 2024/25 annual financial statement to auditors on 26 September 2025, ahead of the 30 September deadline for submission. Auditors (EY) commenced their audit field work on 22 September 2025 in accordance with their audit program.
6. The financial statements addressed all statutory financial requirements imposed on the City and complied with the Australian Accounting Standards.
7. The audit found no instances of non-compliance.
8. A review of the appropriateness of internal controls was also conducted as part of the interim audit process.
9. The review of the appropriateness of internal controls identified no matters requiring management's attention, which is a positive outcome. The Audit Close Report also confirms the one medium-risk and two low-risks issues raised in the prior year have been fully remediated and closed.

Consultation

Nil.

Decision Implications

10. The Committee and Council's consideration of this Item will achieve compliance with the Act.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Sustainable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Section 6.4 of Local Government Act 1995 Regulation 36 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 The audited annual financial statements comply with the above regulatory requirements.
Authority of Council/CEO:	To comply with Local Government regulations the Annual Report, containing the audited, signed Financial Statements, is to be accepted by Council's absolute majority. Before the Annual Report is presented to Council for this purpose, the audited Financial Statements must be accepted by the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee and then signed by the Chief Executive Officer and Office of Auditor General.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

This report presents a historical perspective of the City's financial performance and financial position for the 2024/25 financial year.

Further Information

The City's 2024–25 Audited Annual Financial Statements and the Independent Auditor's Report were issued by the Office of the Auditor General on 28 November 2025.

The Independent Auditor's Report confirms that the City's financial report is based on proper accounts and records, and that it presents fairly, in all material respects, the results of the City's operations for the year ended 30 June 2025 and its financial position as at that date. The report also confirms compliance with the Local Government Act 1995 and the Australian Accounting Standards.

A copy of the OAG stamped 2024-25 Annual Financial Statement and Independent Auditor's report is attached.

11. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Points 7.9. Could the Administration confirm whether the lack of any commentary from the Office of the Auditor General is considered the highest possible standard of an audit outcome, effectively deeming the City's financial management as exemplary ?	Yes, achieving an unqualified audit opinion together with no management letter points is considered an excellent result and reflects the highest standard attainable under the current audit framework. The absence of any findings or commentary across the audited areas of Finance, Payroll, Procurement and Information Technology indicates the City's financial management practices, internal controls and compliances

		processes are operating effectively and to a high standard.
2.	Can I please understand how positive this outcome is?	This result demonstrates that the City's financial governance, internal controls, and compliances processes are operating effectively, consistently, and in line with audit expectations. It is a strong endorsement of the City's financial management and the work of our teams in maintaining high standards across all audited functions.
3.	How rare or common is this?	An outcome with no audit findings or management letter points is not common. Most local governments receive at least a small number of recommendations each year, as auditors typically identify areas for improvement even when controls are generally sound. This achievement reflects a high level of maturity in the City's internal controls.
4.	For instance how many times has the City had a similar outcome?	The City has achieved this result twice during the last 5-year period, in 2022/23 and 2024/25.
5.	How many other LGA's have the have outcome?	The financial audit results published by the Office of the Auditor General do not disclose the number of Local Governments with no audit findings on internal controls or management letter points. While a list of 20 local government 'Best Practice' entities is published, the number of local governments with a similar 'clean' audit is not otherwise publicly available.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-015)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Chris Patton

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the following reports for the period ended 30 June 2025:
 - a. 2024/25 Annual Audit Close Report
 - b. 2024/25 audited Annual Financial Statements
2. ACCEPTS the audited Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2025.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

16. Engagement and Activations Alliance Reports

Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 16.1 (as detailed at Item 5)

Councillor Lisa Ma disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 16.1 (as detailed at Item 5)

16.1 Economic Development Sponsorship 2025/26

Responsible Officer	Tom Griffiths – A/General Manager Engagement and Activation
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 16.1A – Attachment A - Economic Development Summary Recommendation Rationale

Purpose

To provide a sponsorship recommendation to Council under the 2025/26 Economic Development Sponsorship program.

Recommendation

That Council APPROVES, subject to a suitable sponsorship agreement being entered into by the City and all approved applicants listed above on terms acceptable to the City within three months, the following Economic Development Sponsorship totalling \$120,000 excluding GST:

Ref	Applicant / Project	Recommendation Amount
A	Business Events Perth / Business Events Perth, re-aWaken Mega Famil 2026	\$80,000 cash ex GST
B	Education Perth City (INC) / Discover Perth, Agent Education Week	\$40,000 cash ex GST

Background

1. The City is committed to supporting the growth and ongoing development of key industry sectors that represent strategic importance or present significant opportunities. The City's Economic Development Sponsorship Program is designed to provide strategic support to businesses and sectors that position the city as a thriving centre for commerce, boost investment flows, generate employment, facilitate economic growth, profile local industries and promote thought leadership.
2. As part of the City's Economic Development activities, it seeks to strategically engage with key industry sectors to nurture a thriving, diverse and competitive business environment. The key industry sectors are:
 - a. Education and International Student Services
 - b. Health and Medical Life Sciences
 - c. Mining, Resources, Energy, and Energy Transition
 - d. Retail and Property Development
 - e. Technology and Innovation
 - f. Tourism and Hospitality
3. Applicants must demonstrate they will achieve one or more following program outcomes:
 - a. **Direct Economic Impact:** The Perth economy is boosted by direct short-term economic benefits that support businesses based in the City.
 - b. **Enhancing Perth's reputation for commerce and investment:** Project creates opportunities locally or internationally to enhance Perth's reputation as a visitor, business, investment, and/ or education destination.
 - c. **Key Sector Development:** Provides support for projects that focus on growth, knowledge-sharing, capability and sustainability, which contribute to the betterment of Perth.
 - d. **Economic Growth:** Provides support to projects that generate economic benefits, attract investments, enhance competitiveness and create job opportunities.
4. Applications opened for Economic Development Sponsorship on 28 April 2025 and will remain open until budget exhaustion. Applications are accepted following an Expression of Interest to ensure the project aligns with budget and strategic priorities. Expressions of Interest are reviewed in collaboration with the City's Economic Development team who provide subject matter expert advice.
5. There are three tiers of funding available under the Economic Development Sponsorship program, with the maximum contribution from the City ranging from 40 – 100% of project costs (dependent on the tier applied for).
6. Economic Development Sponsorship has a budget of \$650,000 with \$470,800 in approved and pre-committed funds.

Discussion

7. Two Economic Development Sponsorship applications totalling \$120,000 (ex GST) are being presented for decision by Council:

	Applicant/Project	Requested Amount (ex GST)
a.	Business Events Perth Business Events Perth, re-aWaken Mega Famil 2026	\$80,000
b.	Education Perth City (INC) Discover Perth, Agent Education Week	\$40,000

8. The applications were assessed by a three-person panel consisting of City employees with relevant expertise, including a General Manager and a representative from the Economic Development team.
9. The assessment criteria have clear descriptions and a rating scale which guide the assessors when considering an appropriate score.
10. Both applications demonstrated strong alignment and benefit to the Tourism and Hospitality sector and Education and International Student Services sector. Both applications have been recommended for support.
11. A summary of the applications, the assessment panel recommendation rationale, and the total value of the request versus the total value recommended is included in **Attachment A**.

Consultation

12. Nil

Decision Implications

13. A City representative will negotiate sponsorship benefits with the Applicant in line with sponsorship funding amounts, once approved by Council. The Applicant will be required to provide significant benefits in recognition of the City's support.
14. Payment of sponsorship funds will be made in accordance with the achievement of milestones set out in the sponsorship agreement.
15. Successful applicants will be required to submit an acquittal report within three months of project completion. Acquittal reports must demonstrate how the City's sponsorship funding supported projects or initiatives within the City of Perth local government area and demonstrate direct impact on the City of Perth meeting its aspirations of Liveable, Sustainable and Prosperous.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Prosperous
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Economic Development Strategy 2025-28

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Regulation 12 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council Policy 4.3 Outgoing Sponsorship and Grants directs that any sponsorship application for more than \$20,000 or from a funding round be considered by Council.
Policy:	Council Policy 4.3. Outgoing Sponsorship and Grants directs that there be a consistent and transparent assessment process and criteria to guide recommendations to Council. An eligibility check has been conducted on all applications to ensure they are compliant with the Policy and the necessary assessment process has been followed.

Financial Implications

16. The financial implications of the recommendation(s) are accommodated within the existing budget.

Account Number	1066-100-50-10095-7901	Operating
Account Description	Economic Development Sponsorship	
Total Budget	\$650,000	
Committed Funds	\$470,800	
Budget Available	\$179,200	
Budget – This report	\$120,000	
Remaining Budget	\$59,200	
Budget Impact	Accommodation in 2025/26 Budget	

Further Information

17. Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-016)

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council APPROVES, subject to a suitable sponsorship agreement being entered into by the City and all approved applicants listed above on terms acceptable to the City within three months, the following Economic Development Sponsorship totalling \$120,000 excluding GST:

Ref	Applicant / Project	Recommendation Amount
A	Business Events Perth / Business Events Perth, re-aWaken Mega Famil 2026	\$80,000 cash ex GST
B	Education Perth City (INC) / Discover Perth, Agent Education Week	\$40,000 cash ex GST

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

6:59pm Councillor Adam Pacan retired from the meeting prior to Item 16.2.

Councillor Catherine Lezer disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 16.2 (as detailed at Item 5)

16.2 Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant - 30 iParks Pty Ltd

Responsible Officer	Tom Griffiths – A/General Manager Engagement and Activation
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 16.2A – Attachment A - 30 iParks Summary and Recommendation Rationale

Purpose

To provide a recommendation to Council for the Heritage Conservation Grant.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. APPROVES, subject to a suitable sponsorship agreement being entered into by the City and 30 iParks Pty Ltd on terms acceptable to the City within twelve months, the following Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant totalling \$1,000,000 ex GST:

Ref	Applicant	Project	Recommendation Amount
a.	30 iParks Pty Ltd	Bon Marché Arcade Refurbishment and Revitalisation into a Short Stay Accommodation	\$1,000,000 ex GST

2. ACKNOWLEDGES that without limitation, such agreement for the applicant must include the following terms:
 - a. Funding shall only be used for the approved Adaptive Reuse Works which must be completed within three years following Council's approval of the Grant Application.
 - b. The Grantee is required to provide confirmation of total project funding secured, including written confirmation from any relevant financial institution.
 - c. The Grantee must obtain and maintain full value building insurance cover for the Property for the duration of the grant agreement.
 - d. The Grantee must obtain all relevant approvals, permits and licenses for the funded works.
 - e. The Grantee must meet all requirements of its current Development Approval and any future approvals or permits issued.
 - f. There must be on-site public acknowledgment of the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant to satisfaction of the City, including during construction on relevant hoarding, and permanently on completion.
 - g. The Grantee must meet reasonable publicity requests, including sharing of photographs and relevant project information for City use and promotion.

- h. The Grantee must submit Grant Acquittal Milestone Progress Reports and accurately report on the funded project including expenditure, benefits, achievement of agreed milestone, and challenges.
 - i. The Grantee must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City, substantial commencement of works through submission of a progress claim detailing 25% of entire works have been completed ahead of the first milestone payment.
 - j. The project must be completed to the scale reflected in the application and should significant material changes occur to the project approved, the City reserves the right to vary the agreement to a lower amount based on revised works.
 - k. A minimum of 20% of the approved grant amount will be retained until the project is completed and Levels 1 to 3 of the property is tenanted or activated to the satisfaction of the City.
-

Background

1. The City of Perth recognises the importance of the adaptive reuse of Perth's heritage spaces to increase the sustainability, liveability and prosperity of the city.
2. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 December 2021, Council resolved to implement the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant, allocating \$4 million across three years to the Heritage Incentive Reserve.
3. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 25 March 2025, Council approved the continuation of the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant for a further one-year period and expansion of the works area to cover the entire City of Perth Local Government Area.
4. The primary objective of the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grants is to support, assist and encourage property owners to activate vacant and underutilised spaces of heritage-protected buildings, prioritising upper floors and/or basement areas as part of the project area.
5. Restoring and adapting Perth's unique heritage buildings is critical to enhancing the value proposition of the city as a destination for people to live, work and visit, achieving the following program outcomes:
 - a. Cultural Identity - Celebrate and respect our valuable built heritage so future generations can continue to enjoy the city's rich culture. Create a sense of unity and belonging within the community and provide insights into our stories and our layers of history.
 - b. Activation - Activation of vacant and underutilised spaces of heritage buildings in the central business district which is critical to supporting existing businesses, creating new opportunities and results in a positive activation and compatible reuse outcome.
 - c. Conservation - Conservation and improvement to the presentation and condition of a heritage-protected place that will preserve and continue its active use.
 - d. Local Business Support and Economic Growth - Contribute to economic growth of the city centre through redevelopment activity that supports existing businesses by providing a tourism drawcard, enhancing public use, attracting investment, supporting the night-time / after-hours economy, accommodating businesses and increased employment; and supports the creative industries with the provision of space.
6. For a Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant, the guidelines state the City may contribute 10% of the total cost of the Adaptive Reuse Works being undertaken but is capped at a maximum of \$1 million on any one project.
7. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 15 July 2025, Council approved a drawdown of \$2 million from the Heritage Incentive Reserve in the 2025/26 financial year to support works at the Perth Town Hall.

Discussion

8. One application from 30 iParks Pty Ltd for \$1 million has been received for the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant. The application is towards the redevelopment of Bon Marché Arcade on Barrack Street for use as a short-stay accommodation facility.
9. This is the first application ever received in the program.
10. 30 iParks Pty Ltd is the owner of the property and has met the required eligibility requirements, including having Development Approval from the City of Perth for the project.

11. The application was reviewed by a three-person panel, consisting of staff from the City’s administration with subject matter expertise in Planning, Heritage, and Economic Development. Assessors are provided clear descriptions and guidance on the assessment criteria and use a rating scale when reviewing the application.
12. The panel has recommended the application for support, noting the positive heritage conservation outcomes and strong economic and cultural benefit to the surrounding Barrack Street precinct in activating the building. The panel agreed the applicant met the assessment criteria and program outcomes to a high degree.
13. The panel noted the successful development could be used a benchmark to showcase and encourage further adaptive reuse within the city.
14. The City of Perth will pay instalments of the grant after the work covered by the terms of the grant has been completed. Funds will be paid on agreed milestones during the works with a significant portion retained and paid at final completion and acquittal.

1. Payment	2. Milestone	3. Amount
Payment 1 – 30%	Substantial commencement of works (25%).	\$300,000
Payment 2 – 50%	After a permanent occupation certificate is issued by the City for all of the works covered under this grant.	\$500,000
Payment 3 – 20%	After the first occupation by a tenant for the reused space.	\$200,000

15. Detailed project information and panel comments can be found in Attachment A: Summary and Recommendation Rationale.

Consultation

16. The City’s Planning, City Culture and Economic Development teams were engaged to inform the assessment and have been consulted on the proposed conditions.

Decision Implications

17. A City representative will negotiate an agreement in line with the conditions of the Council resolution.
18. Approval of the grant does not constitute any form of development or planning approval which the applicant will be required to obtain as required.
19. The applicant will be required to submit an acquittal report within three months of project completion to demonstrate the impact of the project and how the grant contributed to meeting the City’s aspirations of Liveable, Sustainable and Prosperous.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Prosperous
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 Cultural Development Plan 2019 – 2029 Heritage Strategy 2020 - 2024 Economic Development Strategy 2025 – 2028 Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant Guidelines

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Regulation 12 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 – payments from municipal fund or trust fund, restrictions on making.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council Policy 4.3 Outgoing Sponsorship and Grants directs that any sponsorship application for more than \$20,000 or from a funding round be considered by Council.
Policy:	Council Policy 4.3. Outgoing Sponsorship and Grants directs that there be a consistent and transparent assessment process and criteria to guide recommendations to Council. An eligibility check has been conducted on all applications to ensure they are compliant with the Policy and the necessary assessment process has been followed.

Financial Implications

20. The financial implications of the recommendation(s) are accommodated within the existing budget.

Account Number	1066-100-50-10359-7901	Operating
Account Description	Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant	
Available Budget	\$2,000,000	
Budget – This report	\$1,000,000	
Remaining Budget	\$1,000,000	
Budget Impact	Accommodated within existing budget	

21. The grant will require \$1 million to be transferred from the Heritage Incentive Reserve. This will be phased across two financial years based on the estimates below, dependent on the Grantee achievement of agreed milestones:

Year	2026/27	2027/28
Financial Impact	\$300,000	\$700,000

Further Information

22. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	<p>Just looking at this obviously one million to a private equity is a substantial sum. Does our policy include any kind of clawback clause if the operator sells the building or ceases to use it for the approved purchase within say a few years?</p>	<p>As the City's contribution represents less than 10 per cent of the total project cost, it is acknowledged that the owners' substantial investment makes any short-term change in use or ownership unlikely once operations commence.</p> <p>However, should a change of use or ownership occur after the agreement period, the public benefits of the heritage refurbishment, including the restoration of previously inaccessible areas of the building, will remain.</p> <p>The intended outcomes of the Grant are to improve heritage conservation and increase leasable floor space, enabling tenancy and activation upon project completion. These outcomes are expected to be achieved even if a change of use or ownership occurs after the agreement period.</p> <p>Any future change of use would require planning approval and would be managed in accordance with the City's standard processes.</p> <p>With respect to the disbursement of the grant during construction, the proposed payment milestones minimise risk to the City by ensuring that substantial works have commenced before any funds are released. That is, fifty per cent of the grant is withheld until an Occupancy Permit is issued, with a further 20 per cent retained until the first occupation by a tenant or management company to the satisfaction of the City. This means the City will hold the final payment (\$200,000) until the accommodation facility is operational.</p> <p>During the works and throughout the term of the grant agreement, if significant material changes occur to the approved project, the City reserves the right to vary</p>

		the grant amount in line with any revised scope.
--	--	--

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-017)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council:

1. APPROVES, subject to a suitable sponsorship agreement being entered into by the City and 30 iParks Pty Ltd on terms acceptable to the City within twelve months, the following Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant totalling \$1,000,000 ex GST:

Ref	Applicant	Project	Recommendation Amount
a.	30 iParks Pty Ltd	Bon Marché Arcade Refurbishment and Revitalisation into a Short Stay Accommodation	\$1,000,000 ex GST

2. ACKNOWLEDGES that without limitation, such agreement for the applicant must include the following terms:
 - a. Funding shall only be used for the approved Adaptive Reuse Works which must be completed within three years following Council's approval of the Grant Application.
 - b. The Grantee is required to provide confirmation of total project funding secured, including written confirmation from any relevant financial institution.
 - c. The Grantee must obtain and maintain full value building insurance cover for the Property for the duration of the grant agreement.
 - d. The Grantee must obtain all relevant approvals, permits and licenses for the funded works.
 - e. The Grantee must meet all requirements of its current Development Approval and any future approvals or permits issued.
 - f. There must be on-site public acknowledgment of the Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grant to satisfaction of the City, including during construction on relevant hoarding, and permanently on completion.
 - g. The Grantee must meet reasonable publicity requests, including sharing of photographs and relevant project information for City use and promotion.
 - h. The Grantee must submit Grant Acquittal Milestone Progress Reports and accurately report on the funded project including expenditure, benefits, achievement of agreed milestone, and challenges.

- i. The Grantee must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City, substantial commencement of works through submission of a progress claim detailing 25% of entire works have been completed ahead of the first milestone payment.
- j. The project must be completed to the scale reflected in the application and should significant material changes occur to the project approved, the City reserves the right to vary the agreement to a lower amount based on revised works.
- k. A minimum of 20% of the approved grant amount will be retained until the project is completed and Levels 1 to 3 of the property is tenanted or activated to the satisfaction of the City.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

Purpose

To present the review of Council Policy 4.10 Incoming Sponsorship.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. ADOPTS amended Council Policy 4.10 Incoming Sponsorship, as shown in **Attachment B**.
 2. APPROVES minor typographical amendments, where the materiality of the policy is not affected, and placing the policy in future new templates may be made to improve the presentation and/or make corrections.
-

Background

1. At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 30 August 2022 the 'Incoming Sponsorship Policy (CP4.10) was adopted by Council, with a review date of August 2025.
2. This Policy provides a mechanism for the City to receive, review and decide on incoming sponsorship opportunities (other than Commonwealth or State Government or their agencies and authorities) and is supported by an operational procedure and dedicated resources within the administration.
3. The City attracts incoming sponsorship for City-led events, activations, initiatives and projects such as Christmas Lights Trail and Boorloo Heritage Festival. Sponsorship can be received in the form of cash or in-kind support.
4. In the 2025/26 financial year, \$2.89M has been secured to support City-led events and offset the City's events budget. This figure represents a 47% increase on incoming sponsorship since 2022/23.
5. Expressions of interest from sponsors are currently evaluated by an internal assessment panel which comprises of three internal staff with relevant knowledge. The panel makes a recommendation on whether the City should accept the sponsorship proposal which is provided to the CEO for final decision.
6. A sponsorship assessment form is completed for the panel review and informs the recommendation to CEO. This assessment includes criteria such as eligibility, aims of the partnership, alignment with City objectives, workplace practice, and public sentiment.
7. Where possible the City seeks to secure large value sponsorships for multi-year periods, however there are practical reasons lower-value sponsorships are negotiated annually. As an example, prospective partners for the Christmas Lights Trail are based on the trail locations and installation costs for that year.
8. The current policy results in the administration spending more time reviewing lower-value sponsorships and having to reconvene multiple assessment panels for predominately returning partners. Christmas Lights Trail precinct partners generally provide cash and/or in-kind support to the value of \$15,000 - \$65,000.

Discussion

9. A review of Council Policy 4.10 has been completed under the adopted Policy Framework.
10. The suggested changes outlined in *Attachment 1* remove the operational components and place them into an operational procedure document – refer to Comparison of Changes in *Attachment 2*.
11. Changes to the policy and operational procedure have been recommended to streamline the process.
12. The Policy will still require all sponsorships to be assessed and recommendations to be decided on by the CEO, however the changes will remove the requirement for a formal panel to be convened for sponsorships at a lower financial threshold.
13. Under the accompanying operational procedure, a panel assessment will still be required for any incoming sponsorship with an annual investment over \$150,001. Sponsorship opportunities up to \$150,000 will have an assessment undertaken by the Partnerships Team.

Sponsorship Amount	Reviewed by	Approval	Estimated number annually
Up to \$150,000	Partnerships Team	CEO	8
\$150,001+	Formal Assessment Panel	CEO	4

14. The proposed threshold of \$150,000 is based on what would be considered the minimum funding amount for incoming sponsors to negotiate naming rights benefits.
15. The Partnerships team will use the same sponsorship assessment form used in the panel process. This ensures all recommendations are based on consistent benefit and risk considerations and each stage of the review process is documented.
16. The Partnerships team member completing the assessment for sponsorships under \$150,000 will make a recommendation only and will not have the authority to accept a sponsorship without CEO approval.
17. The standardised use of the assessment form and the approval process, in which the recommendation is also reviewed by the Alliance Manager and General Manager Engagement and Activation, and adherence to conflict of interest management, will support probity in the process.
18. The Partnerships team will assess ongoing suitability of incoming sponsorship and highlight any reasons for concern, should they arise.
19. The proposed changes regarding Managing Conflicts of Interest are aligned with OP19: Management of Employee Conflicts of Interest. Replicating this information would not be best practice, as any future updates would need to be reflected across multiple documents. Instead, the document will simply refer to the Management of Conflict of Interest operating procedure.

Consultation

20. The recommended policy revision (*Attachment 3*) has undergone internal consultation as part of this process with Corporate Communications, Customer Experience, Economic Development, Corporate Governance and Council Governance.
21. The review has included benchmarking of five (5) other Local Government Authorities (inclusive of capital cities) to identify current industry practices and trends.
22. The proposed changes regarding Managing Conflicts of Interest also align with OP19 Management of Employee Conflicts of Interest.
23. Feedback was requested from Elected Members. One Elected Member provided the following feedback:
 - a. “(Clause 13 should) clarify the City will provide the sponsorship agreement”.
24. Clause 13 has been updated to include ‘*on terms agreeable to the City*’, however the requirement for the City to provide the agreement is not included as there may be circumstances where major sponsors have their own sponsorship agreement templates that are used as a starting point for negotiations.

Decision Implications

25. If Council supports the recommendation, then Council Policy 4.10 Incoming Sponsorship will be adopted. If Council does not support the recommendation, the current policy would continue to apply.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Events Strategy 2025-2028 Events Plan 2025-2026

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<u>Local Government Act 1995</u> <i>Section 2.7(2)(b) of the Local Government Act 1995 provides Council is to determine the local government's policies.</i> <u>City of Perth Act 2016</u> Section 11(2a) (2b) (2f(i))
Authority of Council/CEO:	In accordance with Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 Council is responsible for overseeing the allocation of the City's finances and resources; and determination of Council policies.
Policy:	Nil

Financial Implications

26. Nil.

Further Information

27. Nil.

Officer Recommendation

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

That Council:

1. ADOPTS amended Council Policy 4.10 Incoming Sponsorship, as shown in **Attachment B**.
2. APPROVES minor typographical amendments, where the materiality of the policy is not affected, and placing the policy in future new templates may be made to improve the presentation and/or make corrections.

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

During debate, Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves moved a procedural motion as follows:

Procedural Motion (OCM-25/12-018)

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Councillor Chris Patton

That Council defer the item in order for a discussion to be held at an Engagement Session.

LOST (1/7)

For: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Against: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Debate reverted back to the Officers Recommendation:

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-019)

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

That Council:

1. ADOPTS amended Council Policy 4.10 Incoming Sponsorship, as shown in **Attachment B**.
2. APPROVES minor typographical amendments, where the materiality of the policy is not affected, and placing the policy in future new templates may be made to improve the presentation and/or make corrections.

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

Councillor Lisa Ma disclosed an Impartiality Interest in Item 16.4 (as detailed at Item 5)

16.4 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grants Program

Responsible Officer	Tom Griffiths – A/General Manager Engagement and Activation
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 16.4A – 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program Budget Allocation

Purpose

To obtain Council endorsement for the 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program and in-principle budget allocation.

Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program and in-principle budget allocation outlined in **Attachment A**.

Background

1. Each financial year, the City offers a suite of sponsorships and grants to assist in achieving outcomes that benefit residents, rate payers and visitors to Perth, supporting our aspiration to be a liveable, sustainable, and prosperous city.
2. Council Policy 2.3 Strategic Financial Planning and Budgeting, specifically clause 15, outlines a notional allocation of 3% of eligible own source revenue (rates and parking) for grants and sponsorships annually. The purpose of this is to provide certainty and allow for appropriate planning in advance of a financial year. Sponsorship and Grant funding is also accounted for in the Long-Term Financial Plan.
3. Event Sponsorship begins accepting applications for the upcoming financial year in February and subsequent sponsorship and grant programs are released in a phased approach from that point onwards. This allows sufficient time for consideration, decision making, and the establishment of agreements prior to the period of activity.

Discussion

4. In 2025/26 the City's sponsorship budget was \$5,360,000 cash and \$250,000 in-kind support. The total proposed budget for 2026/27 is \$5,600,000 cash and \$250,000 in-kind support budget.
5. The programs and associated budgets are determined based on the strategic priorities of the organisation as well as demonstrated demand over previous years. Program guidelines are developed each year and evolve based on the performance of the grant and stakeholder feedback, ensuring the grant is achieving the intended outcomes. This review happens annually, and all sponsorship and grant guidelines are shared with Elected Members once finalised.
6. Heritage Adaptive Reuse Grants are funded from the Heritage Incentive Reserve, separate to the annual sponsorship and grant budget. The future of this grant program will be discussed with Elected Members early in 2026.
7. The proposed 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Programs and in-principle budget allocation is outlined in Attachment A.

Consultation

8. The proposed 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program was presented to Elected Members for feedback at an Elected Member Engagement Session on Monday 3 November 2025.

Decision Implications

9. Delays in endorsing the 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program will delay the City's ability to accept applications for Event Sponsorship in February.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Community Plan 2022 – 2032 (Liveable, Sustainable and Prosperous pillars) • Economic Development Strategy 2025 - 2028 • Sustainability Strategy 2022 – 2032 • Events Strategy 2026 – 2028 • LGBTQIA+ Plan 2025-2029

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p>Section 8 (1) of the City of Perth Act 2016.</p> <p>(e) to promote awareness of the facilities and events provided or facilitated by the City of Perth and encourage the community to make use of or participate in them;</p> <p>(f) to initiate and promote the continued growth and environmentally sustainable development of the City of Perth and ensure its continued role as a thriving centre of business with vibrant cultural and entertainment precincts, while enhancing and protecting its natural environment and having due regard to the flow-on impact on the Perth metropolitan area;</p> <p>(g) to nurture and support the initiatives and innovations of the diverse precincts of the City of Perth;</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	<p>The recommendation is made to Council in line with both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 2.10 (a) of the Local Government Act 1995 whereby under the role of Councillors; represents the interests of electors, ratepayers and residents of the district; and • section 2.7 which provides Council is to be responsible for the performance of the local government’s functions and oversee the allocation of the local government’s finances and resources.
Policy:	Council Policy 4.3 Outgoing Sponsorship and Grants

Financial Implications

10. 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Programs and in-principle budget allocation is outlined in Attachment A.

Further Information

11. Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-020)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council ENDORSE the 2026/27 Sponsorship and Grant Program and in-principle budget allocation outlined in **Attachment A**

.CARRIED UNOPPOSED (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

17. Chief Executive Officer Reports

17.1 Adopting the Annual Report and Setting the Date for the 2024/25 Electors General Meeting

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 17.1A – City of Perth 2024-2025 Annual Report

Purpose

For Council to consider the City of Perth 2024/25 Annual Report and setting the date for the Electors General Meeting.

Recommendation

That Council:

- ACCEPTS the City of Perth 2024-2025 Annual Report, as provided in **Attachment A**, in accordance with Section 5.53 and 5.54(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act); noting that:
 - a draft version of Annual Report (text only) is attached to this report which will be formatted (including structurally) and graphically designed following acceptance before it is made available; and
 - minor typographical amendments, that do not affect the materiality of the document, may also be made to improve the presentation and/or make corrections.
- APPROVES the advertisement of the availability of the Annual Report in accordance with Section 5.55 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- APPROVES the 2024-2025 Electors General Meeting to be held at 5.00 pm on Tuesday 27 January 2026, at Council House, Level 9, Council Chamber, in accordance with Section 5.27 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Background

1. In accordance with Section 5.53 of the Act, the City of Perth 2024-25 Annual Report has been prepared, summarising the previous year's achievements and challenges and the outlook for the year ahead, as well as addressing stipulated statutory requirements. The Annual Report also demonstrates performance against the City's Strategic Community Plan
2. The Annual Report includes the City's Financial Statements for the 2024-25 financial year, which have been audited by the Office of the Auditor General.
3. The City's Financial Statements for the 2024-25 financial year are included on this Agenda, for consideration by Council, at Item 15.4 – Audit Exit Interview and Presentation of Audited 2024-25 Financial Statements.
4. It is a statutory requirement that Council accepts an Annual Report and for the report to be presented to the Electors General Meeting. The Act requires that an Electors General Meeting is to be held on a day selected by the local government, but not more than 56 days after the Annual Report is accepted.

Discussion

5. This report recommends that Council accepts the City of Perth 2024-25 Annual Report (**Attachment A**), advertises the availability of the Annual Report and sets the date for the 2024-25 Electors General Meeting.
6. Following Council's acceptance of the City's Annual Report, the report must be:
 - a. published on the City's official website within 14 days; and
 - b. presented at the Electors General Meeting to be held within 56 days of Council accepting the report.
7. To set a date for the Electors General Meeting, Council is required to have received the audit report for the prior period and accepted the Annual Report.
8. An Electors General Meeting is to consider matters arising with respect to the previous financial year.
9. The proposed date of the Electors General Meeting, following Council's acceptance of the Annual Report is Tuesday 27 January 2026.
10. Section 5.53 of the *Local Government Act 1995* prescribes the following requirements for inclusion in the Annual Report:

"5.53. Annual reports

 - (1) *The local government is to prepare an annual report for each financial year.*
 - (2) *The annual report is to contain —*
 - (a) *a report from the mayor or president; and*
 - (b) *a report from the CEO; and*
 - [(c), (d) deleted]
 - (e) *an overview of the plan for the future of the district made in accordance with section 5.56, including major initiatives that are proposed to commence or to continue in the next financial year; and*
 - (f) *the financial report for the financial year; and*

- (g) such information as may be prescribed in relation to the payments made to employees; and
- (h) the auditor’s report prepared under section 7.9(1) or 7.12AD(1) for the financial year; and
- (ha) a matter on which a report must be made under section 29(2) of the Disability Services Act 1993; and (hb) details of entries made under section 5.121 during the financial year in the register of complaints, including —
 - (i) the number of complaints recorded in the register of complaints; and
 - (ii) how the recorded complaints were dealt with; and
 - (iii) any other details that the regulations may require; and
- (i) such other information as may be prescribed”.

11. In addition to the requirements of the Act

- a. The *State Records Act 2000* requires the City is required to include a statement on their compliance with their Record Keeping Plan.
- b. Part 5 Sections 94, 96 and 97 of the *Freedom of Information Act 1992*, states that the City is required to publish an Information Statement which details the process for applying for information and provide an up-to-date version every 12 months.

Consultation

Nil.

Decision Implications

- 12. If Council supports the recommendation, it will ensure compliance with the Act.
- 13. If Council does not accept the Annual Report within the statutory timeframes, the City will be in breach of the Act and will need to report the non-compliance when completing its Annual Compliance Audit Return.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Liveable
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Strategic Community Plan and Corporate Business Plan

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Section 5.53(1) of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> (the Act) requires a Local Government to prepare an Annual Report for each financial year. Section 5.53(2)(f) of the Act specifies that the Annual Report is to contain the financial report of the financial year and Section 5.53(2)(h) specifies that it must contain the Independent Auditor's report for the financial year.

	In accordance with Section 5.54(1) of the Act, an Annual Report for the financial year is to be accepted by the Local Government no later than 31 December after that financial year. Section 5.54(2) notes that if the Independent Auditor's report is not available in time for the Annual Report for a financial year to be accepted by 31 December after that financial year, the Annual Report is to be accepted by the local government no later than two months after the Independent Auditor's report becomes available.
Authority of Council/CEO:	In accordance with Section 5.54 of the Local Government Act 1995 Council is required to accept the annual report by absolute majority.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

14. Advertising costs associated with giving local public notice and printing of the Annual Report.

Further Information

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-021)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. ACCEPTS the City of Perth 2024-2025 Annual Report, as provided in **Attachment A**, in accordance with Section 5.53 and 5.54(1) of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act); noting that:
 - a. a draft version of Annual Report (text only) is attached to this report which will be formatted (including structurally) and graphically designed following acceptance before it is made available; and
 - b. minor typographical amendments, that do not affect the materiality of the document, may also be made to improve the presentation and/or make corrections.
2. APPROVES the advertisement of the availability of the Annual Report in accordance with Section 5.55 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
3. APPROVES the 2024-2025 Electors General Meeting to be held at 5.00 pm on Tuesday 27 January 2026, at Council House, Level 9, Council Chamber, in accordance with Section 5.27 of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

17.2 Adoption of the City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 17.2A – Attachment - PROPOSED - City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025 Attachment 17.2B – Attachment - City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025 - showing changes in red and green

Purpose

For Council to consider the adoption of the *City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025*.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. NOTES that no public submissions were received during the public submission period.
2. In accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, ADOPTS the *City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025* as contained in Attachment A, for the purpose and effect as follows:

Purpose: To amend the *City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025*.

Effect: The *City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025*, is amended.

Background

1. Following the adoption of the *City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025*, the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) reviewed the local law and required some actions to be undertaken by the City. The report on the JSCDL review was presented to the Ordinary Council Meeting on 26 August 2025, where Council resolved as follows:

“That Council RESOLVES to undertake to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation that the Council will:

1. *Within six months, amend the City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025 as follows:*
 - a. *in the clause 3.1 definition of ‘transferee’, replace ‘clause 4.14’ with ‘clause 3.14’*
 - b. *in the clause 5.1 definition of ‘infringement notice’, replace ‘clause 5.4’ with ‘clause 5.3’ (Note: this may change if the proposed amendments are adopted, and will be made as a consequential amendment)*
 - c. *in clause 5.6, replace ‘clause 6.3’ with ‘clause 5.3’ (Note: this may change if the proposed amendments are adopted, and will be made as a consequential amendment)*
 - d. *insert Schedule 2 of the WALGA model dog local law as Schedule 2 of this local law*
 - e. *re-number Schedule 2 entitled, ‘Offences in respect of which modified penalty applies’ to Schedule 3; and immediately under the heading to that schedule, replace the reference to clause 6.2 with a reference to clause 5.2 (Note: this may change if proposed amendments are adopted, and will be made as a consequential amendment)*
 - f. *prescribe penalties for offences against the local law*
 - g. *in the new Schedule 3 entitled, ‘Offences in respect of which modified penalty applies’, ensure that the modified penalty for a clause 2.1 offence does not exceed 10% of the penalty of that offence*
 - h. *in the new Schedule 3 entitled, ‘Offences in respect of which modified penalty applies’, delete the modified penalty for a clause 4.1(2) offence and replace it with an amount not exceeding \$100 i. make all consequential amendments arising from the above amendments*
2. *not enforce the local law to the contrary before it is amended in accordance with undertaking 1*
3. *ensure that a copy of these undertakings accompanies the local law wherever it is made publicly available by the City, whether in hard copy or electronic form.*
4. *In accordance with section 3.12(3) of the Local Government Act 1995, APPROVES the giving of local public notice of the City’s intention to make a City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025, as detailed in Attachment A, with the purpose and effect being:*

Purpose: *To amend the City of Perth Dogs local law 2025.*

Effect: *The City of Perth Dogs local law 2025, is amended.”*

Discussion

2. The City gave local public notice of the proposal to make the *City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025* on 12 September 2025 and the submission period ran from 12 September 2025 to 7 November 2025, in accordance with section 3.12(3)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
3. A copy of the proposed local law and the local public notice was sent to the Departmental CEO for Local Government on 24 September 2025, in accordance with section 3.12(3)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
4. No public submissions were received during the public submission period.
5. The Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety (DLGIRS) provided comments in relation to the proposed local law. A summary of their comments and officer response is provided below.

Feedback from the DLGIRS		Officer response
1.	Two minor formatting recommendations were made by the DLGIRS	Both recommendations have been incorporated into the local law.

6. Section 3.12(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995* states that after the last day of submissions, the local government is to consider any submissions made and may make the local law as proposed or make a law that is not significantly different from what was proposed.

Consultation

7. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with sections 3.12(3)(a) and 1.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*:
 - a. Local public notice was published on the City's official website.
 - b. A notice was also placed:
 - i. in the West Australian Newspaper,
 - ii. on the noticeboards at Council House and the Library, and
 - iii. on the City of Perth LinkedIn site.
8. The Departmental CEO for Local Government was provided with a copy of the proposed local law and a copy of the local public notice, as required under section 3.12(3)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Decision Implications

9. If Council support the recommendation to make the *City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025*, the Administration will commence the process to gazette the local law and send a copy to the JSCDL in accordance with the ministerial direction under section 3.12(7) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
10. If Council do not support the recommendation the process to make the local law will cease and the City will not fulfill the undertakings provided to the JSCDL.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Local Government Act 1995</i> Section 3.12 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> outlines the procedure for making local laws.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council It is a legislative function of the local government to make local laws.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

- Estimated costs to prepare an Amendment Local Law to undertake the requirements of the JSCDL are \$3,000, which includes public advertising and publication in the Government Gazette.

Further Information

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-022)

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

That Council:

1. NOTES that no public submissions were received during the public submission period.
2. In accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, ADOPTS the *City of Perth Dogs Amendment Local Law 2025* as contained in Attachment A, for the purpose and effect as follows:

Purpose: To amend the *City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025*.

Effect: The *City of Perth Dogs Local Law 2025*, is amended.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

17.3 Adoption of the City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 17.3A – Proposed City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026 Attachment 17.3B – Consolidated Local Government Property Local Law 2005 - showing changes in red and green Attachment 17.3C – Consolidated Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017 - showing changes in red and green

Purpose

For Council to consider the adoption of the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026*.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. NOTES that no submissions were received during the public submission period.
2. In accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, ADOPTS the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026* as contained in Attachment A, for the purpose and effect as follows:

Purpose: To amend the *City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005* and *Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017*.

Effect: The *City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005* and *Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017*, are amended.

Background

1. Following the adoption of the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2025*, the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation (JSCDL) reviewed the local law and required some actions to be undertaken by the City. The report on the JSCDL review was presented to the Ordinary Council Meeting on 1 July 2025, where Council resolved as follows:

*“That Council **RESOLVES** to undertake to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation that the Council will:*

1. *Within six years, amend the City of Perth Local Government Property Local Law 2005 as follows:*
 - a. *In clause 37, delete the words ‘as defined in the Criminal Code Act Compilation Act 1913’*
 - b. *Make all consequential amendments arising from the above amendments.*
2. *Within six months, amend the City of Perth Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017 as follows:*
 - a. *In clause 1.6, insert a definition for ‘Rest Centre’*
 - b. *In clause 4A.1 insert a definition for ‘Health Act’*
 - c. *In the Schedule, item 48, replace the reference to clause ‘2.17(1)(a)’ to ‘2.17(1)’*
 - d. *In the clause 4A.1 definition of ‘nuisance’:*
 - i. *Paragraph (d), prescribe the threshold sound level that must not be exceeded when building works are carried out*
 - ii. *Paragraph (e), prescribe the threshold vibration level that must not be exceeded when building works are carried out*
 - e. *Make all consequential amendments arising from the above amendments.*
3. *Not enforce the local laws to the contrary before they are amended in accordance with undertakings 1 or 2, respectively.*
4. *Ensure that a copy of these undertakings accompanies the local laws wherever they are made publicly available by the City, whether in hard copy or electronic form.*
5. *In accordance with section 3.12(3) of the Local Government Act 1995, **APPROVES** the giving of local public notice of the City’s intention to make a City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026, as detailed in Attachment A, with the purpose and effect being:*

Purpose: *To amend the City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005 and Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017.*

Effect: *The City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005 and Thoroughfares and Public Place and Public Places Local Law 2017 are amended.”*

Discussion

2. The City gave local public notice of the proposal to make the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026* on 14 July 2025 and the submission period ran from 14 July 2025 to 29 August 2025, in accordance with section 3.12(3)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
3. A copy of the proposed local law and the local public notice was sent to the Departmental CEO for Local Government on 17 July 2025, in accordance with section 3.12(3)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

4. No public submissions were received during the public submission period.
5. The Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety (DLGIRS) provided drafting comments in relation to the proposed local law. These comments and officer response are provided below.

Feedback from the DLGIRS		Officer response
1.	Clause 1.3: This clause can be deleted if the amendments to clauses 2.1 and 3.1 are implemented.	Agreed. This has been deleted.
2.	Clause 2.1: Redesignate as clause 2.2 and prior to this clause, insert the following: 2.1 Local law amended This part amends the <i>City of Perth Local Government Property Local Law 2005</i> as published in the <i>Government Gazette</i> on 14 July 2005 and amended in the <i>Government Gazette</i> on 29 February 2008, 14 November 2015 and 21 March 2025.	Agreed. This has been updated in the local law attached for Council adoption.
3.	Clause 3.1: Redesignate as clause 3.2 and renumber the remaining clauses accordingly. Prior to this clause, insert the following: 3.1 Local law amended This part amends the <i>City of Perth Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017</i> , as published in the <i>Government Gazette</i> on 26 May 2017 and amended in the <i>Government Gazette</i> on 21 March 2025.	Agreed. This has been updated in the local law attached for Council adoption.
4	Replacement Schedule: The majority of the replacement schedule appears to be the same as the schedule originally in the local law. If the City wishes to specifically amend the penalty for clause 2.17, it may be more efficient to do so as follows: 3.4 First Schedule amended In the First Schedule, item 48 is amended by replacing “2.17(1)(a)” with “2.17(1)”.	Agreed. This has been updated in the local law attached for Council adoption.
5	The City should ensure that all references and cross references are accurate, particularly if any changes are made to the draft as a result of the above comments.	The City will ensure that all references and cross references are accurate.

6. Section 3.12(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995* states that after the last day of submissions, the local government is to consider any submissions made and may make the local law as proposed or make a law that is not significantly different from what was proposed.

Consultation

7. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with sections 3.12(3)(a) and 1.7 of the *Local Government Act 1995*:
- a. Local public notice was published on the City's official website.
 - b. A notice was also placed:
 - i. in the West Australian Newspaper,
 - ii. on the noticeboards at Council House and the Library, and
 - iii. on the City of Perth LinkedIn site.
8. The Departmental CEO for Local Government was provided with a copy of the proposed local law and a copy of the local public notice, as required under section 3.12(3)(b) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Decision Implications

9. If Council support the recommendation to make the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026*, the Administration will commence the process to gazette the local law and send a copy to the JSCDL in accordance with the ministerial direction under section 3.12(7) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
10. If Council do not support the recommendation the process to make the local law will cease and the City will not fulfill the undertakings provided to the JSCDL.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Local Government Act 1995</i> Section 3.12 of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> outlines the procedure for making local laws.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council It is a legislative function of the local government to make local laws.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

11. Estimated costs to prepare an Amendment Local Law to undertake the requirements of the JSCDL are \$3,000, which includes public advertising and publication in the Government Gazette.

Further Information

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-023)

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

That Council:

1. NOTES that no submissions were received during the public submission period.
2. In accordance with section 3.12 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, ADOPTS the *City of Perth Amendment Local Law 2026* as contained in Attachment A, for the purpose and effect as follows:

Purpose: To amend the *City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005* and *Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017*.

Effect: The *City of Perth, Local Government Property Local Law 2005* and *Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017*, are amended.

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

17.4 Review of Local Laws

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Nil.

Purpose

To seek Council approval to initiate a review of the following local laws:

1. *Health Local Law 2000;*
2. *Activities on Land Local Law 2001;*
3. *New Street Alignments Local Law 2005;*
4. *Public Trading Local law 2005;*
5. *Standing Orders Local Law 2009; and*
6. *Fencing Local Law 2015.*

Recommendation

That Council APPROVES a review the following local laws in accordance with section 3.16 of the Local Government Act 1995:

- a. *Health Local Law 2000;*
 - b. *Activities on Land Local Law 2001;*
 - c. *New Street Alignments Local Law 2005;*
 - d. *Public Trading Local Law 2005*
 - e. *Standing Orders Local Law 2009; and*
 - f. *Fencing Local Law 2015.*
-

Background

1. The second tranche of local government reforms, the *Local Government Amendment Act 2024*, was assented to on 6 December 2024.
2. Part of these reforms include changes to local law review requirements, which commenced on 7 December 2024.
3. The statutory requirement for local governments to review its local laws every 8 years has been extended to 15 years. Subject to the transitional provisions, local laws not reviewed within 15 years after they commenced, or after the last periodic review, will be repealed.
4. Transitional Provisions in the *Local Government Act 1995* (Schedule 9.3) must be applied to the City's existing local laws, to determine when their next review is required.
5. Local laws that commenced in the period between 7 December 2016 and 6 December 2024, and have not been due for review, are required to be reviewed before 15 years have lapsed since their commencement date.
6. These include the following City local laws:
 - a. *Outdoor Dining Local Law 2019* – due for review by 10 June 2034, and
 - b. *Parking Local Law 2017* – due for review by 13 March 2032.
7. Local laws that were reviewed in the period between 7 December 2016 and 6 December 2024 (from start to finish) are required to be reviewed before 15 years have lapsed since Council's determination that concludes the review under section 3.16(4) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
8. These include the following City local laws:
 - a. *Local Government Property Local Law 2005* – due for review by 23 September 2039.
 - b. *Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law 2017* – due for review by 23 September 2039.
9. For local laws that are currently under review, but the review has not been completed before 7 December 2024, the review process must be completed in accordance with the previous provisions of the *Local Government Act 1995* relating to local laws. The local law would then be due for review 15 years from the date of Council's determination that completes the review process under section 3.16.
10. There are no reviews currently underway.
11. Local laws that are overdue for review, and the process has not commenced for a review, must be reviewed before 6 December 2026. If a review has not been completed before this date, the local law will be revoked and no longer applicable or enforceable.
12. These include the following City local laws:
 - a. *Health Local Law 2000*,
 - b. *Activities on Land Local Law 2001*,
 - c. *New Street Alignments Local Law 2005*,
 - d. *Public Trading Local Law 2005*,
 - e. *Standing Orders Local Law 2009*, and
 - f. *Fencing Local Law 2015*.

Discussion

Health Local Law 2000

13. The *City of Perth Health Local Law 2000* has not undergone the statutory review process since its initial commencement on 19 June 2001 and was last due for review before 19 June 2009.
14. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed for currency, particularly since the introduction of the *Public Health Act 2016*.
15. The *Public Health Act 2016* does not make provisions for local laws, however, local laws related to public health may still be made under the *Local Government Act 1995*.

Activities on Land Local Law 2001

16. The *City of Perth Activities on Land Local Law 2001* was last reviewed 22 June 2004, when it was determined that amendments were required. No action followed. The local law was then due for review before 22 June 2012.
17. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed for currency against the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

New Street Alignments Local Law 2005

18. The *City of Perth New Street Alignments Local Law 2005* has not undergone the statutory review process since its initial commencement on 4 May 2005 and was last due for review before 4 May 2013.
19. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed for currency.

Public Trading Local Law 2005

20. The *City of Perth Public Trading Local Law 2005* was last reviewed on 10 December 2013 when it was determined that the local law remain unchanged. The local law was then due for review before 10 December 2021.
21. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed for currency.

Standing Orders Local Law 2009

22. The *City of Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2009* has not undergone the statutory review process since its initial commencement on 27 October 2009 and was last due for review before 27 October 2017.
23. It is anticipated that the upcoming standardised meeting procedures will repeal local laws relating to meeting procedures, however, these regulations are still being developed as of the date of this report and the commencement date is unknown.
24. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed with the intention of remaining unchanged, for the purpose of regulating the conduct of meetings should the standardised meeting procedures not be introduced before the review deadline.

Fencing Local Law 2015

25. The *City of Perth Fencing Local Law 2015* has not undergone the statutory review process since its initial commencement on 1 March 2016 and was last due for review before 1 March 2023.
26. It is recommended that this local law is reviewed for currency.

Consultation

27. Local public notice must be given of the proposed local law review, in accordance with sections 1.7 and 3.16(2) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
28. Public submissions may be made on the proposed review by the date specified in the notice, not less than six weeks after the notice is given.
29. Any submissions received will be considered and a summary will be provided in the review report to Council after the submission period.

Decision Implications

30. If Council approve the officer's recommendation, the City will commence the review process for the listed local laws, and they will, subject to the outcome of the review, continue to be applicable and enforceable.
31. If Council does not approve the officer's recommendation, the local laws will not be reviewed by the statutory deadline and will then be revoked and no longer application or enforceable.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Local Government Act 1995</i> and <i>Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996</i> . Local law reviews must be in accordance with section 3.16. Local public notice must be given in accordance section 1.7 and regulation 3A.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council Making local laws is a legislative function of local government.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

32. The financial implications of this report include the costs of advertising.

Further Information

Nil.

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-024)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council APPROVES a review the following local laws in accordance with section 3.16 of the Local Government Act 1995:

- a. *Health Local Law 2000;*
- b. *Activities on Land Local Law 2001;*
- c. *New Street Alignments Local Law 2005;*
- d. *Public Trading Local Law 2005*
- e. *Standing Orders Local Law 2009;* and
- f. *Fencing Local Law 2015.*

CARRIED EN BLOC (9/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer, Adam Pacan, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

17.5 2026 Council and Committee Meeting Dates

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Absolute Majority
Attachments	Attachment 17.5A – 2026 Meeting Calendar

Purpose

For Council to consider:

- the proposed dates for Ordinary Council, Special Council and Committee meetings to be held between 1 January 2026 and 31 December 2026; and
- the appointment of the Presiding and Deputy Presiding Member of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee.

Recommendation

That Council:

- APPROVES the 2026 dates, as depicted in **Attachment A**, for the following meetings:
 - Ordinary Council Meetings;
 - Special Council Meetings;
 - Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meetings; and
 - Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee Meetings.
- APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

- APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Deputy Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

Background

Meeting Dates

1. Section 5.3 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) specifies that every Council must hold Ordinary Council Meetings no more than three months apart.
2. Section 5.4 of the Act states that Ordinary Council Meetings are to be held if decided by Council.
3. In addition, Regulation 12 of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* (the Regulations) requires the CEO to publish on the City's website the dates, times and places where ordinary meetings are to be held.
4. Clause 2.3 of the City of Perth *Standing Orders Local Law 2009* states that an Ordinary Committee Meeting will be held if decided by the Council or Committee.

Presiding and Deputy Presiding Member of the CEOPR Committee

5. The *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) was amended on 7 December 2024 by the *Local Government Amendment Act 2024*, which has made changes to the way in which Presiding and Deputy Presiding Members are appointed to their positions on Council Committees.
6. Previously, Presiding and Deputy Presiding Members were required to be **elected** to their positions by the Committee. However, following recent amendments, section 5.12 of the Act now states that a member of the Committee must be **appointed** to the position of Presiding Member by Council (absolute majority required).
7. This section also states that a member of the Committee may also be appointed to the position of Deputy Presiding Member by Council (absolute majority required).

Discussion

8. The attached calendar (**Attachment A**) contains the dates of 2026 meetings required to be set by Council in accordance with the Act, and also contains meeting dates as set by the CEO.

Ordinary Council Meetings

9. City of Perth Ordinary Council Meetings are customarily held on the last Tuesday of each month, except for January where no meeting is held.
10. The Ordinary Council Meetings held in November and December are proposed to be held earlier than usual due to the Christmas period.
11. It is proposed that if a public holiday falls on the Monday before an Ordinary Council Meeting, the meeting will instead be held on the Wednesday of that week (April and September).
12. Ordinary Council meetings are proposed to be held in the Council Chambers at Council House, commencing at 5:00pm consistent with the 2025 meeting schedule and to maximise public participation outside of business hours.

Agenda Briefing Sessions

13. Agenda Briefing Sessions are customarily held, on the Tuesday, the week before Ordinary Council Meetings to give Elected Members an opportunity to ask questions on the agenda items to be presented. This also gives members of the public an opportunity to present deputations relating to items on the agenda.

14. The April Agenda Briefing Session is to be held one week earlier due to the impact of surrounding public holidays.
15. Agenda Briefing Sessions are proposed to be held in the Council Chambers at Council House, commencing at 5:00pm consistent with the 2025 meeting schedule and to maximise public participation outside of business hours.

Committees

16. The City has two Committees of Council; the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee and the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee.
17. These Committee meetings are not open to the public.
18. As the City has no Committees with delegated authority to make decisions, Council is required to set the meeting dates. Therefore, the proposed that 2026 Committee Meeting dates are included for consideration.

Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee

19. When considering the Audit, Risk and Improvement (ARIC) Committee meeting dates, regard has been given to annual requirements of the Committee for the statutory Compliance Audit Return (CAR) and the yearly Audited Financials and internal quarterly reporting dates.

Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee

20. When considering the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee meeting dates, regard has been given to the timing of the presentation of quarterly CEO KPI updates to Agenda Briefing Sessions and Ordinary Council Meetings.
21. At its Special Council Meeting on 28 October 2025, Council resolved to continue the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee and the following Committee members were appointed:
 - a. Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds
 - b. Councillor Liam Gobbert
 - c. Councillor David Goncalves
 - d. Councillor Lisa Ma
 - e. Councillor Chris Patton
22. Council is now required to appoint a CEOPR Committee Member as presiding member and may also appoint a deputy presiding member.

Special Council Meeting

23. In addition to the above, the City of Perth Corporate Business Plan (CBP), Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) and 2026/27 Budget have historically been approved at a Special Council Meeting given the complexity and importance of this process.
24. A Special Council Meeting is proposed for Tuesday, 14 July 2026 for the purpose of adopting the 2026/27 Budget.

Elected Member Engagement Sessions

25. Traditionally, Elected Member Engagement Sessions (EMES) have been held on the first Tuesday of the month and additional meetings are scheduled as required. These meetings are not open to the public.

26. With the exception of those Tuesday's following a public holiday, and the November EMES, these meetings will continue to be held on the first Tuesday of the month.
27. The CEO determines the schedule for these meetings.

CEO Briefing Sessions

28. CEO briefing sessions provide a regular, informal forum for Elected members to engage directly with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO).
29. These sessions will generally be held on the first Tuesday of the month, prior to the EMES, and additional meetings will be scheduled as required.
30. These meetings are not open to the public. A meeting may be cancelled if a formal meeting is scheduled or if there are no substantive agenda items.
31. The CEO determines the schedule for these meetings.

Budget Workshops

32. Interactive Budget Workshops give Elected Members an opportunity to engage with the City and further understand the budget process. Three budget workshops have been scheduled for 2026.
33. The CEO determines the schedule for these meetings.

Consultation

34. The dates, times and location of meetings, which are open to the public, will be published on the City's website following Council's consideration.
35. Elected members were requested to provide feedback on 7 November 2025.
36. One (1) elected member provided feedback on meetings for which Council are responsible, and this is addressed as follows:

Feedback	Administration Response
<p>Two OCM's are shifted to Wednesdays to account for public holidays. This is not my preference; however I understand this makes it easier for the administration, therefore I am not concerned if this stays.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Ordinary Council Meetings (OCMs) continue to be held on the Wednesday following a public holiday. This scheduling is advised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow adequate time for the administration to prepare for the meeting, including responses to public questions and the preparation of meeting documents; and • Consider that elected members and members of the public may take leave around public holidays. <p>Accordingly, it is recommended that the current scheduling remain unchanged.</p>

Decision Implications

37. If Council approves the schedule of meeting dates as recommended, compliance with Regulation 12 of the Regulations is achieved.

38. If Council supports the recommendation and appoints both a Presiding Member and a Deputy Presiding Member, it will ensure compliance with the Act and provide a contingency should the Presiding Member be unavailable or unwilling to preside over a CEOPR Committee Meeting.
39. If Council does not support the recommendation, there will be uncertainty regarding who will preside over CEOPR Committee Meetings and it will not meet the legislative requirements relating to Committees of Council.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Nil.

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<p><i>Local Government Act 1995</i> Section 5.3 Section 5.4 <i>Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996</i> Regulation 12 <i>City of Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2009</i> Clause 2.3 <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> – provides the legislative requirements of Council Committees and presiding/deputy presiding members <i>Local Government Amendment Act 2024</i> – provides the legislative changes to the Act which affect the CEOPR Committee</p>
Authority of Council/CEO:	<p>Council are required to adopt the dates for formal Council and Committee meetings. The dates for ABS, EMES and Budget Workshops are decided by the CEO. Council is required to appoint a presiding member to the CEOPR Committee and may appoint a deputy presiding member – absolute majority required for both.</p>
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

Nil.

Further Information

40. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Point 22. If the Lord Mayor had liaised with the Administration before reinstating the CEOPR could this extra been dealt with at the time, rather than yet another appointment motion	Yes. If the Deputy Lord Mayor had sought advice ahead of the Special Council Meeting held on 28 October 2025, regarding his intended alternate motion, information about the presiding and deputy presiding member for the CEOPR Committee would have been included, averting the need for an additional paper to go to Council.

Officer Recommendation

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

That Council:

1. APPROVES the 2026 dates, as depicted in **Attachment A**, for the following meetings:
 - a. Ordinary Council Meetings;
 - b. Special Council Meetings;
 - c. Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meetings; and
 - d. Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee Meetings.
2. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

3. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Deputy Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

During debate, the Lord Mayor moved the following amended motion:

Amended Motion (OCM-25/12-025)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council:

1. APPROVES the 2026 dates, as depicted in **Attachment A**, for the following meetings:
 - a. Ordinary Council Meetings;
 - b. Special Council Meetings;
 - c. Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meetings; and
 - d. Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee Meetings.
2. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	16 October 2027

3. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Deputy Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

CARRIED (6/2) BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Raj Doshi and Catherine Lezer

The amended motion was incorporated into the substantive motion which was then put:

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-026)

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

That Council:

1. APPROVES the 2026 dates, as depicted in **Attachment A**, for the following meetings:
 - a. Ordinary Council Meetings;
 - b. Special Council Meetings;
 - c. Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Meetings; and
 - d. Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee Meetings.
2. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds	16 October 2027

3. APPOINTS the following Committee Member as **Deputy Presiding Member** of the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Committee:

Member Name	Term Expiry
Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

CARRIED (6/2) BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Chris Patton and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Raj Doshi and Catherine Lezer

Reasons for Change:

To provide the names of the Presiding and the Deputy Presiding Member for Council's consideration.

17.6 Information regarding decisions of Council on a proposed workplace culture review

Responsible Officer	Wendy Attenborough – A/Chief Executive Officer
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Nil.

Purpose

To present administration advice regarding the Notice of Motion passed by Council on 18 November 2025 (Item 21.1) and subsequent events.

Recommendation

That Council RECEIVE the information provided.

Background

1. This report is provided to Council to ensure clarity regarding Council's decision made at the Ordinary Council meeting of 18 November 2025 to (amongst other things):
 - a. establish a new Committee of Council (Workplace Culture Committee) with Terms of Reference set out in an Attachment to the decision;
 - b. appoint Mills Oakley as an Independent Consultant to undertake a Workplace Culture Review and prepare a written Workplace Culture Review Report;
 - c. authorise the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor to sign an engagement agreement with Mills Oakley as an Independent Consultant; and
 - d. authorise a total project budget not to exceed \$125,000 plus GST, to be funded from the 2025/26 budget
2. It is the Administration's view that this decision ignores Council's statutory responsibilities to make informed decisions; is a poor use of ratepayer funds; fails to meet accepted good governance principles and good government; shuns the legislated role of the CEO as the principal advisor to Council; contravenes Council's Code of Conduct and the *Local Government Act 1995*; and contravenes the Council's Purchasing Policy and regulation 11A(1) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*. It is not a lawful decision and is therefore unable to be implemented.

Discussion

3. In the CEO's Performance Review, held in August 2025, no issues were raised by elected members regarding workplace culture. Indeed, the review unanimously recognised the high performance of the CEO and her achievements. In establishing KPI's for the 2025-26 year workplace culture was not indicated as an issue requiring attention by Council.
4. The proposed engagement of Mills Oakley to conduct a review of workplace culture at a cost of up to \$125,000 to ratepayers does not constitute value for money given the sophistication of the City's work health and safety system and the comprehensive nature of reporting on it both to the Executive and the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee.
5. The Administration understands that \$77,000 (inc. GST) of the \$125,000, represents a cost indicated for 'Stage 1' of the proposed Mills Oakley review, with no current advice before Council as to further stages and associated costs, excepting reference to possible future litigation. Any future stages or litigation have not been the subject of any discussion before Council or with the Administration.

The Primary Notice of Motion

6. A Notice of Motion to establish the Committee and the Review was moved by the Lord Mayor as a matter of urgency at the end of the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) of 18 November 2025. The Lord Mayor circulated his Notice of Motion (Primary NoM) to all elected members and limited members of the Administration at 16.54 hrs, six minutes before the start of the OCM.
7. The A/CEO first became aware of the Motion when it was distributed in hard copy format towards the end of the OCM, when the Lord Mayor introduced the item.
8. Early in the business of the 18 November OCM the Lord Mayor asked all elected members to acknowledge they had sufficient time to consider the agenda items presented. Councillor Lezer indicated she had not had sufficient time to review the item distributed by the Lord Mayor at 16.54. The Lord Mayor responded, "that's ok, we will review that a little bit later in the evening".

9. Once the Agenda Item was reached, the Lord Mayor did not provide any information or background to the OCM as to why his motion was urgent, other than to say that the nature of it meant it was not advisable to wait until the next OCM. No further information was provided, other than a reading of the motion itself and a short comment from the Deputy Lord Mayor indicating he was honoured to second it.
10. No questions or debate were allowed at the OCM regarding the Lord Mayor's Primary NoM, with a procedural motion (seconded by the Lord Mayor) moved to put the matter to an immediate vote. This is inconsistent with the Lord Mayor's indication to Cr Lezer that the matter would be reviewed when the agenda item was reached.
11. This is a probable breach of the *Local Government Act 1995* which requires (amongst other things) that Council members facilitate and maintain good working relationships with fellow councillors and the CEO.
12. It is also a likely breach of Council Standing Orders, the purpose of which are intended to result in better decision-making at meetings, the orderly and efficient conduct of meetings, and greater community understanding of the business of Council.
13. It is entirely inconsistent with the fundamental objects and purposes of the Local Government Act, including those set out in section 3.1(2) relating to –
 - (a) better decision making by local governments; and
 - (b) greater community participation in the decisions and affairs of local governments; and
 - (c) greater accountability of local governments to their communities; and
 - (d) more efficient and effective local government'.

The first revocation motion

14. After the OCM Councillor Lezer advised the Administration that she intended to move a revocation motion at the next OCM, scheduled for 9 December 2025. The effect of this revocation motion, if passed, would have been to revoke the Primary NoM (ie Council decision of the 18 November 2025).
15. On Friday 21 November the A/CEO advised the Lord Mayor that Councillor Lezer intended to move a revocation motion at the next OCM. Councillor Lezer subsequently circulated a draft motion to her elected member colleagues, as is usual practice, on 22 November 2025.
16. Later that day, Councillor Lezer sent to the Acting CEO a formal notice of motion to revoke the Council resolution made on 18 November 2025 (in accordance with the provisions of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* and the City of Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2009 (Standing Orders)). The notice of motion, as required by the Standing Orders, nominated the next Ordinary Meeting of the Council (OCM) as the date on which she would move her motion. This did not constitute a formal 'moving' of the motion by Councillor Lezer, which can only occur at a meeting of Council.
17. On Saturday 22 November 2025 the Lord Mayor requested that a Special Council Meeting (SCM) be convened on Tuesday 25 November 2025, for the sole purpose of considering a revocation motion.
18. The Administration provided advice that, as there had been no formal lodgement of a revocation motion that could be considered at the proposed SCM on 25 November 2025, the agenda for that SCM would contain no reports for Council's consideration. The Lord Mayor subsequently advised the Administration that a SCM does not require an item to already exist, and that the meeting should be convened. The Lord Mayor also took this opportunity to include another item for the SCM agenda.
19. There is no legislative basis for such a position to be pursued and the Lord Mayor's insistence on proceeding with this course of action is inconsistent with the City's Standing Orders Local Law.

20. Prior to the SCM the Administration provided legal advice to all elected members which outlined significant legal and governance issues with the decision of 18 November 2025. Elected Members were urged to consider the legal advice ahead of the SCM.
21. Due to the short notice given for the SCM, a number of elected members were not able to attend. This included Cr Lezer and each of the other 2 elected members who voted against the resolution adopted at the OCM on 18 November 2025. As a result, the only elected members in attendance at the SCM were those who voted in favour of the resolution adopted by the Council at the OCM on 18 November 2025.

The Second Revocation Motion

22. At 1447 hrs on the 25 November 2025 (ie 13 minutes ahead of the 1500 hrs SCM start time) Cr Gobbert provided advice of his intention to move a revocation motion (the Second Revocation Motion) at the SCM. The Second Revocation Motion was moved at the SCM, but was not supported by those in attendance at the meeting, including Cr Gobbert.
23. The decision at the SCM on the Second Revocation Motion is invalid and of no effect. This is because a valid notice of revocation motion cannot lawfully be given by an elected member in circumstances where a valid notice of revocation motion in the same terms (or in substantially the same terms) has already been given to the CEO under clause 11.3 of the Standing Orders, and where the earlier revocation motion has not yet been considered and determined by the Council at the date of the Council meeting specified in the earlier revocation motion.
24. Given the Second Revocation Motion was invalid and that the First Revocation Motion (Cr Lezer's notice of revocation motion) remains valid, the Administration is barred, under the Standing Orders, from taking any steps to implement or give effect to the Council resolution of 18 November 2025 (including any steps to progress the engagement of Mills Oakley to conduct a review of workplace culture).

The proposed review

25. **No information has been provided to the CEO by the Lord Mayor or any other elected member which supports the need for an urgent and broad review of workplace culture.** The CEO is unaware of any matters which would require the urgent establishment of a Workplace Culture Committee to consider employee culture and wellbeing. If such matters do exist there is a responsibility upon the Lord Mayor and Council to bring them to the immediate attention of the CEO or the appropriate integrity body.
26. However, **concerns have been raised with the CEO regarding the psychosocial wellbeing and safety of some elected members, and some staff who work closely with them.** In 2025, 10 complaints have been received from staff and elected members regarding the behaviour of elected members. Eight of those have been received since June 2025.
27. The CEO raised these concerns with the Lord Mayor on a number of occasions and particularly on 6 and 12 November 2025. This was done in accordance with her obligations under the Work Health and Safety Act.
28. At the meeting of 12 November 2025 the CEO advised the Lord Mayor of her intention to commission an independent risk assessment to consider psychosocial wellbeing and safety. The risk assessment has been commissioned.
30. The CEO took pre-approved personal leave on 14 November 2025.

Good government, good governance and the separation of powers

31. The *Local Government Act 1995* (section 3.1) establishes that the general function of a local government is to provide for good government. 'Good government' means (amongst other things) that decisions

are made in the interests of the community the local government serves and are made in an informed manner.

32. Section 5.41(3) of the *Local Government Act* provides that the CEO is the council's principal advisor and, as such:
 - (a) advises, and procures advice for, Council
 - (b) ensures that Council has the information and advice it needs to make informed and timely decisions.
33. No advice was given by the A/CEO to the Council in relation to the Proposed Motion, as no information was sought by the Lord Mayor ahead of his tabling of the motion. No questions or debate were allowed once the motion was moved.
34. The role of the Lord Mayor includes liaising with the CEO (section 2.8(1)(e)). There was no liaison by the Lord Mayor with the A/CEO in relation to the Proposed Motion. This constitutes an 'improper use' of the office of the Lord Mayor, and a breach of the Rules of Conduct, as set out in Division 4 of the *City of Perth Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates*. The Lord Mayor should have liaised with the CEO about the Proposed Motion from the time that he began to prepare it.
35. The role of the Lord Mayor also includes providing leadership and guidance to Council members, including guidance as to their roles (section 2.8(1)(a)).
36. In the circumstances presenting on 18 November 2025, where the Lord Mayor proceeded to ensure that the Proposed Motion, without notice, would be considered by the Council without any advice from the CEO, it was open to the Council to resolve to not proceed with consideration of the Proposed Motion until it had relevant advice and information from the A/CEO.
37. **This would have been consistent with Council's obligations**, under section 2.7 of the *Local Government Act* to respect the separation of powers (section 2.7(3)) and **to make its decisions 'on the basis of evidence, on the merits and in accordance with the law' (section 2.7(4))**.
38. It **would also have been consistent with fundamental principles of good decision-making**, whereby decisions of this nature are not made without the opportunity for all Council members to give proper consideration to the issues, after having been provided with all relevant information and advice.
39. **Instead, in adopting the Proposed Motion, the Council prevented the A/CEO from exercising the CEO's legislative role and deprived itself of advice and information** required to make an informed decision.

Responsibility for management and administration of the City

40. Under section 5.41(2)(g) of the *Local Government Act*, it is the CEO, not the Council, who is responsible for the management and administration of the City.
41. **The CEO is also responsible**, under section 5.41(5), for any other function imposed under another Act or another written law. Under the *Work Health and Safety Act 2020* (WHS Act), the principal responsibility **for workplace health and safety** is vested in the 'person conducting a business or undertaking' (PCBU). For a local government, this is the CEO (either alone or with other senior employees of the local government).
42. The primary duty of care of a PCBU is set out in section 19 of the WHS Act. It provides that a PCBU must ensure (so far as is reasonably practicable) the health and safety of workers. The responsibilities in this regard are extensive and include psychological health and psychosocial safety.
43. There is at least a significant overlap between the CEO's responsibilities for the management of the City's employees (under the *Local Government Act* and the WHS Act) and the proposed objectives of

the Workplace Culture Committee. Given this, **it was particularly important for the Council to have obtained and properly considered advice and information from the A/CEO before making a decision.**

Work Health, Safety and Employee Experience at the City of Perth

44. The system of work health and safety at the City of Perth is **structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement**, including with respect to employee experience and workplace culture. The effectiveness of the WHS system is embedded in the City's Strategic Risk Register, providing the most senior level of visibility and accountability.
45. The City's WHS system efficacy is reported to Council through the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC). The last two reports were provided to ARIC in May and November 2025. The reports noted no known systemic or major areas of concern. Of particular note, employee turnover trends are below the local government sector average.
46. The City's WHS system is applied through a practical framework that is supported by best practice, organising our efforts around the five key pillars of:
 - Management commitment and documentation
 - Hazard identification and awareness
 - Risk assessment and risk management
 - Training and consultation
 - Monitoring and reporting
47. Overall investment in staff through workplace culture and wellbeing initiatives was increased to \$1,328,664 in the 2025/26 Budget, up from \$1,245,733 in the previous financial year. This includes funding for (amongst other things) leadership development, professional development, WHS training, staff performance shaping, employee reward and recognition for high performance and respectful team-orientated behaviours, a comprehensive Employee Assistance Program, and staff healthy lifestyle subsidy.
48. Confidential employee experience surveys (including through the industry leading 'Culture Amp' on-line tool) and focus groups are conducted regularly (with two employee 'pulse-check' surveys in 2025). Together with injury and hazard metrics, survey results guide organisational continuous improvement activity, such as roll out of a new 'emerging leader program', updates to policies and procedures and risk assessments for front-line staff.
49. **Metrics currently indicate a stable workforce, effective incident management practices, and a proactive safety culture, including with respect to staff wellbeing and workplace culture. Continuous improvement activities are identified and executed.**
50. Further information about the City's WHS system, including its culture and wellbeing focus, can be found on the City's website at [Our evolution to sustained excellence | City of Perth](#)

Purchasing Policy, procurement of Mills Oakley and value for money considerations

51. Regulation 11A(1) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* requires a local government to prepare and implement a purchasing policy in relation to contracts where the value is, or is expected to be, \$250,000 or less or worth \$250,000 or less.
52. Under regulation 11A(2), the Purchasing Policy must be 'followed by the local government'. The 'local government' in the case of the City of Perth, comprises the Council and the Administration.

53. Council last considered its Purchasing Policy in August 2025 when amendments were adopted, consistent with relevant statutory requirements. The Purchasing Policy is a policy of Council.
54. The Purchasing Policy is expressed to apply to ‘all employees, appointed representatives or agents ... involved in the procurement of goods and services for the City’. Construed in the context of regulation 11A(2), the Purchasing Policy must apply to the Council to the extent that it is ‘involved in the procurement of goods and services for the City’ – either because it is an ‘agent’ or, in any event, because that is required by regulation 11A(2) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations*.
55. In authorising the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor to finalise and sign an engagement agreement with Mills Oakley on behalf of the City, Council has not given appropriate consideration to the separation of roles established within s2.7(3) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
56. If an individual Council member, including the Lord Mayor, sought quotations of the type described in the Purchasing Policy they may be in breach of clause 19 of the *City’s Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates*.
57. **The question as to whether or not Council may undertake what would otherwise be considered to be administrative actions (ie procuring of legal advice) was considered by the Authorised Inquiry into the Town of Cambridge.** Specifically, that Inquiry found that by authorising the Mayor to undertake administrative tasks:
- Council failed to ensure good governance processes with respect to procuring law firms and the appropriate allocation of the Town’s finances, and
 - Council interfered in administrative matters by engaging law firms which is a function of the administration.
58. Leaving aside the question of whether the Lord Mayor (or any other Council member) has breached clause 19 of the *City’s Code of Conduct*, no information has been provided to Council regarding:
- the process of selecting law firm Mills Oakley as the Independent Review consultancy and its appropriateness for the task
 - how the project budget was established, particularly given it is understood Mills Oakley will provide a Senior Council (amongst others in a legal team) to conduct the review
 - the scope of work, methodology, resourcing, milestones and deliverables of the review
 - the contract management arrangements.
59. If, as it appears from the information currently available, Mills Oakley was appointed by the Council without complying with the requirements of the Purchasing Policy, that appointment is invalid. As a result, the Administration cannot take any steps to implement or give effect to that decision (such as the review of the proposed terms of engagement of Mills Oakley).
60. All of these matters go to questions of best practice and compliance in procurement processes, and ensuring value for money and transparency.

Next steps

61. It is recommended that the Motion of Revocation before Council at Agenda Item 19.1 is supported in the interests of good governance and good government.
62. Any engagement between Mills Oakley and any elected members, including the Lord Mayor, should cease as it contravenes Council’s Code of Conduct and the *Local Government Act 1995*

63. The CEO is keen to discuss with elected members issues of interest or concern that prompted the Lord Mayor’s original notice of motion. Such action would be consistent with the provisions of the *Local Government Act* to enable advice to be provided to Council by the CEO, and liaison between the Lord Mayor and the CEO.
64. Such engagement will ascertain where confidence needs to be built in relation to the City’s WHS system and provide data and suggestions for subsequent actions.
65. Importantly, it will provide the community the opportunity for an open and transparent discussion about matters of importance to Council and activities of the Administration.

Consultation

66. Legal advice was sought by the Administration regarding the Primary Motion of 18 November 2025 and subsequent events. This legal advice has been provided to all Elected Members.

Decision Implications

67. This report is provided for noting purposes.

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032 Corporate Business Plan 2025/26 – 2028/29 <i>Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates.</i>

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	<i>Local Government Act 1995</i> <i>Standing Orders Local Law 2009</i>
Authority of Council/CEO:	It is recommended that Council receive this advice.
Policy:	CP 2.2 - Purchasing Policy

Financial Implications

Nil.

Further Information

68. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	Did any “new elected member” seek any advice from governance or admin on any of the matters related to the culture committee proposal of the Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds?	No. New elected members did not seek advice in relation to the Lord Mayor’s notice of motion at the 18 November 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting.
2.	Basis for calling Council’s decision “UNLAWFUL” In the Current Issues Briefing Note dated 27 November 2025, Council’s decision on 18 is described as “UNLAWFUL and therefore unable to be actioned.” Can Governance please: Indicate any section of the Local Government Act, Regulations or Standing Orders that prohibits the Council from establishing a new committee?	Section 5.8 of the Local Government Act 1995 provides that a local government may establish committees of three or more persons to assist the Council, noting that an absolute majority decision is required. However such action needs to be done in a manner which meets the requirements of the Act (and thus is lawful). This is considered further within the legal advice provided to Elected Members on 25 November 2025.
3.	Identify the exact clause in the Local Government Act 1995 that prohibits Council from initiating a governance level workplace culture review?	This matter is covered in advice provided to Elected Members on 25 and 27 November 2025.
4.	Confirm that Council has an oversight duty under the Local Government Act 1995 under section 2.7 regarding performance and governance of the organisation, including culture and staff wellbeing?	Section 2.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 outlines that Council is responsible for key governance functions. However, the Act also makes clear that these responsibilities must be nuanced and balanced with the principle of separation between the Council’s governing role and the CEO’s executive role under section 5.41. Section 2.7(3) specifically requires that, in ensuring proper governance, Council must have regard to the following principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Council’s role is distinct from the CEO’s administrative and operational functions; and • it is important that the Council respects that separation. In practical terms, this means that while Council may set strategic direction and provide

		oversight, it must not step into operational decision-making or direct employees other than through the CEO. Any oversight functions must therefore be exercised in a manner consistent with the CEO's statutory authority to manage day-to-day operations, staff, and the implementation of Council decisions.
5.	Indicate any section of the Local Government Act, Regulations or Standing Orders that requires the mover of a motion to consult the CEO before submitting it?	This matter is considered in the advice provided to Elected Members on 25 November 2025.
6.	Confirm that the Standing Orders Local Laws clause 14.4 expressly permits urgent business at the discretion of the presiding member?	<p>The inclusion of urgent business is not an unfettered discretion.</p> <p>In accordance with Clause 4.14 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009, the Presiding Member must be satisfied that one of the following applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the nature of the business is such that it cannot reasonably wait for inclusion on the agenda of the next meeting; or b) delaying the matter to the next meeting could result in adverse legal or financial implications for the City.
7.	Confirm that the Standing Orders Local Laws clause 12.1(d) allows for a procedural motion to put the motion to the vote at any time?	This matter was covered in the advice provided to elected members on 27 November 2025.
8.	Identify the specific passages in the McLeods advice that characterise the 18 November resolution itself as unlawful, and	The legal advice provided to elected members indicates, in some detail, the failure of Council to act in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 when endorsing the motion of 18 November 2025.
9.	clarify whether that term "unlawful" is intended to apply to the whole resolution, or only to particular aspects (for example, the procurement process or the attempted 25 November revocation)?	See question 8 above.
10.	The briefing note alleges the motion breached the Code of Conduct. Please identify the clause number of the Code breached and how, noting that Code applies to behaviour, not motions?	This is identified in the Agenda Briefing Session Paper at paragraph 34.

11.	<p>The briefing note claims no culture issues exist yet also states that the CEO raised psychosocial safety concerns and 10 complaints have been received. Can these two contradictory statements be reconciled?</p>	<p>This is not correct.</p> <p>The Agenda report states at (25) and (26):</p> <p>The CEO is unaware of any matters which would require the urgent establishment of a Workplace Culture Committee to consider employee culture and wellbeing.</p> <p>And</p> <p>That ten complaints have been received from staff and elected members regarding the behaviour of elected members; eight of which since June 2025.</p>
12.	<p>Confirm that a WHS psychosocial risk assessment and a workplace culture review are two separate processes with different purposes under different Acts?</p>	<p>As contained within the Report (at 28):</p> <p>The CEO initiated an independent risk assessment to consider psychosocial wellbeing and safety in response to concerns raised with her by staff and elected members.</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the legal advice provided in CI BNs on 25 and 26 November deals with the CEOs responsibilities under the <i>Local Government Act 1995 and the Work Health and Safety Act 2020</i>.</p>
13.	<p>Unimplementable vs unlawful</p> <p>My reading of the advice is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the 25 November revocation resolution is said to be <i>invalid and of no effect</i>; and • while a valid revocation motion is on foot, <i>no steps are to be taken to implement or give effect to the 18 November resolution.</i> <p>Can Governance confirm whether the advice distinguishes between:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) a decision that is <i>unlawful in itself</i>; and b) a decision that may be lawful but currently <i>cannot be implemented</i> because of 	<p>The legal advice provided clearly addresses these matters, particularly whether the decision of 18 November was done in accordance with the law, and whether the revocation motion of 25 November was valid.</p> <p>The CEO cannot implement a decision of Council which is unlawful and/or invalid.</p>

	<p>Standing Orders or other procedural reasons?</p> <p>c) Does the Local Government Act give the CEO the power to deem a Council decision "invalid" or "unlawful"?</p> <p>d) Confirm that the Local Government Act 1995 Section 5.41(c) outlines the function of a CEO is to cause Council decisions to be implemented?</p>	
14.	<p>3. Procurement, exemptions and legal services</p> <p>a) Does any of the written legal advice specifically address: the legal services / WALGA-preferred supplier exemption in the City's Purchasing Policy; and whether that exemption would have applied to Mills Oakley for the purposes of the 18 November resolution?</p> <p>Can Governance confirm whether the Purchasing Policy is drafted primarily as an administrative instrument applying to employees and agents, and whether a departure from that policy by Council, of itself, renders a Council decision unlawful or simply creates a governance / risk issue?</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with in the legal advice provided to all Elected Members on 25 November 2025.</p> <p>However, for the purposes of clarity, and as set out in the report to Council, under regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, the Purchasing Policy (in relation to contracts where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000) must be 'followed by the local government' and 'the local government', in the case of the City of Perth, comprises the Council and the Administration.</p> <p>In relation to any proposed contract where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000, the Council and the Administration must, as a matter of law, have regard to, and genuinely consider, the Purchasing Policy. There is no record of any evidence that the Council, before appointing Mills Oakley, had regard to and genuinely considered the Purchasing Policy. As a result, that decision was in breach of regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 because it resulted in the Purchasing Policy not being 'followed by the local government'.</p> <p>The Purchasing Policy, adopted by the Council, provides for an exemption to be given to the CEO in respect of the engagement of Legal Services Providers. There is no similar exemption that is given to the Council.</p>
15.	<p>4. Procurement as "administration only"</p>	<p>See question 3 above.</p>

	<p>The legal advice notes that the Purchasing Policy applies to “employees, appointed representatives or agents ... involved in the procurement of goods and services” and that procurement process requirements sit within the executive role of the CEO, not the governing role of Council.</p> <p>Can Governance please clarify the City’s position on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether Council <i>can</i> lawfully resolve to engage a legal services provider, leaving the CEO to manage process details; and • if Council does so without the usual RFQ process, whether that is characterised in the advice as <i>unlawful</i>, or as a failure to follow preferred administrative process? 	
16.	<p>5. Section 5.45(2)(a) and Council’s ability to obtain legal advice</p> <p>Can Governance please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) explain how section 5.45(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 1995 has been taken into account in the advice; and b) advise whether any provision of the Act <i>prevents</i> Council, by resolution, from seeking its own independent legal advice (including from a barrister or SC), as distinct from advice procured via the CEO? 	<p>This matter is dealt with in the legal advice provided on 25 November 2025.</p>
17.	<p>My question is basis for calling council decision unlawful and the current issue briefing note dated 27th of November. Council's decision on 18 is described as unlawful and they're not and therefore cannot be actioned. In your experience in governance is it's a yes and no answer. Is it unlawful yes or isn't it no?</p>	<p>The legal advice provided to Elected Members regarding Council's decision of 18 November 2025 sets out the failure of Council to meet the lawful requirements of Local Government Act 1995.</p>
18.	<p>This question is for the administration regarding the complaints data. We've heard about it quite a bit. We have heard</p>	<p>The administration can only provide information on the number of complaints</p>

	<p>that 10 complaints regarding behavior have received in 2025 with eight since June.</p> <p>Can the administration please provide the total number of complaints received since the 1st of April 25 broken down by the three complaint categories. The behavioral complaints, the minor complaints, and the serious complaints.</p>	<p>received in relation to Behavioural Breach Complaints.</p> <p>The Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety may be able to provide information relating to Minor and Serious Breach complaints.</p>
19.	<p>Is the culture work already been done by the city independent? I know there's substantial culture work already being done, but is it independent?</p>	<p>The system of work health and safety at the City of Perth is structured, legislatively compliant and underpinned by an active commitment to continuous improvement, including in relation to employee experience and workplace culture.</p> <p>Information about the City's organisational culture initiatives and improvement programs is available on our website at: Our evolution to sustained excellence City of Perth</p> <p>The City has committed more than \$1.3 million in the 2025/26 budget to workplace culture and wellbeing initiatives.</p> <p>This work includes a range of measures which enable anonymity and appropriate confidentiality.</p>
20.	<p>If an inspector, if the inspector was to be appointed uh and the Lord Mayor said he was inviting them in, who pays for the inspector's work?</p>	<p>Please see information at Local Government Inspector and Monitors for the role and powers of the Local Government Inspector and Monitors. Any appointment of a monitor by the Local Government Inspector will be borne by the local government.</p>
21.	<p>Just to follow up to councillor Gobbert's question, can the admin advise whether setting policy effectively catch creates a catch 22 for council in that council is expected to comply with policy itself rather than the admin following policy when it's making decisions. Yet the policy itself may limit or predetermine the very powers that council is meant to independently exercise under the act as a legislating body?</p>	<p>The City is required under the Local Government Act 1995 to maintain a Purchasing Policy.</p> <p>Council establishes policy provisions to guide how specific functions are to be carried out, ensuring quality, transparency, and consistent decision-making.</p> <p>Under regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, the Purchasing Policy (in relation to contracts where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000) must be 'followed by the local government' and 'the local government', in the case of the City of</p>

		<p>Perth, comprises the Council and the Administration.</p> <p>In relation to any proposed contract where the value is expected to be less than \$250,000, the Council and the Administration must, as a matter of law, have regard to, and genuinely consider, the Purchasing Policy. There is no record of any evidence that the Council, before appointing Mills Oakley, had regard to and genuinely considered the Purchasing Policy. As a result, that decision was in breach of regulation 11A(2) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 because it resulted in the Purchasing Policy not being 'followed by the local government'.</p> <p>The Purchasing Policy, adopted by the Council, provides for an exemption to be given to the CEO in respect of the engagement of Legal Services Providers. There is no similar exemption that is given to the Council.</p>
22.	<p>Just the follow up there is just in terms of councillor Gobbert's question there asking for that advice and the response given by the acting CEO was that they would provide that. I'd like to know will that be provided for the OCM.</p>	<p>The question has been answered.</p>

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-027)

Mover: Councillor Catherine Lezer

Seconded: Councillor Raj Doshi

That Council RECEIVE the information provided.

CARRIED (6/2)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Catherine Lezer, Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Viktor Ko and Chris Patton

7:26pm Councillor Chris Patton retired from the meeting during Item 17.7.

17.7 Termination of Membership - Catalina Regional Council

Responsible Officer	Charlie Clarke – A/Executive Director Governance and Strategy
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Nil.

Purpose

The purpose of this report, should Council choose to proceed with this matter, is to:

- outline the requirements relating to membership of the Catalina Regional Council (CRC) Establishment Agreement, that the City is a party; and
- advise Council on the steps necessary to ensure compliance

Recommendation

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

Background

1. At its Special Council Meeting on 28 October 2025, Council resolved the following:

“5. *APPOINTS* the following elected members as members and/or deputy members of the committees and external groups as listed:

d. *Catalina Regional Council*

<i>Member</i>	<i>Term Expiry</i>
<i>Councillor Raj Doshi</i>	<i>16 October 2027</i>
<i>Deputy Member</i>	<i>Term Expiry</i>
<i>Councillor David Goncalves</i>	<i>16 October 2027”</i>

2. At its Ordinary Council Meeting on 18 November 2025, Council further resolved the following:

“3. *APPOINTS* the following elected members as members and/or deputy members of the committees and external groups as listed:

a. *Catalina Regional Council*

<i>Member</i>	<i>Term Expiry</i>
<i>Councillor David Goncalves</i>	<i>16 October 2027</i>
<i>Deputy Member</i>	<i>Term Expiry</i>
<i>Councillor Raj Doshi</i>	<i>16 October 2027”</i>

Discussion

3. The only valid way in which Council can change its membership of the Catalina Regional Council, as outlined under Section 6.2 of its establishment agreement is:

- Following the next ordinary election (October 2027) when membership terms end
- If the member/deputy member ceases being a City of Perth Councillor
- If the member/deputy member resign their position on the CRC
- If the Council **terminates** the members appointment

4. Therefore, as advised by the administration in its response to the Notice of Motion of the 18 November 2025 ‘19.2 Notice of Motion – Appointments and Nominations to Council Committees and External Bodies’ raised by Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves, the membership approved by Council on the 18 November 2025 did not terminate the existing membership but simply appointed additional members.

5. Council is now required to clarify its membership by clearly articulating its preferred elected member appointment to each position.

Consultation

6. Council was advised of the above requirements in the administration response to Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves Notice of Motion on 18 November 2025.

Decision Implications

7. If Council does not expressly terminate the current membership on Catalina Regional Council, the membership will continue to be inconsistent with the Catalina Regional Council Establishment Agreement and unimplementable (as the City has only one member position).

Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

Strategy	
Strategic Pillar (Objective)	A Well-Governed City
Related Documents (Issue Specific Strategies and Plans):	Catalina Regional Council Establishment Agreement

Legislation, Delegation of Authority and Policy	
Legislation:	Nil.
Authority of Council/CEO:	Council.
Policy:	Nil.

Financial Implications

Nil.

Further Information

8. Questions and Responses forming part of the Agenda Briefing Session on 2 December 2025 are as follows:

	Question	Response
1.	If the Deputy Lord Mayor had liaised with the Administration before proposing their amended could this situation of having two people in place for the same committee position been dealt with at the time, rather than yet another membership motion?	The Administration provided advice on the requirement to terminate an elected members representation on the Catalina Regional Council in its response to the notice of motion to appoint extra members (Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 18 November 2025 pages 222/223)

2.	<p>So how does that affect the official payments of committee fees for both of these individuals?</p>	<p>The Catalina Regional Council Establishment Agreement requires each member Council to appoint one member and one deputy member as its representatives.</p> <p>Council's recent decision to appoint an additional member and an additional deputy member has created ambiguity regarding who is formally representing the City in each role. As a result, the administration must seek clarification from Council before notifying the Catalina Regional Council.</p> <p>Until Council confirms its intended appointments and formal advice is issued, our understanding is that the original membership remains in effect.</p>
3.	<p>Lord Mayor, David Goncalves recently recommended that I, Councillor Doshi, be removed from the Catalina Regional Council and self-appointed.</p> <p>Please clarify for the public record the rationale that DLM Goncalves provided to you for putting forward this late recommendation including any criteria, governance considerations or operational factors he identified?</p>	<p>Thank you, Councillor.</p> <p>I want to be clear for the record that I did not have any extended discussion with the Deputy Lord Mayor about his alternate motion.</p>
4.	<p>Lord Mayor. Based on the competencies normally expected for representation on Catalina Regional Council, did the Deputy Lord Mayor Goncalves provide you with any justification as to why he considered himself better placed than I, noting the two years of experience I already have on the committee, the 100% attendance record that I hold on the committee, and a letter from the CEO of the Catalina Council confirming a positive extended did participation on Catalina activities.</p>	<p>"No, Councillor. I did not discuss it in any detail."</p>
5.	<p>Does the city hold any assessment of whether this late change may give rise to organisational or reputational risk for the city, including potential impacts on the city's relationship with the Catalina Regional Council, its administration, and anybody else who is involved?</p>	<p>This is a decision of Council and the implications of proceeding with the Notice of Motion were provided by the administration in the agenda for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 18 November 2025.</p>

6.	<p>The email for the alternate motion was received at 4:20 on the same day as a meeting that took place at 5:00 p.m. Would you class that as sufficient time for me to talk to elected members?</p>	<p>“Councillor, I understand the concern. The Deputy Lord Mayor had indicated earlier in the week that he was considering an amendment or alternate nomination, but it is correct that the specific wording was circulated at 4:20pm ahead of the 5:00pm meeting. It personally was enough time for me to arrive at my decision.</p>
7.	<p>Lord Mayor, as a leader of the council under the local government act, are you aware of any new elected members communicated? Did any of the new elected members communicate with you regarding this sudden change to Catalina Council on at 4:20 p.m. And I also ask the same question of the administration.</p>	<p>Response provided by LM in the Chamber: No.</p> <p>The administration became aware of a Notice of Motion from the Deputy Lord Mayor on Tuesday 11 November 2025. The administration was not aware of who was proposed to be representing the City on the Catalina Regional Council, only that there would be a motion presented on the membership.</p> <p>As the proposed changes to committee memberships may affect elected members, it was advised that it would be appropriate, and consistent with the Lord Mayor’s process prior to the Special Council Meeting, that everyone have an opportunity to review and discuss the motion at an Engagement Session.</p> <p>The Deputy Lord Mayor advised the administration that he would prefer to proceed directly to the Ordinary Council Meeting.</p> <p>The administration then prepared an administration response which is outlined in the agenda for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 18 November 2025.</p> <p>At 4:18pm on 18 November 2025, the administration received Deputy Lord Mayor Goncalves’ alternate motion which contained the names of those they proposed for representation on the Catalina Regional Council.</p>

		This alternate motion was distributed to elected members at 4:29pm on the same day.
--	--	---

Officers Recommendation

Mover: Councillor Raj Doshi

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

During debate, Councillor Raj Doshi moved an Amended Motion as follows:

Amended Motion (OCM-25/12-028)

Mover: Councillor Raj Doshi

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

The Lord Mayor foreshadowed the officers recommendation in the event that the motion under debate is lost.

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

3. ACKNOWLEDGE that If this amended motion fails, I wish to be removed from the Catalina Regional Council.

LOST (3/4)

For: Councillors Raj Doshi, Viktor Ko and Catherine Lezer

Against: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert and Lisa Ma

7:24pm Councillor Viktor Ko raised a point of order in accordance with Clause 8.3 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009, that by disparaging Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves, Councillor Raj Doshi was breaching Clause 7.4 (2a) of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009.

7:24pm The Lord Mayor acknowledged the point of order and allowed Councillor Doshi to continue with the debate.

8:30pm Councillor Raj Doshi attempted to raise a point of order in accordance with Clause 8.3 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009.

Councillor Raj Doshi did not follow the procedure for raising a point of order and debate resumed.

Debate reverted back to the Officers Recommendation.

Officers Recommendation

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
	16 October 2027

Prior to debate, Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves moved an Alternate Motion as follows:

8:45pm Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves attempted to raise a point of order in accordance with Clause 8.3 of the City's Standing Orders Local Law 2009.

Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves did not follow the procedure for raising a point of order and debate resumed.

Alternate Motion (OCM-25/12-029)

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Liam Gobbert	16 October 2027

CARRIED (4/3)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Raj Doshi, Viktor Ko and Catherine Lezer

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-030)

Mover: Councillor Liam Gobbert

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Ma

That Council, should it resolve to proceed with this matter, do so in accordance with the requirements of the Establishment Agreement to:

1. TERMINATE the following membership to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Raj Doshi Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027

2. APPOINT the following members to the Catalina Regional Council

Member	Term Expiry
Councillor David Goncalves	16 October 2027
Deputy Member	Term Expiry
Councillor Liam Gobbert	16 October 2027

CARRIED (4/3)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert and Lisa Ma

Against: Councillors Raj Doshi, Viktor Ko and Catherine Lezer

Reasons for Change:

My recommendation was guided by a governance-based rationale: to ensure that the City of Perth's representation on the Catalina Regional Council reflects the leadership level that our partner councils have already embraced. All our neighbouring local governments - including the City of Vincent, the Town of Cambridge, and the Town of Victoria Park - all of whom were part of the original pre-1995 City of Perth - appoint their Mayor or Deputy Mayor to this regional body. Their approach signals the strategic importance they place on the Catalina project and the leadership weight they believe is appropriate for such a significant inter-council undertaking. By aligning our representation with this model of senior leadership involvement, we strengthen the City of Perth's ability to collaborate effectively, influence strategic direction, and maintain parity with our partner councils. This is especially important given the scale and long-term nature of the Catalina land development. Crucially Catalina should generate substantial returns that can support member councils, and these returns should play a vital role in supporting community infrastructure and offsetting liabilities associated with related entities, including the Mindarie Regional Council. Given these stakes, it is

prudent that the City's representative be able to provide high-level strategic oversight, maintain strong relationships with other councils' leadership, and advocate forcefully for our community's interests in this multi-decade development project. Elevating the role to the Deputy Lord Mayor supports these objectives and ensures that the City of Perth has a strong, authoritative voice at the table as key decisions are made.

This decision was not taken lightly. It was made with the interests of our local community in mind and in keeping with the Code of Conduct's requirement that we exercise our responsibilities in the public interest. I want to acknowledge Cr Doshi's involvement over the past fourteen months (rather than the two years claim) since taking over the vacancy left by a previous councillor. This change is not a reflection on your personal competency or commitment. The nomination to put myself forward for consideration was based on the role and position I hold, and the ability to constructively work closely with the Lord Mayor and Council as a whole. I believe it is what the Deputy Lord Mayor's role can bring to the table in terms of leadership linkage, rather than any shortcoming in your performance. As DLM I have a responsibility to support the Lord Mayor and lead in various forums, and being on this Regional Council would allow a more direct line of communication between that external body and the City's leadership. This can facilitate a constructive, consensus approach to representing our Council's interests - I can readily liaise with the Lord Mayor, fellow Councillors, and the City administration to ensure our stance at Catalina meetings reflects a unified Council position. It is also common practice among our former constituent councils - including Vincent, Cambridge and Victoria Park - to appoint their Mayor or Deputy Mayor to major regional committees. This reflects a shared understanding that senior office-holders are best placed to represent the whole Council's position, provide continuity of leadership, and engage constructively with their counterparts across local government. My aim is to bring that same level of senior representation for the City of Perth utilising the scope and open communication channels of the office I occupy - which is better positioned to serve the strategic needs of this role at this particular crucial time. The strategic future of Catalina and the Mindarie Regional Councils is at a critical point, and it demands active, senior-level representation to ensure the City of Perth's interests are fully understood, advocated for and protected by working actively with our neighboring councils and indeed Council itself.

18. Committee Reports

Nil

19. Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given

Item 19 was brought forward to be considered prior to Officer Reports. See+ page 47

20. Matters for which the meeting may be closed

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-031)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Liam Gobbert

That Council CLOSE the meeting to the public.

Strategic Risk Profile Review November 2025

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (7/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Raj Doshi, Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

7:51pm *The Meeting was closed to the public and the livestream paused.*

Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee meeting held on 24 November 2025

In accordance with Section 5.23(2)(f) of the Local Government Act 1995, the following Item 20.1 and its attachments are confidential.

7:56pm Councillor Raj Doshi retired from the meeting prior to Item 20.1.

20.1 Strategic Risk Profile Review November 2025

Responsible Officer	Brent Godfrey – Audit and Risk Manager
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Attachment 20.1A – Strategic Risk Profile November 2025

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-032)

Mover: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Lezer

That Council ENDORSES the Strategic Risk Profile November 2025.

CARRIED (5/1)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer and Lisa Ma

Against: Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves;

Council Resolution (OCM-25/12-033)

Mover: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds

Seconded: Councillor Viktor Ko

That Council OPEN the meeting to the public.

CARRIED UNOPPOSED (6/0)

For: Lord Mayor Bruce Reynolds; Deputy Lord Mayor David Goncalves; Councillors Liam Gobbert, Viktor Ko, Catherine Lezer and Lisa Ma

Against: Nil.

7:59pm *The Meeting was reopened to the public and the livestream resumed.*

21. Urgent Business

Nil.

22. Closure

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 8:00pm.